JAN 18 2001

DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

5 Shell Ely

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

. 10

1

2

5

_ -

11

12

13

14

.15

16

17

18 19

20

22

23

25

.26

In the Matter of the Accusation of DAVID IRA GREENHOLTZ,

Respondent.

No. H-25745 LA

ORDER DENYING REINSTATEMENT OF LICENSE

On May 15, 1995, an Order was rendered revoking the real estate broker license of Respondent, but granting Respondent the right to the issuance of a restricted real estate broker license. A restricted real estate broker license was issued to Respondent on June 13, 1995.

On July 15, 1999, Respondent petitioned for reinstatement of said real estate broker license, and the Attorney General of the State of California has been given notice of the filing of said petition.

I have considered Respondent's petition and the evidence and arguments in support thereof. Respondent has failed to demonstrate to my satisfaction that Respondent has undergone

sufficient rehabilitation to warrant the reinstatement of Respondent's real estate broker license.

Respondent participated in the submission of a falsified loan application. That application showed an inflated income level for the borrower and enabled the borrower to qualify for and obtain a purchase money loan for which the borrower would otherwise not be qualified. Subsequently, the borrower was unable to make the loan payments and lost the property encumbered by the loan in a foreclosure proceeding. The borrower lost the value of her deposit and the payments made to purchase the property. Respondent has not made any restitution in this matter.

Restitution in disciplinary matters is a rehabilitative device analogous to fines or penalties and not the repayment of a debt. The case of <u>Brookman v. State Bar(1988)</u>, 46 Cal. 3d 1004, 1009, citing <u>Kelly v. Robinson (1986)</u>, 479 U.S. 36, holds that "nothing in the Bankruptcy Act, or the cases interpreting that act, prevents imposition of restitution as a condition of probation in an attorney disciplinary matter—even if the underlying subject of the restitution has previously been discharged in bankruptcy, and thus cannot be collected as a debt as such." The <u>Brookman court concluded that requiring</u> restitution of \$48,900 as a condition of probation and the right to practice law was permissible under the federal bankruptcy law.

Respondent's failure to make restitution constitutes a lack of compliance with Section 2911 (b), Title 10, California Code of Regulations.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that Respondent's petition for reinstatement of his real estate broker license is denied. This Order shall become effective at 12 o'clock February 7 noon on 2001. PAULA REDDISH ZINNEMANN Real Estate Commissioner . 9

Department of Real Estate 107 South Broadway, Room 8107 Los Angeles, California 90012 Telephone: (213) 897-3937



By C. Say

DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

10

In the Matter of the Accusation of

DAVID IRA GREENHOLTZ and

MICHAEL GRANVILLE, individually
and dba Western Express Funding,
and dba Western Express Mortgage,

Respondents.

No. H-25745 LA L-63292

STIPULATION AND AGREEMENT IN SETTLEMENT AND ORDER

It is hereby stipulated by and between Respondent <u>DAVID</u>

IRA GREENHOLTZ (hereinafter "Respondent") represented by Calvin E.

Davis, Esq., and the Complainant acting by and through Christopher

K.D. Leong, Counsel for the Department of Real Estate, as follows

for the purpose of settling and disposing of the Accusation filed

on March 15, 1994, in this matter (hereinafter "the Accusation"):

A. All issues which were to be contested and all evidence which was to be presented by Complainant and Respondents at a formal hearing on the Accusation, which hearing was to be held in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure

27

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

23

24

25

26

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 8-72)

R5 34769

-1-

1 Act (APA), shall instead and in place thereof be submitted solely on the basis of the provisions of this Stipulation.

- Respondent has received, read and understands the Statement to Respondent, the Discovery Provisions of the APA and the Accusation, filed by the Department of Real Estate in this proceeding.
- On March 29, 1994, Respondent filed a Notice of С. Defense pursuant to Section 11505 of the Government Code for the purpose of requesting a hearing on the allegations in the Accusation. Respondent hereby freely and voluntarily withdraws said Notice of Defense. Respondent acknowledges that he understands that by withdrawing said Notice of Defense, Respondent will thereby waive his right to require the Commissioner to prove the allegations in the Accusation at a contested hearing held in accordance with the provisions of the APA and that Respondent will waive other rights afforded to him in connection with the hearing, such as the right to present evidence in defense of the allegations in the Accusation and the right to cross-examine witnesses.
- D. Respondent agrees that the allegations in Paragraphs 1 through 17, inclusive, of the Accusation can be the basis of this Stipulation and Agreement in Settlement and Order and that the Real Estate Commissioner shall not be required to provide further evidence of such allegations.
- It is understood by the parties that the Real Estate Commissioner may adopt the Stipulation and Agreement in Settlement and Order as his decision in this matter thereby imposing the penalty and sanctions on Respondent's real estate license and

COURT PAPER TATE OF CALIFORNIA

2

3

5

7

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

license rights as set forth in the "Order" below. In the event
that the Commissioner in his discretion does not adopt the
Stipulation and Agreement in Settlement and Order, the Stipulation
and Agreement in Settlement and Order shall be void and of no
effect, and Respondent shall retain the right to a hearing and
proceeding on the Accusation under all the provisions of the APA
and shall not be bound by any admission or waiver made herein.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

By reason of the foregoing stipulations, admissions and waivers and solely for the purpose of settlement of the pending Accusation without a hearing, it is stipulated and agreed that the following determination of Issues shall be made:

The acts and omissions of Respondent, described in Paragraphs 1 through 17, of the Accusation, are cause for the suspension or revocation of all real estate licenses and license rights of Respondent under the provisions of Section 10176(i) of the Code.

ORDER

WHEREFORE, THE FOLLOWING ORDER is hereby made:

- A. The license and license rights of Respondent under the provisions of Part 1 of Division 4 of the Business and Professions Code are hereby revoked commencing on the effective date of the Decision entered herein.
- 1. However, Respondent shall be entitled to apply for and be issued a restricted real estate broker license pursuant to Section 10156.5 of the Code if Respondent makes application therefore and pays to the Department the appropriate fee for said

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 8-72)

- 2. 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 the Code.
- 3. The restricted license 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 bears a significant relationship to Respondent's fitness or capacity as a real estate licensee.
- 4. The restricted license may be suspended, prior to and pending final determination after formal hearing by Order of the Real Estate Commissioner based upon evidence satisfactory to the Commissioner that Respondent has, subsequent to the date hereof, violated provisions of the California Real Estate Law, the Subdivided Lands Law, Regulations of the Real Estate Commissioner or conditions attaching to this restricted license.
- 5. Respondent shall not be eligible to apply for the issuance of an unrestricted real estate license nor the removal of any of the conditions, limitations or restrictions of the restricted license until at least one year has elapsed from the date of this Order.
- 6. Respondent shall obey all laws of the United States, the State of California and its political subdivisions, and shall

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD, 113 (REV. 8-72

further obey and comply with all rules and regulations of the Real Estate Commissioner.

- 7. Respondent shall not act as the designated broker of Los Angeles Federal Mortgage Corporation while he has a restricted real estate broker license.
- 8. The restricted license and license rights of
 Respondent, under the provisions of Part 1 of Division 4 of the
 Business and Professions Code, are hereby suspended for a period of
 six (6) months commencing on the effective date of any new
 restricted real estate broker license issued.
- 9. Respondent shall, within six months from the effective date of the restricted license, take and pass the Professional Responsibility Examination administered by the Department including the payment of the appropriate examination fee. If Respondent fails to satisfy this condition, the Commissioner may order suspension of the restricted license until Respondent passes the examination.
- effective date of the Decision, present evidence satisfactory to the Real Estate Commissioner that he has, since the most recent issuance of an original or renewal real estate license, taken and successfully completed—the—continuing education requirements of—Article 2.5 of Chapter 3 of the Real Estate Law for renewal of a real estate license. If Respondent fails to satisfy this condition, the Real Estate Commissioner shall afford Respondent the opportunity for a hearing pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act to present such evidence.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 IREV. 8-72

EXECUTION OF STIPULATION

I have read the Stipulation and Agreement in Settlement and Order and its terms are understood by me and are agreeable and acceptable to me. I understand that I am waiving rights given to me by the California Administrative Procedure Act (including but not limited to Sections 11506, 11508, 11509 and 11513 of the Government Code), and I willingly, intelligently and voluntarily waive those rights, including the right of requiring the Commissioner to prove the allegations in the Accusation at a hearing at which I would have the right to cross-examine witnesses against me and to present evidence in defense and mitigation of the charges.

DATED:	3-14-95

DAVID IRA GREENHONTZ Respondent

DATED: 3/15/95

CALVIN E. DAVIS, ESQ. Respondent's Attorney

DATED: 4 (28/95

CHRISTOPHER K.D. LEONG, ESQ. Counsel for Complainant

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD, 113 (REV. 8-72

ORDER

The foregoing Stipulation and Agreement in Settlement is hereby adopted as the Decision and Order of the Real Estate Commissioner in the above-entitled matter with respect to Respondent DAVID IRA GREENHOLTZ.

This Decision shall become effective at 12 o'clock

noon on June 13, 1995

IT IS SO ORDERED

11cm 12, 1913

JOHN R. LIBERATOR
Interim Commissioner

Ву:

Betty R. Ludeman

Assistant Commissioner

Enforcement

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 8-72) Department of Real Estate
107 South Broadway, Room 8107
Los Angeles, California 90012
Telephone: (213) 897-3937

DEPARTME
STATE

MAY 2 4 1995

DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

By C-ng

DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

* :

11 In the Matter of the Accusation of

DAVID IRA GREENHOLTZ and MICHAEL GRANVILLE, individually and dba Western Express Funding, and dba Western Express Mortgage,

Respondents.

No. H-25745 LA

L-63292

STIPULATION AND AGREEMENT IN SETTLEMENT AND ORDER

It is hereby stipulated by and between Respondent MICHAEL GRANVILLE, individually and dba Western Express Funding, and dba Western Express Mortgage (hereinafter "Respondent") represented by Frank M. Buda, Esq., and the Complainant acting by and through Christopher K.D. Leong, Counsel for the Department of Real Estate, as follows for the purpose of settling and disposing of the Accusation filed on March 15, 1994, in this matter (hereinafter "the Accusation"):

A. All issues which were to be contested and all evidence which was to be presented by Complainant and Respondent at a formal hearing on the Accusation, which hearing was to be held in

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 8-72)

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 |

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), shall instead and in place thereof be submitted solely on the basis of the provisions of this Stipulation.

- B. Respondent has received, read and understands the Statement to Respondent, the Discovery Provisions of the APA and the Accusation, filed by the Department of Real Estate in this proceeding.
- Defense pursuant to Section 11505 of the Government Code for the purpose of requesting a hearing on the allegations in the Accusation. Respondent hereby freely and voluntarily withdraws said Notice of Defense. Respondent acknowledges that he understands that by withdrawing said Notice of Defense, Respondent will thereby waive his right to require the Commissioner to prove the allegations in the Accusation at a contested hearing held in accordance with the provisions of the APA and that Respondent will waive other rights afforded to him in connection with the hearing, such as the right to present evidence in defense of the allegations in the Accusation and the right to cross-examine witnesses.
- D. Respondent agrees that the allegations in Paragraphs

 1 through 11, and 16 through 17, inclusive, of the Accusation can

 be the basis of this Stipulation and Agreement in Settlement and

 Order and that the Real Estate Commissioner shall not be required

 to provide further evidence of such allegations.
- E. It is understood by the parties that the Real Estate Commissioner may adopt the Stipulation and Agreement in Settlement and Order as his decision in this matter thereby imposing the

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. B-72)

. 1 penalty and sanctions on Respondent's real estate licenses and license rights as set forth in the "Order" below. In the event that the Commissioner in his discretion does not adopt the Stipulation and Agreement in Settlement and Order, the Stipulation and Agreement in Settlement and Order shall be void and of no effect, and Respondent shall retain the right to a hearing and proceeding on the Accusation under all the provisions of the APA and shall not be bound by any admission or waiver made herein.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

By reason of the foregoing stipulations, admissions and waivers and solely for the purpose of settlement of the pending Accusation without a hearing, it is stipulated and agreed that the following determination of Issues shall be made:

The acts and omissions of Respondent, described in Paragraphs 1 through 11, and 16 through 17, of the Accusation, are cause for the suspension or revocation of all real estate licenses and license rights of Respondent under the provisions of Section 10177(h) of the Code.

ORDER

WHEREFORE, THE FOLLOWING ORDER is hereby made:

- The license and license rights of Respondent under the provisions of Part 1 of Division 4 of the Business and Professions Code are hereby <u>revoked</u> commencing on the effective date of the Decision entered herein.
- However, Respondent shall be entitled to apply for and be issued a restricted real estate broker license pursuant to Section 10156.5 of the Code if Respondent makes application

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 6-72)

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

therefore and pays to the Department the appropriate fee for said

license within one year from the effective date of the Decision

herein.

- 2. 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 the Code.
- 3. The restricted license 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 bears a significant relationship to Respondent's fitness or capacity as a real estate licensee.
- 4. The restricted license may be suspended, prior to and pending final determination after formal hearing by Order of the Real Estate Commissioner based upon evidence satisfactory to the Commissioner that Respondent has, subsequent to the date hereof, violated provisions of the California Real Estate Law, the Subdivided Lands Law, Regulations of the Real Estate Commissioner or conditions attaching to this restricted license.
- 5. Respondent shall not be eligible to apply for the issuance of an unrestricted real estate license nor the removal of any of the conditions, limitations or restrictions of the restricted license until at least one year has elapsed from the date of this Order.
- 6. Respondent shall obey all laws of the United States, the State of California and its political subdivisions, and shall

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD, 113 (REV. 8-72)

further obey and comply with all rules and regulations of the Real Estate Commissioner.

7. The restricted license and license rights of
Respondent, under the provisions of Part 1 of Division 4 of the
Business and Professions Code, are hereby suspended for a period of
15 days commencing on the effective date of any new restricted real
estate broker license issued.

shall be stayed if, prior to the effective date of the Decision herein, said Respondent, pursuant to Section 10175.2 of the Code, pays \$1,500.00 to the Real Estate Recovery Account. The adoption of this provision in the Decision of the Real Estate Commissioner shall constitute a determination that it would not be against the public interest to permit said Respondent to pay a monetary penalty. Payment of the monetary penalty shall be by certified or cashier's check made payable to the Department of Real Estate.

Procedure Act that further cause for disciplinary action against the real estate license and license rights of Respondent has occurred within one (1) year from the effective date of this Decision, the stay of suspension hereby granted, or such portion thereof, as the Real Estate Commissioner shall deem to be appropriate, shall be immediately vacated.

If no further cause for disciplinary action against the real estate license and license rights of Respondent shall occur within one (1) year from the effective date of this Decision, the stay hereby granted shall become permanent.

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 8-72

8. Respondent shall, within six months from the effective date of the restricted license, take and pass the Professional Responsibility Examination administered by the Department including the payment of the appropriate examination fee. If Respondent fails to satisfy this condition, the Commissioner may order suspension of the restricted license until Respondent passes the examination.

9. Respondent shall, within 12 months from the effective date of the Decision, present evidence satisfactory to the Real Estate Commissioner that he has, since the most recent issuance of an original or renewal real estate license, taken and successfully completed the continuing education requirements of Article 2.5 of Chapter 3 of the Real Estate Law for renewal of a real estate license. If Respondent fails to satisfy this condition, the Real Estate Commissioner shall afford Respondent the opportunity for a hearing pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act to present such evidence.

EXECUTION OF STIPULATION

I have read the Stipulation and Agreement in Settlement and Order and its terms are understood by me and are agreeable and acceptable to me. I understand that I am waiving rights given to me by the California Administrative Procedure Act (including but not limited to Sections 11506, 11508, 11509 and 11513 of the Government Code), and I willingly, intelligently and voluntarily waive those rights, including the right of requiring the Commissioner to prove the allegations in the Accusation at a hearing at which I would have

1	the right to cross-examine witnesses against me and to present
2	evidence in defense and mitigation of the charges.
3	
4	11. 1. 1. 12
5	DATED: 9.16.93 MICHAEL GRANVILLE, individually
6	and dba Western Express Funding, and dba Western Express Mortgage,
7	Respondent
8	AS TO FORM:
9	DATED: 3.6.95 Frank M. Berba
10	FRANK M. BUDA, ESQ. Respondent's Attorney
11	Respondent 5 Accorney
12	112495 chins leurs
13	DATED: 4(28/95 CHRISTOPHER K.D. LEONG, ESQ.
14	Counsel for Complainant
15	ORDER
16	The foregoing Stipulation and Agreement in Settlement is
17	hereby adopted as the Decision and Order of the Real Estate
18	Commissioner in the above-entitled matter with respect to
19	Respondent MICHAEL GRANVILLE, individually and dba Western Express
20	Funding, and dba Western Express Mortgage.
21	This Decision shall become effective at 12 o'clock
. 22	noon on June 13, 1995 .
23	IT IS SO ORDERED May 15, 1995.
24	JOHN R. LIBERATOR Interim Commissioner
25	Interim Commissioner
26	O = P
27	By: But R. Judeman
	Betty R. Ludeman Assistant Commissioner
COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 6-72)	Enforcement

-7-

85 34769

• •



BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation of

DAVID IRA GREENHOLTZ and MICHAEL GRANVILLE,

individually and dba Western Express Funding, and dba Western Express Mortgage,

Respondent(s)

) Case No. <u>H-25745 LA</u>

OAH No. L-63292

5 | 5 | [10 | 2 | 1994 | [

DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTAT

By C. Bay

NOTICE OF CONTINUED HEARING ON ACCUSATION

To the above-named Respondent(s):

You are hereby notified that a hearing will be held before the Department of Real Estate at the Office of Administrative Hearings, 314 W. First Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012 on October 27 and 28, 1994, 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.

DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

Dated: August 29, 1994

Ву

CHRISTOPHER K.D. LEONG, Counsel

cc: David Ira Greenholtz Michael Granville Frank M. Buda, Esq.

√Sacto. OAH

O

RE 501 (La Mac 11/92)



BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation of

DAVID IRA GREENHOLTZ and MICHAEL GRANVILLE, individually and dba Western Express Funding, and dba Western Express Mortgage,

) Case No. <u>H-25745 LA</u>

) OAH No. L-63292

April 22, 1994

DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTAT

Respondent(s)

NOTICE OF HEARING ON ACCUSATION

To the above-named Respondent(s):

By C. Bay

You are hereby notified that a hearing will be held before the Department of Real Estate at the Office of Administrative Hearings, 314 W. First Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012 on <u>SEPTEMBER 15 and 16, 1994</u>, at the hour of <u>9:00 A.M.</u>, 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.

DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

Dated: April 22, 1994

Ву

THRISTOPHER K.D. LEONG, Counsel

cc: David Ira Greenholtz
Michael Granville
Frank M. Buda, Esq.
Sacto.

OAH

RE 501 (La Mac 11/92)

CEB

Dac.

CHRISTOPHER K.D. LEONG, Counsel Department of Real Estate 107 South Broadway, Room 8107 Los Angeles, CA 90012

FILED

MAR 15 1994

BY C. 3 REAL ESTATE

(213) 897-3937

6

5

1

2

3

7 8

9

10

ΤÜ

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

~ ~ ~ ~

In the Matter of the Accusation of)

DAVID IRA GREENHOLTZ and)

MICHAEL GRANVILLE, individually and dba Western Express Funding, and dba Western Express Mortgage,)

Respondents.

No. H-25745 LA

ACCUSATION

The Complainant, Steven J. Ellis, a Deputy Real Estate Commissioner of the State of California, for cause of Accusation against DAVID IRA GREENHOLTZ (hereinafter "GREENHOLTZ") and MICHAEL GRANVILLE, individually and dba Western Express Funding, and dba Western Express Mortgage (hereinafter "GRANVILLE") (hereinafter sometimes both referred to as "Respondents"), is informed and alleges as follows:

1.

The Complainant, Steven J. Ellis, a Deputy Real Estate Commissioner of the State of California, makes this Accusation against Respondents in his official capacity.

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 8-72)

85 34769

- 1 -

COURT PAPER

At all times herein mentioned, Respondents were licensed by, or had license rights with, the Department of Real Estate of the State of California (hereinafter "Department").

3.

Respondent GRANVILLE is presently licensed and/or has license rights under the Real Estate Law, Part 1 of Division 4 of the Business and Professions Code (hereinafter "the Code") as a real estate broker.

4.

Respondent GREENHOLTZ is presently licensed and/or has license rights under the Real Estate Law, Part 1 of Division 4 of the Business and Professions Code (hereinafter "the Code") as a real estate broker. From October 25, 1990 through September 22, 1992, Respondent GREENHOLTZ was licensed as a real estate salesperson and was employed by GRANVILLE.

5.

From June 1, 1991 to present, in Los Angeles County, California, Respondents engaged in the business of, acted in the capacity of, advertised or assumed to act as real estate brokers in the State of California within the meaning of Sections 10131(d) and 10131.2 of the Code, including the solicitation and negotiation of loans secured by interest in real property, wherein borrowers and lenders were solicited for loans, wherein such loans were arranged, negotiated, processed, and consummated on behalf of others and for fees often collected in advance.

CLYBOURN TRANSACTION

6.

On or about June 1, 1991, Respondent GREENHOLTZ met with Carolyn Ledoux (hereinafter "Ledoux") and Ledoux's mother, Hazel George (hereinafter "George") to discuss a loan. Ledoux hired Respondents GREENHOLTZ and GRANVILLE to assist her in applying for a loan to purchase property located at 6640 Clybourn, #68, North Hollywood, CA (hereinafter "the Clybourn property"). Respondent GREENHOLTZ interviewed Ledoux and completed a loan application form. Ledoux signed and dated this handwritten application form, which at the time reflected her true and only source of income as employment with Allied Signal of North Hollywood. George also reviewed the loan application before it was signed by Ledoux.

7.

At the same meeting Ledoux questioned GREENHOLTZ how she would be able to qualify for a loan when she had been previously told by two lenders that she could not qualify.

GREENHOLTZ stated to Ledoux that private lenders were not as strict as other lenders. Respondent GREENHOLTZ told Ledoux that there was a possibility that the lender would call to ask her questions regarding her employment. GREENHOLTZ told Ledoux to tell the caller that everything on the application was correct.

8.

Ledoux was not given a copy of her application form from GREENHOLTZ. She later received a copy, after the funding of the loan, from the lender GN Mortgage (GN). Ledoux received

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. B-72)

two copies of loan application forms, one handwritten and signed and the other was typed and unsigned. Both application forms list a second employment with a company named Air Design, Too in Sherman Oaks, with an income of \$2,800 per month. Ledoux has never worked for this company. Ledoux visited the address listed and found that the company does not exist at the location listed.

9.

On or about July 18, 1991, this loan was funded. The lender, GN relied on Ledoux's incomes from both jobs. GN received Verifications of Employment (hereinafter "VOE") and W-2 Forms and pay check stubs from Western Express Funding (hereinafter "WEF") for both jobs. Susie Wallace, an employee of GN, verified employment with Air Design, Too by phoning (818)505-6585, and speaking with Dan Cohen, President of the company. This phone number was listed under the name of Rachel and Dan Cohen, who are husband and wife.

10.

On or about December 2, 1992, Ray Conen (hereinafter "Conen"), manager and co-owner of WEF, sent to Ledoux a letter with a credit report attached that purportedly verified the secondary employment. Rachel Cohen is also a co-owner of WEF.

11.

Ledoux subsequently lost her employment at Allied Signal and the Clybourn property went into foreclosure. As a result, Leduoux lost the value of her deposit and payments.

OURT PAPER

FIRST CAUSE OF ACCUSATION

(Violation by Respondents GREENHOLTZ and GRANVILLE of Section 10176(a) and (i) of the Code)

12.

As a First Cause of Accusation, Complainant incorporates by this reference the Preamble and each of the allegations in Paragraphs 1 through 11, herein above.

13.

The conduct of Respondents GREENHOLTZ and GRANVILLE in fraudulently: 1) altering Ledoux's loan application from one job to two, and 2) changing her job title from machinist to clerk, as described herein above, constitutes a violation of Section 10176(a) and (i) of the Code and is cause to suspend or revoke the real estate licenses and license rights of Respondents.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACCUSATION

(Violation by Respondents GREENHOLTZ and GRANVILLE of Section 10177(g) of the Code)

14.

As a Second Cause of Accusation, Complainant incorporates by this reference the Preamble and each of the allegations in Paragraphs 1 through 11, herein above.

15.

The conduct of Respondents GREENHOLTZ and GRANVILLE in negligently allowing the: 1) altering of Ledoux's loan application from one job to two, and 2) changing her job title from machinist to clerk, as described herein above, constitutes

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 9-72)

22

23

24

25

26

27

a violation of Section 10177(g) of the Code and is cause to suspend or revoke the real estate licenses and license rights of Respondents.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACCUSATION

(Violation by Respondent GRANVILLE of Section 10177(h) of the Code)

16.

As a third Cause of Accusation, Complainant incorporates by this reference the Preamble and each of the allegations in Paragraphs 1 through 11, herein above.

17.

The conduct of Respondent GRANVILLE in allowing GREENHOLTZ and WEF to: 1) alter Ledoux's loan application from one job to two, and 2) change her job title from machinist to clerk, as described herein above, constitutes a failure to supervise, in violation of Section 10177(h) of the Code and is cause to suspend or revoke the real estate license and license rights of Respondent.

COURT PAPER STATE OF GALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 8-72)

WHEREFORE, Complainant prays that a hearing be conducted on the allegations of this Accusation and that upon proof thereof, a decision be rendered imposing disciplinary action against all licenses and license rights of Respondents DAVID IRA GREENHOLTZ and MICHAEL GRANVILLE, individually and dba Western Express Funding, and dba Western Express Mortgage, under the Real Estate Law (Part 1 of Division 4 of the Business and Professions Code), and for such other and further relief as may be proper under other applicable provisions of law. Dated at Los Angeles, California this 15th day of March, 1994.

STEVEN J. ELLIS

Deputy Real Estate Commissioner

David Ira Greenholtz cc: Michael Granville Sacto.

MG

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 8-72)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

R5 34769