1 DAVID A. PETERS, Counsel Department of Real Estate 2 P. O. Box 187000 Sacramento, CA 95818-7000 DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE (916) 739-3607 5 6 7 8 BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE 9 STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 In the Matter of the Accusation of ) NO. H-2445 SAC 12 FRAN SHELTON & ASSOCIATES, LARRY GALE FEATHERSTON, and ACCUSATION 13 MARY LOUISE REDDING, 14 Respondents. 15 The Complainant, G. Mike Pace, a Deputy Real Estate 16 Commissioner of the State of California, for cause of Accusation 17 against FRAN SHELTON & ASSOCIATES (hereinafter "respondent 18 ASSOCIATES"), LARRY GALE FEATHERSTON (hereinafter "respondent 19 FEATHERSTON"), and MARY LOUISE REDDING (hereinafter "respondent 20 "REDDING"), is informed and alleges as follows: 21 22 FIRST CAUSE OF ACCUSATION 23 Ţ The Complainant, G. Mike Pace, a Deputy Real Estate 24 Commissioner of the State of California, makes this Accusation in 25 his official capacity. 26 27 ///

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 112 (REV. 8-72) 2 Respondent ASSOCIATES is presently licensed and/or has

- 3 license rights under the Real Estate Law (Part 1 of Division 4 of
- 4 the California Business and Professions Code) (hereinafter
- 5 "Code"). At all times herein mentioned, respondent ASSOCIATES was
- 6 licensed as a real estate corporation. Within the three-year
- 7 period immediately preceding the filing of this Accusation through
- 8 on or about February 11, 1988, respondent ASSOCIATES acted by and
- 9 through its designated officer respondent FEATHERSTON.
- 10
- 11 Respondent FEATHERSTON is presently licensed and/or has
- 12 license rights under the Real Estate Law (Part 1 of Division 4 of
- 13 the Code), as a real estate broker. Within the three-year period
- 14 immediately preceding the filing of this Accusation through on or
- 15 about February 11, 1988, respondent FEATHERSTON served as the
- 16 designated broker officer for respondent ASSOCIATES.
- 17
- Respondent REDDING is presently licensed and/or has
- 19 license rights under the Real Estate Law (Part 1 of Division 4 of
- 20 the Code), as a real estate salesperson. At all times herein
- 21 mentioned, until on or about December 1, 1987, respondent REDDING
- 22 acted in the employ of respondent ASSOCIATES.
- 23 ///

1

- 24 ///
- 25 ///
- 26 ///
- 27 ///

1 y

On or before January 1, 1987, respondent ASSOCIATES and

- 3 respondent FEATHERSTON and respondent REDDING acting on behalf of
- 4 another or others and in expectation of compensation managed
- 5 certain rental real properties located in or near Chico,
- 6 California.

7 VI

- 8 During the course of the property management activities
- 9 described in Paragraph V above, respondents ASSOCIATES,
- 10 FEATHERSTON and REDDING received and disbursed funds held in trust
- 11 on behalf of another or others.
- 15 All
- In connection with the collection and disbursement of
- 14 said trust funds, respondents ASSOCIATES, FEATHERSTON and REDDING
- 15 failed to deposit and maintain said funds in said bank account in
- 16 such manner that as of November 30, 1987, there was a shortage of
- 17 \$42,289.38 of trust funds in said bank account and as of
- 18 January 20, 1988, there was a shortage of \$25,155.47 of trust
- 19 funds in said bank account.
- SO AIII
- 21 Respondents ASSOCIATES and FEATHERSTON failed to obtain
- 22 prior written consent of their principals for the reduction of the
- 23 aggregate balance of trust funds in said bank account to an amount
- 24 less than the existing aggregate trust fund liability to the
- 25 owners of said funds.
- 26 ///
- 27 ///

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STO. 113 (REV. 8-72) 1 1X

2 The facts alleged above are grounds for the suspension

- 3 or revocation of the licenses of respondents ASSOCIATES,
- 4 FEATHERSTON and REDDING under Sections 2830 and 2832.1 of
- 5 Title 10, California Code of Regulations (hereinafter
- 6 "Regulations") and Section 10145 of the Code in conjunction with
- 7 Section 10177(d) of the Code.

## 8 SECOND CAUSE OF ACCUSATION

9 X

- There is hereby incorporated in this second, separate
- ll and distinct cause of accusation all of the allegations contained
- 12 in Paragraphs I, II, III, IV and V of the First Cause of Accusa-
- 13 tion with the same force and effect as if herein fully set forth.
- 14 XI
- In connection with the property management activities
- 16 described in Paragraph V above, respondents ASSOCIATES,
- 17 FEATHERSTON and REDDING received and disbursed funds held in trust
- 18 on behalf of another or others.
- 19 XII
- 20 Within the three-year period immediately preceding the
- 21 filing of this Accusation in connection with the collection and
- 22 disbursement of trust funds on behalf of another or others,
- 23 respondents ASSOCIATES and FEATHERSTON commingled with their own
- 24 money or property funds held in trust for others and converted
- 25 said trust funds to their own use or benefit or for purposes not
- 26 authorized by the rightful owners of said funds. The exact amount
- 27 of said commingled and converted trust funds is unknown to

- l Complainant, but well known to respondents ASSOCIATES and
- 2 FEATHERSTON and is not less than \$652.86.

3 XIII

- Within the three-year period immediately preceding the
- 5 filing of this Accusation through on or about November 30, 1987,
- 6 respondent REDDING while in the employ of respondent ASSOCIATES
- 7 and in connection with the property management activities
- 8 described in Paragraph V above, commingled with her own money or
- 9 property funds held in trust for others and converted said trust
- 10 funds to her own use or benefit or for purposes not authorized by
- 11 the rightful owners of said funds. The exact amount of said
- 12 commingled and converted trust funds in unknown to Complainant,
- 13 but well known to respondent REDDING and is not less than
- 14 \$33,913.50.

15 XIV

- Within the three-year period immediately preceding the
- 17 filing of this Accusation through on or about November 30, 1987,
- 18 respondent FEATHERSTON as designated officer for respondent
- 19 ASSOCIATES, failed to exercise reasonable supervision over
- 20 respondents ASSUCIATES and REDDING. Respondent FEATHERSTON's
- 21 failure to reasonably supervise the activities of respondents
- 22 ASSOCIATES and REDDING for which a real estate license was
- 23 required included, but are not limited to, the acts and omissions
- 24 set forth below:
- 25 (1) In connection with the property management
- 26 activities described in Paragraph V above, respondent FEATHERSTON
- 27 failed to review, initial and date within five (5) working days

- I all instruments having a material effect upon a party's rights or
- 2 obligations prepared by respondent ASSOCIATES' employees,
- 3 associates, or real estate salespersons.
- (2) In connection with the property management
- 5 activities described in Paragraph V above, respondent FEATHERSTON
- 6 failed to reasonably supervise respondent REDDING thereby allowing
- 7 respondent REDDING to commingle and convert trust funds as
- 8 described in Paragraph XIII above.
- 9 XV
- The facts alleged above in the Second Cause of
- ll Accusation are grounds for the suspension or revocation of the
- 12 licenses of respondents ASSOCIATES, FEATHERSTON and REDDING under
- 13 the following sections of the Business and Professions Code of the
- 14 State of California:
- (1) As to Paragraph XII under Sections 10176(e),
- 16 10176(i) and 10177(j) of the Code as to respondents ASSOCIATES and
- 17 FEATHERSTON.
- (2) As to Paragraph XIII under Sections 10176(e),
- 19 10176(i) and 10177(j) of the Code as to respondent REDDING.
- 20 (3) As to Paragraph XIV under Section 10177(h) of the
- 21 Code or in the alternative under Section 10177(g) of the Code as
- 22 to respondent FEATHERSTON.
- 23 (4) As to Paragraph XIV (1) under Section 10177(d) of
- 24 the Code in conjunction with Section 2725 of Title 10, California
- 25 Code of Regulations as to respondent FEATHERSTON.
- 26 ///
- 27 ///

WHEREFORE, Complainant prays that a hearing be conducted I on the allegations of this Accusation and that upon proof thereof, 2 a decision be rendered imposing disciplinary action against all 3 licenses and license rights of Respondents, 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 the provisions of law. 8 9 10 1.1 Deputy Real Estate Commissioner Dated at Sacramento, California 12 this 21 day of August, 1989. 13 14 15 16 ľ 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

COURT PAPER
TAYE OF CALIFORNIA
(TO: 113 (REV. 8-72)

27