	1
•	
1	
2	
3	JUN 1 3 2001
4	DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE
5	By Sparten
6	
7	
8	
9	BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE
10	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
11	* * *
12	In the Matter of the Accusation of) NO. H-2084 SA
13	KIRKOR YARACIYAN,)
14	Respondent.)
15	ORDER GRANTING REINSTATEMENT OF LICENSE
16	On April 15, 1997, a Decision was rendered herein
17	revoking the real estate broker license of Respondent, but
18	granting Respondent the right to the issuance of a restricted
19	real estate broker license. A restricted real estate broker
20	license was issued to Respondent on June 4, 1997 and Respondent
21	has operated as a restricted licensee without cause for
22	disciplinary action against Respondent since that time.
23	On January 31, 2001, Respondent petitioned for
24	reinstatement of said real estate broker license and the
25	Attorney General of the State of California has been given
26	notice of the filing of said petition.
27	111

j.

I have considered the petition of Respondent and the evidence and arguments in support thereof. Respondent has demonstrated to my satisfaction that Respondent meets the requirements of law for the issuance to Respondent of an unrestricted real estate broker license and that it would not be against the public interest to issue said license to Respondent KIRKOR YARACIYAN.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that Respondent's 9 petition for reinstatement is granted and that a real estate 10 broker license be issued to Respondent if Respondent satisfies 11 the following conditions within nine (9) months from the date 12 of this Order: 13 Submittal of a completed application and payment 1. 14 of the fee for a real estate broker license. 15 Submittal of evidence of having, since the most 2. 16 recent issuance of an original or renewal real estate license, 17 taken and successfully completed the continuing education 18 requirements of Article 2.5 of Chapter 3 of the Real Estate Law 19 for renewal of a real estate license. 20 This Order shall become effective immediately. 21 the DATED: 22 PAULA REDDISH ZINNEMANN 23 Real Estate Commissioner 24 25 26 Kirkor Yaraciyan cc: 27 5181 Gelding Circle Huntington Beach, CA 92649

y.	1
Jo Ar	2
τŅ	
	4 JUL - 7 1997
	5 DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE
	6 . 41
	7 By trily Akeden
	8 DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE
	9 STATE OF CALIFORNIA
	0 * * * * * *
1	In the Matter of the Accusation of) No. H-2084 SA
1)
1	INC., KIRKOR YARACIYAN,)
	individually and as)
1	Capital Investments, Inc.,)
1	DONALD JOHN SAFFIRE,
-	Respondents.)
, 1	ORDER DENVING RECONSIDERATION
20	On April 15, 1997, a Decision was rendered in the
21	
22	12 o'clock noon on June 4, 1997.
23	An Order Staying Effective Date was issued staying the
24	effective date for a period of thirty (30) days until 12 o'clock
. 25	noon on July 7, 1997.
26	1
27	/
	. /
STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 3-95) 95 28391	

On June 20, 1997, respondent UNION CAPITAL INVESTMENTS, INC., petitioned for reconsideration of the Decision of April 15, 1997, and submitted additional argument in support of its petition for reconsideration. I have given due consideration to the petition of said respondent. I find no good cause to reconsider the Decision of April 15, 1997, and reconsideration is hereby denied. IT IS SO ORDERED JIM ANTT, JR. Real Estate Commissioner lu PAPER LIFORNIA EV. 3-951

SPECTO'	
1	
2	
3	DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE
4	Av Baher
5	
6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
7	
8	DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE
9	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10	* * * *
11	In the Matter of the Accusation of) No. H-2084 SA
12	UNION CAPITAL INVESTMENTS,) INC., et al.,) J
13	INC., et al.,)) Respondents.)
14)
15	AMENDED ORDER STAYING EFFECTIVE DATE
16	On April 15, 1997, a Decision was rendered in the above-
17	entitled matter to become effective June 4, 1997.
18 19	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the effective date of the
/ 20	Decision of April 15, 1997, is stayed for a period of 30 days as to
21	respondent <u>UNION CAPITAL INVESTMENTS, INC</u> only.
22	The Decision of April 15, 1997, shall become effective at
23	12 o'clock noon on July 7, 1997.
24	DATED: June 2, 1997.
25	JIM ANTT, JR. Real Estate Commissioner
28	
27	By: Keulolith Klanded
COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 3-95) 95 28391	RANDOLPH BRENDIA Regional Manager

Spilare	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE
6	
7	By Stille Stars
8	DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE
9	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10	* * * *
11	In the Matter of the Accusation of) No. H-2084 SA) L-9511022
12	UNION CAPITAL INVESTMENTS,) INC., et al.,)
13	Respondents.)
14)
15	ORDER STAYING EFFECTIVE DATE
16	On April 15, 1997, a Decision was rendered in the above-
17	entitled matter to become effective June 4, 1997.
18	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the effective date of the
/ 19	Decision of April 15, 1997, is stayed for a period of 30 days as to
20	respondents UNION CAPITAL INVESTMENTS, INC., and SIMON JAMES DILLON
21	only.
22	The Decision of April 15, 1997, shall become effective at
23	12 o'clock noon on July 7, 1997.
24	DATED: May 30, 1997.
25	JIM ANTT, JR. Real Es tate Commission er
26	Nedi include commissioner
27 COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 3-93) 95 28391	By: RANDOLPH BRENDIA Regional Manager



DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

* * * * *

)

In the Matter of the Accusation of

UNION CAPITAL INVESTMENTS, INC.; KIRKOR YARACIYAN; and GLENN EVERETT SAXTON, individually and as designated officers of Union Capital Investments, Inc.; SIMON JAMES DILLON, and DONALD JOHN SAFFIRE, DRE No. H-2084 SA OAH No. L-9511022

Respondents.

DECISION

The Proposed Decision dated March 19, 1997, of the Administrative Law Judge of the Office of Administrative Hearings has been considered by me.

Pursuant to Section 11517(b) of the Government Code of the State of California, the disciplinary action imposed upon respondent UNION CAPITAL INVESTMENTS, INC., is reduced by modifying Paragraph 1 of the Order of the Proposed Decision to be as follows:

> a. Respondent pays a monetary penalty pursuant to Section 10175.2 of the Business and Professions Code at the rate of \$222.23 for each day of the suspension for a total monetary penalty of \$10;000.

Except as hereby modified and amended, the Proposed Decision dated March 19, 1997, is hereby adopted as the Decision of the Real Estate Commissioner.

ι

- -

۰.

÷ 1.

	This Decision shall become effective at 12 o'clock
noon on	
• •	IT IS SO ORDERED

JIM ANTT, JR. Real Estate Commissioner

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SA

In the Matter of the Accusation)
· ·) No. H-2084
UNION CAPITAL INVESTMENTS, INC.,)) L-9511022
KIRKOR YARACIYAN, and)
GLENN EVERETT SAXTON,) .
individually and as)
designated officer of Union)
Capital Investments, Inc.,)
SIMON JAMES DILLON, and)
DONALD JOHN SAFFIRE,)
)
Respondents.)
)

PROPOSED DECISION

This matter came on regularly for hearing before Ronald M. Gruen, Administrative Law Judge of the Office of Administrative Hearings, at Los Angeles, California, on February 26, 1997.

Elliott MacLennan, Staff, Counsel, Department of Real Estate, represented the complainant. Respondent Union Capital Investments, Inc., a corporation was represented by its Vice-President, Nezam Nejad. Respondents Glenn Everett Saxton and Simon James Dillon were present and represented themselves. Respondent's Kirkor Yaraciyan and Donald John Saffire were not present or represented although duly and legally served with service of process and notice of hearing.

Oral and documentary evidence having been received, submission of the matter was deferred until March 7, 1997, to permit the complainant an opportunity to file a written brief. No such brief having been timely filed the matter stood submitted as of March 7, 1997. On March 13, 1997, the complainant's brief was received and marked as Exhibit 21 for identification but was not considered. The Administrative Law Judge now finds as follows:

The complainant, Thomas McCrady, is a Deputy Real Estate Commissioner and filed the Accusation in his official capacity.

11

At all times mentioned herein, Union Capital Investments, Inc. ("Union"), was and still is licensed by the Department of Real Estate of the State of California ("Department") as a corporate real estate broker.

At all times herein mentioned, Kirkor Yaraciyan ("Yaraciyan") was licensed by the Department as a real estate broker in his individual capacity. From August 4, 1992, to February 24, 1994, Yaraciyan was licensed by the Department as the designated officer of Union. As the designated officer of Union, Yaraciyan was responsible for the supervision and control of the activities conducted on behalf of Union by its officers and employees as necessary to secure full compliance with the Real Estate Law as set forth in Section 10159.2 of the Code.

1

IV

At all times herein mentioned, Glenn Everett Saxton ("Saxton") was licensed by the Department as a real estate broker in his individual capacity. It was not established that from February 25, 1994, to May 31, 1994, Saxton was acting as the officially designated officer of Union, and therefore was not was responsible for the supervision and control of the activities conducted on behalf of Union by its officers and employees as necessary to secure full compliance with the Real Estate Law.

The evidence showed that respondent Saxton applied to the Department for designated officer status with Union, but the Department never acted on such application and respondent Saxton never became designated officer of record for Union, and is not legally responsible for his conduct in performing as a designated officer.

V

At all times mentioned herein, Simon James Dillon ("Dillon") was licensed by the Department as a real estate salesperson. On or about June 3, 1990, Dillon's license was suspended by the Department for failing to comply with Section 10153.4(a) of the California Business and Professions Code (Code). On or about February 16, 1994, Dillon was licensed by the Department as a real estate salesperson employed under the broker license of Saxton.

VI

From May 20, 1994 to May 19, 1998, Donald John Saffire ("Saffire") was and is licensed by the Department as a real estate salesperson employed under the broker license of Saxton.

VII

At no time mentioned herein were Ingrid England ("England"), Paul M. Albert ("Albert"), Nezam Nejad ("Nejad"), Jeff Summer Russell ("J. Russell"), or Richard Russell ("R. Russell") licensed by the Department as real estate salespersons operating under the license of a real estate broker or as real estate brokers.

1

VIII

At all times mentioned herein, for or in expectation of compensation, Union engaged in the business of, acted in the capacity of, advertised or assumed to act as a real estate broker in the State of California, within the meaning of Section 10131(d) of the Code, including the operation of a mortgage loan brokerage business with the public wherein lenders and borrowers were solicited for loans secured directly or collaterally by liens on real property, wherein such loans were arranged, negotiated, processed, and consummated on behalf of others for compensation or in expectation of compensation.

IX

On or about June 23, 1994, Department personnel completed an investigative audit of the books and records of Union, pertaining to its mortgage loan broker activities, for a period commencing on January 1, 1993, and terminating on May 31, 1994, and unless otherwise specified, the relevant period of time referenced herein shall be the same. The findings of that audit are set forth in the findings of fact that follow.

Х

A. On or about January 1, 1993, and continuing thereafter, Union engaged in the business of claiming, demanding, charging, receiving, collecting or contracting for the collection of advance fees within the meaning of Sections 10026 and 10131.2 of the Code. Said advance fees were collected from the prospective borrowers as a loan application fee for the negotiation of financing for

the purchase and/or development of real property secured directly or collaterally by liens on said real property. The advance fees collected were not placed in a trust account nor was an accounting made to the principals as required by law.¹ The contention on the part of Union, that such fees were not associated with costs of the loan, and therefore not advance fees, is rejected. Further it was established that Union did not submit to the Commissioner at least ten days prior to its use, any of the materials used in collecting the advance fees as required by law.¹

XI

On or about November 30, 1993, Saffire solicited and negotiated a loan application for a Carol Maas ("Maas") although he was not licensed by the Department at the time. The loan application taken by Saffire was the result of prior discussion between Maas, J. Russell, Dillon, Saffire, and Nejad about financing although none were licensed at the time by the Department. Maas paid a loan application fee of \$95.00 at the time. This fee was deposited into Union's general operating account on December 10, 1993. J. Russell was compensated from this transaction. J. Russell, Dillon, Saffire, and Nejad violated the law² by performing said acts which require a license when J. Russell, Dillon, Saffire, and Nejad were not licensed by the Department at the time as either real estate brokers or as salespersons employed under the license of Union. Union violated the law³ by employing and/or compensating J. Russell, Dillon, Saffire, and Nejad for these acts. As previously noted Union did not consider application fees to be an advance fee and therefore saw no need to deposit same into a trust account.

1

XII

The audit examination also revealed that Union employed Dillon, England and Nejad to perform acts which require a real estate license when none were licensed by the Department at the time. Dillon, England and Nejad assisted Union as loan officers by soliciting borrowers and negotiating rates and terms with said borrowers as telemarketers, for the purpose of originating mortgage loans. Dillon, Nejad and England discussed financing with Mark and Cindy Reidlinger and England took their loan application on September 9, 1993. The Reidlingers paid a loan application fee of \$95.00 at the time. This fee was deposited into Union's

¹Code Sections 10085 and 10146.

And Chapter 6, Title 10, California Code of Regulations, Sections 2970 and 2972.

²Code Section 10130.

³Code Section 10137.

general operating account on September 13, 1993. Dillon, England and Nejad violated the law² by performing said acts which require a license when Dillon, England and Nejad were not licensed by the Department at the time as either real estate broker or as salespersons employed under the license of Union. Union violated the law³ by employing and/or compensating Dillon, England and Nejad for these acts.

XIII

At all times material in the course of the above-described mortgage loan brokerage business, Union solicited borrowers for and negotiated for loans secured by liens on real property. The evidence did not establish that borrowers did not receive Mortgage Loan Disclosure Statements when mortgage loans were arranged as required by law.⁴

XIV

1

The audit examination revealed that Union employed real estate salespersons who prepared instruments which had a material effect upon the rights and obligations of principals represented by Union. Yaraciyan violated the Regulations⁵ by failing to review, initial and date all such instruments.

XV

The audit examination also revealed that Union failed to maintain written broker-salesperson agreements for the salespeople employed by them, in connection with mortgage loan brokerage activities for which a real estate license is required in violation of the Regulation.⁶ Union's contention that such agreements were maintained is not supported by the evidence.

⁴Code Section 10240.

 ⁵Chapter 6, Title 10, California Code of Regulations, Section 2725.
⁶Section 2726

XVI

The audit examination also revealed that Union employed real estate $\langle a a b b c a$

XVII

The audit examination also revealed that Union did not disclose to borrowers that it received rebates from lenders for mortgage loans arranged through said lenders. Union violated the law⁸ by taking such secret compensation without notifying the borrowers of this fact.

XVIII

1

Union is a family-owned mortgage lender. The equity holders are Nezam Nejad and his brother. Neither of the brothers are real estate licensees. Nezam testified on behalf of Union and displayed ignorance in certain areas of the law critical to licensure. However, with a qualified designated officer for Union, as required by law, the violations found hereinabove should be corrected. The violations for the most part arose out of failure of active supervision on the part of the designated officer. There is no evidence of deliberate wrongdoing on the part of Union or its principals.

XIX

All allegations in the accusation not found to be true were not established by the evidence.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

1. Respondents Union and Yaracivan violated Code Section <u>10137</u> and Section <u>10177(d)</u> by reason of findings X, XI, XII, XIV, XV, XVI and XVII.

2. Respondent Yaraciyan as designated officer of Union, failed to exercise reasonable supervision and control and cause for suspension or revocation exists under Code Section 10177(h) by reason of findings X, XI, XII, XIV, XV, XVI and XVII.

⁷Section 2752

⁸Business and Professions Code Section 10176(g).

3. Respondents <u>Dillon</u> and <u>Saffire</u> violated Code Section <u>10130</u> and cause for suspension or revocation exists under Section <u>10177(d)</u> by reason of findings XI and XII for acting as a real estate licensees without a license.

4. No violation of law was established on the part of respondent Saxton by reason of finding IV.

WHEREFORE, THE FOLLOWING ORDER is hereby made:

1. All licenses and licensing rights of respondent Union Capital Investments, Inc. under the Real Estate Law are suspended for a period of fortyfive (45) days from the effective date of this Decision; provided, however, that if respondent petitions, said suspension shall be stayed upon condition that:

a. Respondent pays a monetary penalty pursuant to Section 10175.2 of the Business and Professions Code at the rate of \$250.00 for each day of the suspension for a total monetary penalty of \$11,250.00

1

ç

b. Said payment shall be in the form of a cashier's check or certified check made payable to the Recovery Account of the Real Estate Fund. Said check must be delivered to the Department prior to the effective date of the Decision in this matter.

c. No further cause for disciplinary action against the real estate license of respondent occurs within one year from the effective date of the Decision in this matter.

d. If respondent fails to pay the monetary penalty in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Decision, the Commissioner may, without a hearing, order the immediate execution of all or any part of the stayed suspension in which event the respondent shall not be entitled to any repayment nor credit, prorated or otherwise, for money paid to the Department under the terms of this Decision.

e. If respondent pays the monetary penalty and if no further cause for disciplinary action against the real estate license of respondent occurs within one year from the effective date of the Decision, the stay hereby granted shall become permanent. 2. All licenses and licensing rights of respondent Kirkor Yaraciyan under the Real Estate Law are revoked; provided, however, a restricted real estate broker license shall be issued to respondent pursuant to Section 10156.5 of the Business and Professions Code if respondent makes application therefore and pays to the Department of Real Estate the appropriate fee for the restricted license within 90 days from the effective date of this Decision. The restricted license issued to respondent shall be subject to all of the provisions of Section 10156.7 of the Business and Professions Code and to the following limitations, conditions and restrictions imposed under authority of Section 10156.6 of that Code:

> <u>a. The restricted license issued</u> to respondent may be suspended prior to hearing by Order of the Real Estate Commissioner in the event of respondent's conviction or plea of nolo contendere to a crime which is substantially related to respondent's fitness or capacity as a real estate licensee.

> > 1

b. The restricted license issued to respondent may be suspended prior to hearing by Order of the Real Estate Commissioner on evidence satisfactory to the Commissioner that respondent has violated provisions of the California Real Estate Law, the Subdivided Lands Law, Regulations of the Real Estate Commissioner or conditions attaching to the restricted license.

c. Respondent shall not be eligible to apply for the issuance of an unrestricted real estate license nor for the removal of any of the conditions, limitations or restrictions of a restricted license until two (2) years have elapsed from the effective date of this Decision.

3. All licenses and licensing rights of respondents Simon James Dillon and Donald John Saffire under the Real Estate Law are suspended for a period of thirty (30) days from the effective date of this Decision; provided, however, that if respondents petition, said suspension shall be stayed upon condition that:

> a. Respondents and each of them pay a monetary penalty pursuant to Section 10175.2 of the Business and Professions Code at the rate of \$150.00 for each day of the suspension for a total monetary penalty of \$4,500.00.

b. Said payment shall be in the form of a cashier's check or certified check made payable to the Recovery Account of the Real Estate Fund. Said check must be delivered to the Department prior to the effective date of the Decision in this matter.

c. No further cause for disciplinary action against the real estate license of respondents occur within one year from the effective date of the Decision in this matter.

d. If respondents or any of them fail to pay the monetary penalty in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Decision, the Commissioner may, without a hearing, order the immediate execution of all or any part of the stayed suspension in which event the defaulting respondents shall not be entitled to any repayment nor credit, prorated or otherwise, for money paid to the Department under the terms of this Decision.

7

e. If respondents pay the monetary penalty and if no further cause for disciplinary action against the real estate license of respondents occur within one year form the effective date of the Decision, the stay hereby granted shall become permanent.

4. The accusation against respondent Glenn Everett Saxton is

dismissed.

1997 Q DATED:

RONALD M. GRUEN

Administrative Law Judge Office of Administrative Hearings

RMG:btm

10. 110.	BEFORE THE DEPAR	MENT OF REAL LA FATE	
			NOV 26 1996
	*	* * DEP	ARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE
	In the Matter of the Accusation of		The REAL ESTATE
	UNION CAPITAL INVESTMENTS,))	All and
	et al.,		
) Case No. H-2084 SA	\bigcirc \bigcirc
	Respondents.) OAH No. L-9511022	
	_ ·	_)	

NOTICE OF CONTINUED HEARING ON ACCUSATION

To the above-named Respondents:

You are hereby notified that a hearing will be held before the Department of Real Estate at Office of Administrative Hearings, 314 West First Street, Los Angeles, California, on February 26, 1997, at the hour of 9:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter can be heard, upon the Accusation served upon you.

You may be present at the hearing. You have the right to be represented by an attorney at your own expense. You are not entitled to the appointment of an attorney to represent you at public expense. You are entitled to represent yourself without legal counsel. If you are not present in person nor represented by counsel at the hearing, the Department may take disciplinary action against you based upon any express admission or other evidence including affidavits, without any notice to you.

You may present any relevant evidence and will be given full opportunity to cross-examine all witnesses testifying against you. You are entitled to the issuance of subpenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, documents or other things by applying to the Department of Real Estate.

The hearing shall be conducted in the English language. If you want to offer the testimony of any witness who does not proficiently speak the English language, you must provide your own interpreter. The interpreter must be approved by the Administrative Law Judge conducting the hearing as someone who is proficient in both English and the language in which the witness will testify. You are required to pay the costs of the interpreter unless the Administrative Law Judge directs otherwise.

Dated: November 26, 1996.

DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

cc: Union Capital Investments Kirkor Yaracivan Glenn Everett Saxton Simon James Dillon Donald John Saffire Sacto. OAH

ei y. L

ELLIOTT MAC LENNAN, Counsel

RE 501 (Mac 8/92vj)

prop 2 3	George Wright, Staff Counsel Department of Real Estate 107 South Broadway, Room 8107 Los Angeles, CA 90012 (213) 897-3937 By Ktubelog
4	
6	
7	
8	
9	DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE
10	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
11	In the Matter of the Accusation of) No. H-2084 SA
12)
13	UNION CAPITAL INVESTMENTS, INC.,) ACCUSATION KIRKOR YARACIYAN, and GLENN) EVERETT SAXTON, individually)
14	and as designated officers of) Union Capital Investments, Inc.,)
15	SIMON JAMES DILLON, and DONALD) JOHN SAFFIRE,
16	Respondents.
17)
18	The Complainant, Thomas McCrady, a Deputy Real Estate
/ 19	Commissioner of the State of California, for cause of accusation
20	against UNION CAPITAL INVESTMENTS, INC., KIRKOR YARACIYAN, and
21	GLENN EVERETT SAXTON, individually and as designated officers of
22	Union Capital Investments, Inc., SIMON JAMES DILLON, and DONALD
23	JOHN SAFFIRE, alleges as follows:
24	I The Complainant, Thomas McCrady, a Deputy Real Estate
25	Commissioner of the State of California, makes this Accusation in
26	his official capacity.
27	
COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV 3-93) 95 28391	-1-

ار د د

1 At all times mentioned herein, UNION CAPITAL 2 INVESTMENTS, INC. ("UNION"), was and still is licensed by the 3 Department of Real Estate of the State of California 4 ("Department") as a corporate real estate broker. 5 III 6 At all times herein mentioned, KIRKOR YARACIYAN 7 ("YARACIYAN") was licensed by the Department as a real estate 8 broker in his individual capacity. From August 4, 1992, to 9 February 24, 1994, YARACIYAN was licensed by the Department as the 10 designated officer of UNION. As the designated officer of UNION, 11 YARACIYAN was responsible for the supervision and control of the 12 activities conducted on behalf of UNION by its officers and 13 employees as necessary to secure full compliance with the Real 14 Estate Law as set forth in Section 10159.2 of the Code. 15 IV 16 At all times herein mentioned, GLENN EVERETT SAXTON 17 ("SAXTON") was licensed by the Department as a real estate broker 18 in his individual capacity. From February 25, 1994, to May 31, 19 1994, SAXTON was acting as the designated officer of UNION. As

II

26

27

10159.2 of the Code.

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV 3-95)

95 28391

-2-

the designated officer of UNION, SAXTON was responsible for the

supervision and control of the activities conducted on behalf of

UNION by its officers and employees as necessary to secure full

compliance with the Real Estate Law as set forth in Section

V 1 At all times mentioned herein, SIMON JAMES DILLON 2 ("DILLON") was licensed by the Department as a real estate 3 salesperson. On or about June 3, 1990, DILLON'S license was 4 suspended by the Department for failing to comply with Section 5 10153.4(a) of the California Business and Professions Code. On or 6 about February 16, 1994, DILLON was licensed by the Department as 7 a real estate salesperson employed under the broker license of 8 SAXTON. 9 VI 10 At all times mentioned herein, DONALD JOHN SAFFIRE 11 ("SAFFIRE") was licensed by the Department as a real estate 12 salesperson employed under the broker license of SAXTON. 13 VII 14 At no time mentioned herein were Ingrid England 15 ("England"), Paul M. Albert ("Albert"), Nezam Nejad ("Nejad"), 16 Jeff Summer Russell (" J. Russell"), or Richard Russell ("R. 17 Russell") licensed by the Department as real estate salespersons 18 operating under the license of a real estate broker or as real 19 estate brokers. 20 VIII 21 All further references to the "Code" are to the 22 California Business and Professions Code, and all further 23 references to the "Regulations" are to Chapter 6, Title 10, 24 California Code of Regulations. 25 26 27 113 (REV. 3-95) -3-

At all times mentioned herein, for or in expectation of 2 compensation, UNION engaged in the business of, acted in the 3 capacity of, advertised or assumed to act as a real estate broker 4 in the State of California, within the meaning of Section 10131(d) 5 of the Code, including the operation of a mortgage loan brokerage 6 business with the public wherein lenders and borrowers were 7 solicited for loans secured directly or collaterally by liens on 8 real property, wherein such loans were arranged, negotiated, 9 processed, and consummated on behalf of others for compensation or 10 in expectation of compensation. 11 Х 12

On or about June 23, 1994, Department personnel completed an investigative audit of the books and records of UNION, pertaining to its mortgage loan broker activities, for a period commencing on January 1, 1993, and terminating on May 31, 1994, and unless otherwise specified, the relevant period of time referenced herein shall be the same. The findings of that audit are set forth in the paragraphs that follow.

XI

On or about January 1, 1993, and continuing thereafter, UNION engaged in the business of claiming, demanding, charging, receiving, collecting or contracting for the collection of advance fees within the meaning of Sections 10026 and 10131.2 of the Code. Said advance fees were collected from the prospective borrowers as a loan application fee for the negotiation of financing for the purchase and/or development of real property secured directly or

-4-

IX

1

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

T PAPER of California 13 (REV. 3-95)

1 collaterally by liens on said real property. The advance fees 2 collected were not placed in a trust account nor was an accounting 3 made to the principals. UNION did not submit to the Commissioner 4 at least five days prior to its use, any of the materials used in 5 collecting the advance fees. UNION violated Sections 10085 and 10146 of the Code and Sections 2970 and 2972 of the Regulations by such conduct.

XII

On or about November 30, 1993, SAFFIRE solicited and 9 negotiated a loan application for a Carol Maas ("Maas") although 10 he was not licensed by the Department at the time. The loan 11 application taken by SAFFIREwas the result of prior discussion 12 between Maas, J. Russell, DILLON, SAFFIRE, and Nejad about 13 financing although none were licensed at the time by the 14 Department. Maas paid a loan application fee of \$95.00 at the 15 time. This fee was deposited into UNION'S general operating 16 account on December 10, 1993. J. Russell was compensated for this 17 transaction. J. Russell, DILLON, SAFFIRE, and Nejad violated 18 Section 10130 of the Code by performing said acts which require a 19 license when J. Russell, DILLON, SAFFIRE, and Nejad were not 20 licensed by the Department at the time as either real estate 21 brokers or as salespersons employed under the license of UNION. 22 UNION violated Section 10137 of the Code by employing and/or 23 compensating J. Russell, DILLON, SAFFIRE, and Nejad for these 24 acts. 25

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 3-95)

26

27

8

-5-

The audit examination also revealed that UNION employed 2 DILLON, England, Albert, R. Russell and Nejad to perform acts 3 which require a real estate license when none were licensed by the 4 Department at the time. DILLON, England, Albert and Nejad 5 assisted UNION as loan officers by soliciting borrowers and 6 negotiating rates and terms with said borrowers as telemarketers, 7 for the purpose of originating mortgage loans. DILLON, Nejad and 8 England discussed financing with Mark and Cindy Reidlinger and 9 England took their loan application on September 9, 1993. The 10 Reidlingers paid a loan application fee of \$95.00 at the time. 11 This fee was deposited into UNION'S general operating account on 12 September 13, 1993. DILLON, England, R. Russell and Nejad violated 13 Section 10130 of the Code by performing said acts which require a 14 license when DILLON, England, R. Russell and Nejad were not 15 licensed by the Department at the time as either real estate 16 brokers or as salespersons employed under the license of UNION. 17 UNION violated Section 10137 of the Code by employing and/or 18 compensating DILLON, England, R. Rusell and Nejad for these acts. 19 XIV

At all times material in the course of the abovedescribed mortgage loan brokerage business, UNION solicited borrowers for and negotiated for loans secured by liens on real property. The audit revealed that borrowers did not receive Mortgage Loan Disclosure Statements when mortgage loans were arranged. UNION violated Section 10240 of the Code by failing to provide said borrowers with mortgage loan disclosure statements

XIII

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 3-95) 95 28391

20

21

22

23

24

25 ^{||}

26

27

-6-

	1	when appropriate.
	2	XV
	3	The audit examination also revealed that UNION employed
	4	real estate salespersons who prepared instruments which had a
	5	material effect upon the rights and obligations of principals
	6	represented by UNION. YARACIYAN violated Section 2725 of the
	7	Regulations by failing to review, initial, and date all such
	8	instruments. SAXTON violated Section 2725 of the Regulations by
	9	failing to initial, date and review said documents in a timely
. 1		manner.
1	11	IVX
I	12	The audit examination also revealed that UNION failed to
]	13	maintain written broker-salesperson agreements for the salespeople
I	.4	employed by them, in connection with mortgage loan brokerage
:	15	activities for which a real estate license is required in
J	16	violation of Regulation 2726.
:	17	XVII
:	18	The audit examination also revealed that UNION
, :	19	employed real estate salespersons SAFFIRE and DILLON but
:	20	failed to notify the Department. UNION violated Section 2752
:	21	of the Regulations by failing to failing to notify the
2	22	Department of their employment.
:	23	XVIII
:	24	The audit examination also revealed that UNION did not
:	25	disclose to borrowers that it received rebates from lenders for
:	26	mortgage loans arranged through said lenders. UNION violated
:	27	Section 10176(g) of the Code by taking such secret compensation
COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORT STD. 1 3 (REV. 3-6		-7-

95 28391

1

.

without notifying the borrowers of this fact.

XIX

The conduct of DILLON and SAFFIRE, as alleged in Paragraphs XII and XIII, violated Section 10130 of the Code, and constitutes cause for the suspension or revocation of all licenses and/or license rights of the DILLON and SAFFIRE under Section 10177(d) of the Code.

XX

9 The conduct of UNION, YARACIYAN and SAXTON, as alleged 10 hereinabove in Paragraphs XI through XVIII, constitutes cause for 11 the suspension or revocation of all licenses and/or license rights 12 of UNION, YARACIYAN and SAXTON under Sections 10137 and 10177 (d) 13 of the Code.

XXI

The conduct of Respondent YARACIYAN, in allowing Respondent UNION to violate the above-described provisions of the Code while acting as the designated officer of UNION, constitutes a failure to exercise reasonable supervision and control of the activities of UNION for which a real estate license is required, and is cause for the suspension or revocation of the licenses -and/or licensing rights of YARACIYAN under Section 10177(h) of the Code.

XXII

The conduct of Respondent SAXTON, in allowing Respondent UNION to violate the above-described provisions of the Code while acting as the designated officer of UNION, constitutes a failure to exercise reasonable supervision and control of the activities of UNION for which a real estate license is required, and is cause

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 3-95)

1

2

8

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1	for the suspension or revocation of the licenses and/or licensing
2	rights of SAXTON under Section 10177(h) of the Code.
3	WHEREFORE, Complainant prays that a hearing be conducted
4	on the allegations of this Accusation and that upon proof thereof,
5	a decision be rendered imposing disciplinary action against all
6	licenses and/or license rights of the Respondents under the Real
7	Estate Law and for such other and further relief as may be proper
8	under applicable provisions of law.
9	Dated at Santa Ana, California
. 10	this 21st day of September, 1995.
11	PETER F. HURST
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
, 19	
20	
21	
22	
23	cc: Union Capital Investments, Inc.
24	Kirkor Yaraciyan Glenn Everett Saxton
25	Simon James Dillon Donald John Saffire
26	SACTO ML
27	
COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 3-05) 95 28391	-9-