1 2 3 4 5 6 7	LAURENCE D. HAVESON, Counsel (SBN 152631) Department of Real Estate 320 West 4th Street, Suite 350 Los Angeles, California 90013-1105 Telephone: (213) 576-6982 Direct: (213) 576-6911 Fax: (213) 576-6917 Attorney for Complainant			
8	BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE			
9	STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
10	* * *			
11	In the Matter of the Accusation of) No. H-41563 LA			
12	STELLER CORP, CYNTHIA) <u>ACCUSATION</u>			
13	JANNETTE GOMEZ, individually and) as former designated officer of Steller)			
14	Corp, and CATHERINE ROMERO,) individually and as former designated)			
15	officer of Steller Corp,			
16	Respondents.)			
17	The Complainant, Maria Suarez, a Supervising Special Investigator for the			
18	Department of Real Estate ("Department" or "DRE") of the State of California, for cause of			
19	Accusation against STELLER CORP ("SC"), CYNTHIA JANNETTE GOMEZ ("GOMEZ"), and			
20	CATHERINE ROMERO ("ROMERO") (collectively "Respondents"), alleges as follows:			
21	1. The Complainant, Maria Suarez, acting in her official capacity as a Supervising			
22	Special Investigator, makes this Accusation against Respondents.			
23	2. All references to the "Code" are to the California Business and Professions Code			
24	and all references to "Regulations" are to Title 10, Chapter 6, California Code of Regulations.			
25	LICENSE HISTORY			
26	3. Respondent SC has been licensed by the Department as a real estate corporation,			
27	License ID 02018339, from on or about October 6, 2016, through the present, with SC's license			
28	scheduled to expire on August 20, 2022 unless renewed. SC was licensed from on or about			
	-1- ACCUSATION			

.

October 6, 2016 to on or about October 9, 2018, through GOMEZ's real estate broker ("REB")
license, ID 01411148, and GOMEZ was the designated officer ("D.O.") during this time until the
officer was canceled on or about October 9, 2018. SC was licensed from on or about August 21,
2018 to on or about November 14, 2018, through ROMERO's REB license, ID 01756798, and
ROMERO was the D.O. during this time until the officer was canceled on or about November 14,
2018. SC is currently licensed through REB Hilda Maria Sanchez-Cantu's ("Sanchez-Cantu")
REB license, ID 01259287, and Sanchez-Cantu is currently the D.O. for SC.

4. According to Department records as of February 19, 2019, SC had two branch
offices and employed 91 salespersons and five broker associates. Also according to Department
records as of February 19, 2019 and currently, the fictitious business name "Century 21 Town &
Country" is licensed to SC.

12 5. Respondent GOMEZ has been licensed by the Department as a REB from on or 13 about July 7, 2009, through the present, with GOMEZ's license scheduled to expire on July 6, 14 2021, unless renewed. Previously, GOMEZ was licensed by the Department as a real estate 15 salesperson ("RES") from on or about February 20, 2004 to on or about July 6, 2009. GOMEZ 16 also has two mortgage loan originator ("MLO") license endorsements: National Mortgage 17 Licensing System ("NMLS") ID 1489700 (individual MLO endorsement), and NMLS ID 1690863 18 (company MLO endorsement). According to Department records to date, the fictitious business 19 name "Source Funding" is licensed to GOMEZ, and has been active as of January 23, 2019. 20 GOMEZ employed one real estate salesperson as of February 19, 2019.

6. Respondent ROMERO has been licensed by the Department as a REB from on or
 about June 10, 2010, through June 9, 2014, and September 9, 2015 through the present, with
 ROMERO's license scheduled to expire on September 8, 2023, unless renewed. Previously,
 ROMERO was licensed by the Department as a RES from on or about June 16, 2006 to June 9,
 2010. According to Department records to date, ROMERO has no fictitious business names.

26

DRE CASE NO. H-40874 LA

27 7. On or about September 21, 2018, in Case No. H-40874 LA, the Department filed a
28 Stipulation and Agreement for TNC, INC. and CYNTHIA JANNETTE GOMEZ. Under the

-2-

5				
1	Stipulation and	l Agree	ement, all licenses and licensing rights of GOMEZ under the Real	Estate Law
2	were suspended for a period of 120 days from the effective date of the decision provided, however,			
3	that the initial	30 day	s of the suspension would be stayed on condition that:	
4		a.	GOMEZ paid a monetary penalty;	
5		b.	GOMEZ's payment be received prior to the effective date of the	Decision;
6	and			
7		c.	No further cause for disciplinary action against the real estate lic	ense of
8	GOME	ΕΖ οςςι	r within three years from the effective date of the Decision;	
9	8.	The re	maining 90 days of GOMEZ's 120 day suspension would be stay	ed for three
10	years subject t	o terms	s and conditions including, but not limited, to:	
11		a.	GOMEZ shall obey all laws, rules, and regulations governing th	e rights,
12	duties,	and re	sponsibilities of a real estate licensee in the State of California	
13		b.	That no final subsequent determination be made after hearing or	upon
14	stipula	tion, th	at cause for disciplinary action occurred within three years from t	he effective
15	date of	the De	ecision; and	
16		c.	GOMEZ shall not be the D.O. of any corporation that she is not	t the 100
17	percen	t owne	r of.	
18	9.	The S	tipulation and Agreement was adopted as the Decision of the Acti	ng Real
19	Estate Commi	ssione	r, effective October 11, 2018.	
20			BROKERAGE: SC	
21	10.	At all	times mentioned, in the County of San Bernardino, SC acted as a	real estate
22	broker, condu	cting li	censed activities within the meaning of Code Section 10131(a): se	elling or
23	offering to sel	l, buyi	ng or offering to buy, real property for others. In addition, SC con	ducted
24	broker-contro	lled eso	crows under the exemption set forth in California Financial Code	Section
25	17006(a)(4) fo	or real	estate brokers performing escrows incidental to a real estate trans	action where
26	the broker is a	a party	and where the broker is performing acts for which a real estate lic	enșe is
27	required.			
28	117			
		2	- 3 -	ACCUSATION

1	11. As is relevant to this Accusation, SC was acting by and through GOMEZ as its D.O.
2	from January 1, 2017 to September 20, 2018, and by and through ROMERO as its D.O. from
3	August 21, 2018 to November 13, 2018, pursuant to Code Section 10159.2 and GOMEZ and
4	ROMERO, respectively, were responsible for ensuring compliance with the Real Estate Law.
5	AUDIT OF SC: AUDIT NO. LA180042
6	12. On April 30, 2019, the Department completed an audit examination of the books and
7	records of SC's real estate activities that require a corporate real estate broker license under Code
8	Section 10131. The audit examination, LA180042, covered the time January 1, 2017 to
9	September 30, 2018 ("audit period") and was limited to LTPMC's broker escrow activities.
10	13. The purpose of the audit examinations was to determine whether SC conducted its
11	real estate activities and handled and accounted for trust funds in accordance with the Real Estate
12	Law and the Regulations.
13	14. An entrance conference was held by the DRE's auditor on November 14, 2018 with
14	SC's former D.O.'s GOMEZ and ROMERO at SC's main office located at 16923 Sierra Lakes
15	Pkwy #101, in Fontana, California. SC's escrow officer Tammy Lynn Gilbert (non-licensee,
16	expired RES ID 01127750) provided SC's records for examination.
17	15. Based on discussions between the Department's auditor and GOMEZ, SC's
18	corporate structure as of November 30, 2018 was as follows:
19	NameTitleLicenseShareholder %Nasim AhmedCEO00966808 (REB)100%
20	("N.Anmed")
21	16. According to GOMEZ and documents examined, SC performed residential sales
22	activities, representing both buyers and sellers. According to GOMEZ and records examined, SC
23	also performed broker escrow services to its own clients. SC closed approximately 279 escrows
24	with total receipts of \$45,659,896.85 during the audit period.
25	17. During the audit period, SC maintained two (2) bank accounts in which trust funds
26	were deposited. SC's bank accounts were as follows:
27	
28	
	-4- ACCUSATIC

1		a.	Trust Accoun	t 1 ("TA1")	
2		Bank:		Comerica Bank	
3			nt Name:	Steller Corp Trust Account	
4		Accou	nt #:	XXXXXXXX2379	
5		Signat	ories:	Zeshawn Ahmed ("Z.Ahmed") (RES, ID No. 01804760) GOMEZ Sanchez-Cantu	
6		Signa	tures required:	One (1) signature	
7		Descr		TA1 was opened on 6/9/17. The account was maintained	for
8				handling trust fund receipts and disbursements related to broker escrow activities	
9					
10		b.	General Ope	rating Account 1 ("GA1")	
11		Bank:		Comerica Bank	
12			int Name:	Steller Corp Dba Century 21 Town & Country	
13		Accou		XXXXXXXX6998	
14		Signa	tories:	Z.Ahmed GOMEZ N.Ahmed	
15		Signa	tures required:	One (1) signature	
16 17		Descr	iption:	GA1 was as opened on 12/30/16. The account was main handling receipts and disbursements related to SC's gen operating activities SC disbursed trust funds from TA1 to general operating account during the audit period.	eral
18			Audit V	violations in Audit No. LA180042	
19	18.	The (Complainant rea	lleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegati	ons
20	contained in p	aragra	phs 1 through 1	7 above, with the same force and effect as though full	y set forth
21	herein.				
22	19.	The a	udit examinatio	n revealed violations of the Code and the Regulations	, as set
23	forth in the fo	llowin	g paragraphs, ar	nd more fully discussed in Audit No. LA180042 and t	he
24	exhibits and v	vork p	apers attached to	the audit report:	
25	Issue One (1)	. Cod	e Section 10145	and Regulation 2832.1; Regulations 2950(g) and 2	<u>951:</u>
26	<u>Trust Fund I</u>	land	ing for Multiple	e Beneficiaries; When Broker Handles Escrow	
27	20.	Bank	reconciliations	were prepared for TA1 as of audit cutoff dates Augus	t 20 and
28	September 30	, 2018	. The adjusted b	ank balances were then compared to the total balance	of
				- 5 - AC	CUSATION

1	separate records (accountability). SC's control record was inaccurate. Some deposits and
2	disbursements were not recorded for TA1. SC's separate records were inaccurate and incomplete.
3	Some deposits and disbursements were inaccurately recorded for TA1. The DRE's auditor
4	reconstructed the trust fund records based on records provided for the audit, as presented in
5	summary form below.
6	a. <u>TA1 Audit Cutoff Date, 9/30/18: ROMERO (Effective 8/21/18)</u>
7	Minimum Adjusted Bank Balance, 9/30/18\$260,320.94Minimum Identified Accountability, 9/30/18413,165.03
8	Minimum Shortage, 9/30/18 < <u>\$152,844.09</u> > The minimum shortage was caused by:
9	1. Minimum Negative Escrow Account Balance <\$325.00>
10	2. Minimum Bank Charges <15,756.29> 3. Minimum Unauthorized Disbursement/ Conversion of
11	Trust Funds <136,762.80> Minimum Shortage, 9/30/18 < <u>\$152,844.09</u> >
12	21. SC provided no evidence that the owners of the trust funds gave their written
13	consent to allow SC to reduce the balance of the funds in TA1 to an amount less than the existing
14	aggregate trust fund liabilities.
15	b. TA1 Audit Cutoff Date, 8/20/18: GOMEZ (1/1/17 to 8/20/18)
16	
17	Minimum Adjusted Bank Balance, 8/20/18 \$357,983.97 Minimum Identified Accountability, 8/20/18 415,797.43 Minimum Shortage, 8/20/18 < <u>\$130,163.38</u> >
18	The minimum shortage was caused by: 1. Minimum Bank Charges <\$14,400.58>
19	2. Minimum Unauthorized Disbursement/ Conversion of Trust Funds <115,762.80>
20	Minimum Shortage, 8/20/18 < <u>\$130,163.38</u> >
21	22. SC provided no evidence that the owners of the trust funds gave their written
22	consent to allow SC to reduce the balance of the funds in TA1 to an amount less than the existing
23	aggregate trust fund liabilities.
24	23. SC's failure to obtain the written consent of the owners of the trust funds to reduce
25	the balance of the funds in TA1 to an amount less than the existing aggregate trust fund liability
26	was in violation of Code Section 10145 and Regulations 2832.1, 2950(g), and 2951.
27	111
28	. 111
	- 6 - ACCUSATIO

Issue Two (2). Code Section 10145 and Regulations 2831, 2950(d), and 2951: Trust Fund

2 Records to be Maintained; When Broker Handles Escrow

24. The records of all trust funds received and disbursed General Ledger (control
records) maintained for TA1 related to SC's broker escrow activities were inaccurate. Some of the
trust fund dates of deposits were inaccurately recorded. Examples found by the Department's
auditor are as follows:

7	<u>GOMEZ (1/1/17 to 8/20/18)</u>			
8	Escrow No.	Date Deposit Recorded	Actual Date of Deposit	Amount
9	18-5292	06/19/2018	06/12/2018	\$5,000.00
	18-5228	04/02/2018	03/30/2018	\$3,000.00
10	17-5077-TG	09/12/2017	09/11/2017	\$2,000.00
11			Total:	\$10,000.00
11				
	ROMERO (Effec	tive 8/21/18)		
12	ROMERO (Effec 18-5304	tive 8/21/18) 10/01/2018	09/28/2018	\$7,555.00
12				
	18-5304	10/01/2018	09/28/2018	\$7,555.00

25. During the audit period, there were several "Web Funds Transfer" trust fund 15 deposits and disbursements that were not recorded on TA1's control record. In addition, the records 16 did not reflect an accurate running daily balance between TA1 and GA1. These transfers did not 17 have any identifiable transactions or related escrow numbers. As detailed more fully in Audit 18 Report No. LA180042, the Department's auditor identified: 26 examples of web fund transfers 19 from October 6, 2017 to August 17, 2018 (GOMEZ) that were not recorded on the control records; 20 and 8 examples of web fund transfers from August 22, 2018 to September 19, 2018 (ROMERO) 21 that were not recorded on the control records. 22

23 26. SC's failure to maintain a complete and accurate control record of trust funds for
24 TA1 in connection with broker escrow activities was in violation of Code section 10145 and
25 Regulations 2831, 2950(d), and 2951.
26 ///
27 ///

28 ///

1

1	Issue Three (3). Code Section 10145 and Regulations 2831.1, 2950(d), and 2951: Separate			
2	Records for Each Beneficiary or Transaction; When Broker Handles Escrow			
3	a. <u>TA1 Audit Cutoff Date</u> , 9/30/18: ROMERO (Effective 8/21/18)			
4	27. SC did not maintain a complete and accurate separate record for each escrow			
5	transaction during the audit period. Some of the deposit dates of trust funds were inaccurately			
6	recorded or not recorded. In one example, a check was recorded as void when it was cleared			
7	through TA1. In addition, the records did not reflect an accurate balance after posting the			
8	transaction on any date. The Department's auditor reconstructed trust fund records based on			
9	records provided for the audit.			
10	28. As detailed more fully in Audit Report No. LA180042, the Department's auditor			
11	identified 8 examples of web fund transfers from August 22, 2018 to September 19, 2018			
12	(ROMERO) that were inaccurately recorded.			
13	b. <u>TA1 Audit Cutoff Date, 8/20/18: GOMEZ (1/1/17 to 8/20/18)</u>			
14	29. As also detailed more fully in Audit Report No. LA180042, the Department's			
15	auditor identified 4 examples of transactions from June 14, 2017 to June 12, 2018 (GOMEZ) that			
16	were inaccurately recorded, involving Escrow Nos. 18-5292, 18-5228, 17-5077-TG, and 17-5010-			
17	TG.			
18	30. The Department's auditor reconstructed trust funds transferred from TA1 into GA1			
19	based on records provided for the audit examination. (See Issue 2, above, for examples).			
20	31. During the audit period, there were several "Web Funds Transfer" trust fund			
21	deposits and disbursements that were not recorded on TA1's control record. In addition, the records			
22	did not reflect an accurate running daily balance between TA1 and GA1. The transfers did not have			
23	any identifiable transactions or related escrow numbers.			
24	32. SC's failure to maintain a complete and accurate separate record for each escrow			
25	transaction during the audit period was in violation of Code Section 10145 and Regulations			
26	2831.1, 2950(d), and 2951.			
27				
28	. 111			
9	- 8 - ACCUSATION			

1	Issue Four (4). Code Sections 10145 and 10176(i), and Regulations 2950(g) and 2951:
2	Unauthorized Disbursements; When Broker Handles Escrow
3	a. <u>ROMERO (Effective 8/21/18)</u>
4	33. As detailed more fully in Audit Report No. LA180042, SC disbursed \$136,762.80,
5	in trust funds to GA1 without any identifiable transactions or related escrow number. The funds
6	were transferred via "Web Funds Transfer" from TA1 to GA1 without instructions from the owners
7	of the funds. The transfers included \$88,762.80 from November 7, 2017 to August 17, 2018, which
8	was carried over from the August 20, 2018 audit cutoff date (GOMEZ) and \$48,000.00 from
9	August 22, 2018 to September 19, 2018 (ROMERO).
10	34. As also detailed more fully in Audit Report No. LA180042, SC made unauthorized
11	disbursements from TA1 into GA1. Based on an examination of records, it appears that the balance
12	in GA1 was reduced to an amount that was less than the amount of trust funds deposited.
13	a. <u>GOMEZ (1/1/17 to 8/20/18)</u>
14	35. SC disbursed \$115,762.80 in funds, as of August 20, 2018, from TA1 to GA1
15	without any identifiable transaction or related escrow number. The funds were transferred via
16	"Web Funds Transfer" from TA1 into GA1 without instructions from the owners of the funds.
17	36. According to ROMERO and based on TA1's bank statement, "Web Funds
18	Transfers" of \$16,000 on August 13, 2018 and \$11,000 on August 14, 2018 were returned on
19	August 31, 2018.
20	37. As detailed more fully in Audit Report No. LA180042, SC made unauthorized
21	disbursements from TA1 into GA1 between May 11, 2018 and August 20, 2018.
22	38. Again, it appears that the balance in GA1 was reduced to an amount that was less
23	than the amount of trust funds deposited. An examination of records revealed that SC transferred
24	\$16,500 from TA1 to GA1 on May 14, 2018, and that GA1 had an ending balance of <\$1,742.37>
25	as of May 14, 2018. SC also transferred a minimum of \$47,000 from TA1 to GA1 between August
26	13 and 17, 2018, and GA1 had an ending balance of \$14,530.81 as of audit cutoff August 20, 2018.
27	
28	111
	-9- ACCUSATION

- 11					
1	39.	SC's unauthorized disbursem	ent from TA1 with	nout written authorization fr	om the
2	owners of the	trust funds was in violation of	Code Sections 10	145(a) and 10176(i), and	
3	Regulations 2	950(g) and 2951.			
4	Issue Five (5)	. Regulation 2950(h): When	Broker Handles I	<u> Escrow – Financial Interes</u>	<u>st</u>
5	<u>GOMI</u>	EZ (1/1/17 to 8/20/18)			
6	40.	SC did not advise all parties i	n writing that SC	had an interest as an owner	and
7	stockholder of	SC's non-independent broker	escrow. The Depa	artment's auditor identified	the
8	following exa	mples of SC failing to advise a	ll parties in writin	g that SC had an interest as	an owner
9		er of SC's non-independent br	-		
		essen aanse naarsens nut zoegentusen atres hande Segen aanse soesteren maare			
10	Escrow No.	Borrower	<u>Total</u> Consideration	Close of Escrow	
11	18-5292	Gurpreet Singh	\$367,000.00	07/27/18	
12	18-5228	Carisa L. Barnes	\$375,000.00	05/30/18	
	17-5158	Natividad Gerardo Villa	\$260,000.00	01/29/18	
13	17-5010	Isaias Cortes	\$178,500.00	09/15/17	
14	17-5022	Guillermo Reyes Gastelum and Edith Reyes	\$315,000.00	08/15/17	
15	17-5077	Naul Alcon Maldonado	\$270,000.00	10/24/17	
16		Total:	\$2,433,500.00		
17	41.	SC's failure to provide a full	written disclosure	to advise all parties that SC	c has an
18	interest as a st	ockholder, officer, partner, or	owner of the agen	cy holding the escrow was	in
19	violation of R	egulation 2950(h).			
20	Issue Six (6).	Code Section 10141.6: Notif	ication of Escrow	Activities	
21	GOM	EZ (1/1/17 to 8/20/18)			
22	42.	Code section 10141.6 provid	es in pertinent par	t:	
23		"(a) A real estate broker v	vho engages in esc	row activities for five or mo	ore
24		transactions in a calendar yea contained in Section 17006 c	ar pursuant to the e	exemption from the Escrow	Law
25		pursuant to that exemption ex calendar year, shall file with	qual or exceed one	million dollars (\$1,000,000) in a
26		completion of the calendar y	ear, documenting	the number of escrows cond	ucted and
20		the dollar volume escrowed of met. This report shall be made			u was
28		(c) A real estate broker v subdivision (a) shall be asses		the report required pursuar fty dollars (\$50) per day for	
			- 10 -	AC	CUSATION

11

1	the report has not been received by the department, up to and including the 30th day
2	after the first day of the assessment penalty. On and after the 31st day, the penalty shall be one hundred dollars (\$100) per day, not to exceed a total penalty of ten thousand dollars (\$10,000), regardless of the number of days, until the department
3	receives the report."
4	43. SC engaged in escrow activities for more than five transaction in calendar year
5	2017, and its escrow activities exceeded \$1 million in calendar year 2017, thus triggering the
6	requirement under Code Section 10141.6 that SC file a report with the Department within 60 days
7	following the completion of calendar year 2017, documenting the number of escrows conducted
8	and the dollar volume escrowed during the calendar year.
9	44. In 2017, SC closed approximately one hundred and one (111) escrows with an
10	aggregate total of \$16,976,613.43 in trust fund receipts. SC thus met the escrow threshold,
11	however, SC did not submit an escrow activity report (RE 890) within 60 days after the end of the
12	calendar year 2017, which was due on March 1, 2018.
13	45. SC's failure to submit an escrow activity report within 60 days after the end of the
14	calendar year 2017 was in violation of Code Section 10141.6.
15	Issue Seven (7). Code Sections 10159.2 and 10177(h) and Regulation 2725: Responsibility of
15 16	Issue Seven (7). Code Sections 10159.2 and 10177(h) and Regulation 2725: Responsibility of Corporate Officer in Charge / Broker Supervision
16	Corporate Officer in Charge / Broker Supervision
16 17	Corporate Officer in Charge / Broker Supervision 46. The Complainant realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations
16 17 18	Corporate Officer in Charge / Broker Supervision 46. The Complainant realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 45 above, with the same force and effect as though fully set forth
16 17 18 19	Corporate Officer in Charge / Broker Supervision 46. The Complainant realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 45 above, with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.
16 17 18 19 20	 <u>Corporate Officer in Charge / Broker Supervision</u> 46. The Complainant realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 45 above, with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein. 47. Based on the above findings in Issues 1 through 6 above, as the brokers and
16 17 18 19 20 21	Corporate Officer in Charge / Broker Supervision 46. The Complainant realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 45 above, with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein. 47. Based on the above findings in Issues 1 through 6 above, as the brokers and designated officers of SC, GOMEZ (effective 8/21/18) and ROMERO (1/1/17 to 8/20/18) did not
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 <u>Corporate Officer in Charge / Broker Supervision</u> 46. The Complainant realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 45 above, with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein. 47. Based on the above findings in Issues 1 through 6 above, as the brokers and designated officers of SC, GOMEZ (effective 8/21/18) and ROMERO (1/1/17 to 8/20/18) did not exercise adequate supervision and control over the real estate activities of SC's employees and its
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	 <u>Corporate Officer in Charge / Broker Supervision</u> 46. The Complainant realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 45 above, with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein. 47. Based on the above findings in Issues 1 through 6 above, as the brokers and designated officers of SC, GOMEZ (effective 8/21/18) and ROMERO (1/1/17 to 8/20/18) did not exercise adequate supervision and control over the real estate activities of SC's employees and its salespersons licensees to ensure compliance with the Real Estate Laws and Regulations. GOMEZ
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	 <u>Corporate Officer in Charge / Broker Supervision</u> 46. The Complainant realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 45 above, with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein. 47. Based on the above findings in Issues 1 through 6 above, as the brokers and designated officers of SC, GOMEZ (effective 8/21/18) and ROMERO (1/1/17 to 8/20/18) did not exercise adequate supervision and control over the real estate activities of SC's employees and its salespersons licensees to ensure compliance with the Real Estate Laws and Regulations. GOMEZ and ROMERO failed to establish policies, rules, procedures, and systems to review, oversee,
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 	 Corporate Officer in Charge / Broker Supervision 46. The Complainant realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 45 above, with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein. 47. Based on the above findings in Issues 1 through 6 above, as the brokers and designated officers of SC, GOMEZ (effective 8/21/18) and ROMERO (1/1/17 to 8/20/18) did not exercise adequate supervision and control over the real estate activities of SC's employees and its salespersons licensees to ensure compliance with the Real Estate Laws and Regulations. GOMEZ and ROMERO failed to establish policies, rules, procedures, and systems to review, oversee, inspect, and manage transactions requiring a real estate license and the handling of trust funds.
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 	 Corporate Officer in Charge / Broker Supervision 46. The Complainant realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 45 above, with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein. 47. Based on the above findings in Issues 1 through 6 above, as the brokers and designated officers of SC, GOMEZ (effective 8/21/18) and ROMERO (1/1/17 to 8/20/18) did not exercise adequate supervision and control over the real estate activities of SC's employees and its salespersons licensees to ensure compliance with the Real Estate Laws and Regulations. GOMEZ and ROMERO failed to establish policies, rules, procedures, and systems to review, oversee, inspect, and manage transactions requiring a real estate license and the handling of trust funds. 48. GOMEZ's and ROMERO's acts and/or omissions were in violation of Code
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 	 Corporate Officer in Charge / Broker Supervision 46. The Complainant realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 45 above, with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein. 47. Based on the above findings in Issues 1 through 6 above, as the brokers and designated officers of SC, GOMEZ (effective 8/21/18) and ROMERO (1/1/17 to 8/20/18) did not exercise adequate supervision and control over the real estate activities of SC's employees and its salespersons licensees to ensure compliance with the Real Estate Laws and Regulations. GOMEZ and ROMERO failed to establish policies, rules, procedures, and systems to review, oversee, inspect, and manage transactions requiring a real estate license and the handling of trust funds. 48. GOMEZ's and ROMERO's acts and/or omissions were in violation of Code Sections 10159.2 and 10177(h), and Regulation 2725.

11

1	INVESTIGATION AND ENFORCEMENT COSTS
2	49. Code Section 10106 provides that in any order issued in resolution of a disciplinary
3	proceeding before the Department of Real Estate, the Commissioner may request the administrative
4	law judge to direct a licensee found to have committed a violation of this part to pay a sum not to
5	exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case.
6	AUDIT COSTS
7	50. Code Section 10148(b) provides, in pertinent part, the Commissioner shall charge a
8	real estate broker for the cost of any audit, if the Commissioner has found in a final decision
9	following a disciplinary hearing that the broker has violated Code Section 10145 or a regulation or
10	rule of the Commissioner interpreting said section.
11	WHEREFORE, Complainant prays that a hearing be conducted on the allegations of
12	this Accusation and that upon proof thereof, a decision be rendered imposing disciplinary action
13	against all the licenses and license rights of STELLER CORP, CYNTHIA JANNETTE GOMEZ,
14	and CATHERINE ROMERO under the Real Estate Law, for the costs of investigation and
15	enforcement, and audit as permitted by law, and for such other and further relief as may be proper
16	under other applicable provisions of law, and for costs of audit.
17	AND A
18	Dated at Los Angeles, California this 2414 day of December , 2019.
19	\mathcal{T}
20	Ma MII This ing
21	Maria Suarez Supervising Special Investigator
22	Supervising Special investigation
23	
24	cc: STELLER CORP CYNTHIA JANNETTE GOMEZ
25	CATHERINE ROMERO Maria Suarez
26	Sacto.
27	
28	
	- 12 - ACCUSATION