1 2 3 4 5 6 7	JOHN W. BARRON, Counsel (SBN 171246) Department of Real Estate P. O. Box 187007 Sacramento, CA 95818-7007 Telephone: (916) 227-0789 (main) (916) 227-0792 (direct) By K. Max		
8	BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE		
9	STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
10	***		
11			
12	In the Matter of the Accusation of) No. H-5467 SAC		
13	FIRST CAPITAL MORTGAGE		
14	LOAN CORPORATION,) <u>ACCUSATION</u> CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL MILLER)		
15	and JACK ROLLAND EMERSON,)		
16	Respondents.)		
17	· · ·		
18	The Complainant, TRICIA D. SOMMERS, a Deputy Real Estate Commissioner		
19	of the State of California, for cause of Accusation against FIRST CAPITAL MORTGAGE		
20	LOAN CORPORATION (hereafter "FIRST CAPITAL"), CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL MILLER		
21	(hereafter "MILLER") and JACK ROLLAND EMERSON (hereafter "EMERSON") (hereafter		
22	collectively "Respondents"), is informed and alleges as follows:		
23	1		
24	The Complainant makes this Accusation in her official capacity.		
25	2		
26	At all times relevant herein, FIRST CAPITAL was and is licensed by the		
27	Department of Real Estate (hereafter "the Department") as a corporate real estate broker.		
	- 1		

`

•

.

1 3 2 At all times relevant herein, MILLER was and is licensed by the Department as a 3 real estate salesperson. MILLER is the Chief Executive Officer, Chief Financial Officer and 4 100% Shareholder of FIRST CAPITAL. 5 4 6 At all times relevant herein, EMERSON was and is licensed by the Department 7 as a real estate broker. 8 5 9 At all times relevant herein, EMERSON was and is licensed by the Department 10 as the designated broker/officer of FIRST CAPITAL. As the designated broker/officer, 11 EMERSON was responsible, pursuant to Section 10159.2 of the California Business and 12 Professions Code (hereafter "the Code"), for the supervision of the activities of the officers, 13 agents, real estate licensees and employees of FIRST CAPITAL for which a real estate license is 14 required. 15 6 16 At all times herein mentioned, Respondents engaged in the business of, acted in 17 the capacity of, advertised or assumed to act as a real estate broker within the State of California 18 within the meaning of Section 10131(d) of the Code, including the operation and conduct of a 19 loan brokerage business with the public, wherein, on behalf of others, for compensation or in 20 expectation of compensation, Respondents solicited lenders and borrowers for loans secured 21 directly or collaterally by liens on real property, and wherein Respondents arranged, negotiated, 22 processed and consummated such loans. 23 7 24 Whenever reference is made in an allegation in this Accusation to an act or 25 omission of FIRST CAPITAL, such allegation shall be deemed to mean that the officers, 26 directors, employees, agents and real estate licensees employed by or associated with FIRST 27 CAPITAL committed such act or omission while engaged in furtherance of the business or

1	operations of FIRST CAPITAL and while acting within the course and scope of their corporate		
2	authority and employment.		
3	FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION		
4	8		
5	Beginning November 3, 2009, and continuing intermittently through		
6	February 10, 2010, an audit was conducted at FIRST CAPITAL's main office located at 2400		
7	Professional Drive, Suite 150, Roseville, California, where the auditor examined the records for		
8	the period of July 1, 2007, through September 30, 2009 (the audit period).		
9	· 9		
10	FIRST CAPITAL did not and does not maintain a trust account and does not		
11	handle investment funds from lenders. Respondents use third party service providers to draft		
12	loan documents and to act as the servicer for the loans they negotiate.		
13	10		
_	10		
14	The audit described in Paragraph 8, above, revealed that in the course of the		
14	The audit described in Paragraph 8, above, revealed that in the course of the		
14 15	The audit described in Paragraph 8, above, revealed that in the course of the activities described in Paragraph 6, above, Respondents performed, or failed to perform, the		
14 15 16	The audit described in Paragraph 8, above, revealed that in the course of the activities described in Paragraph 6, above, Respondents performed, or failed to perform, the following acts:		
14 15 16 17	The audit described in Paragraph 8, above, revealed that in the course of the activities described in Paragraph 6, above, Respondents performed, or failed to perform, the following acts: (a) FIRST CAPITAL failed to notify the Department about its threshold		
14 15 16 17 18	The audit described in Paragraph 8, above, revealed that in the course of the activities described in Paragraph 6, above, Respondents performed, or failed to perform, the following acts: (a) FIRST CAPITAL failed to notify the Department about its threshold reporting status. In April and June of 2007, FIRST CAPITAL arranged two (2) loans totaling		
14 15 16 17 18 19	The audit described in Paragraph 8, above, revealed that in the course of the activities described in Paragraph 6, above, Respondents performed, or failed to perform, the following acts: (a) FIRST CAPITAL failed to notify the Department about its threshold reporting status. In April and June of 2007, FIRST CAPITAL arranged two (2) loans totaling \$395,000. The negotiation of a combination of two (2) or more loans in an aggregate amount of		
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	The audit described in Paragraph 8, above, revealed that in the course of the activities described in Paragraph 6, above, Respondents performed, or failed to perform, the following acts: (a) FIRST CAPITAL failed to notify the Department about its threshold reporting status. In April and June of 2007, FIRST CAPITAL arranged two (2) loans totaling \$395,000. The negotiation of a combination of two (2) or more loans in an aggregate amount of more than \$250,000 in any successive three (3) months created the rebuttable presumption that		
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	The audit described in Paragraph 8, above, revealed that in the course of the activities described in Paragraph 6, above, Respondents performed, or failed to perform, the following acts: (a) FIRST CAPITAL failed to notify the Department about its threshold reporting status. In April and June of 2007, FIRST CAPITAL arranged two (2) loans totaling \$395,000. The negotiation of a combination of two (2) or more loans in an aggregate amount of more than \$250,000 in any successive three (3) months created the rebuttable presumption that FIRST CAPITAL would meet the threshold for a successive 12-month period. For the		
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	The audit described in Paragraph 8, above, revealed that in the course of the activities described in Paragraph 6, above, Respondents performed, or failed to perform, the following acts: (a) FIRST CAPITAL failed to notify the Department about its threshold reporting status. In April and June of 2007, FIRST CAPITAL arranged two (2) loans totaling \$395,000. The negotiation of a combination of two (2) or more loans in an aggregate amount of more than \$250,000 in any successive three (3) months created the rebuttable presumption that FIRST CAPITAL would meet the threshold for a successive 12-month period. For the successive 12-month period ending on December 31, 2007, FIRST CAPITAL arranged eleven		
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	The audit described in Paragraph 8, above, revealed that in the course of the activities described in Paragraph 6, above, Respondents performed, or failed to perform, the following acts: (a) FIRST CAPITAL failed to notify the Department about its threshold reporting status. In April and June of 2007, FIRST CAPITAL arranged two (2) loans totaling \$395,000. The negotiation of a combination of two (2) or more loans in an aggregate amount of more than \$250,000 in any successive three (3) months created the rebuttable presumption that FIRST CAPITAL would meet the threshold for a successive 12-month period. For the successive 12-month period ending on December 31, 2007, FIRST CAPITAL arranged eleven (11) loans totaling approximately \$4.7 million. Within thirty (30) days of meeting the threshold		
 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	The audit described in Paragraph 8, above, revealed that in the course of the activities described in Paragraph 6, above, Respondents performed, or failed to perform, the following acts: (a) FIRST CAPITAL failed to notify the Department about its threshold reporting status. In April and June of 2007, FIRST CAPITAL arranged two (2) loans totaling \$395,000. The negotiation of a combination of two (2) or more loans in an aggregate amount of more than \$250,000 in any successive three (3) months created the rebuttable presumption that FIRST CAPITAL would meet the threshold for a successive 12-month period. For the successive 12-month period ending on December 31, 2007, FIRST CAPITAL arranged eleven (11) loans totaling approximately \$4.7 million. Within thirty (30) days of meeting the threshold figure, FIRST CAPITAL failed to submit a Threshold Notification to the Department. In		

. .

.

)

- 3 -

. .

`	1			
1	Such acts and	l/or omissions violate Se	ctions 10232(e) (30-	day threshold reporting
2	requirement), 10232.2(b) (R	equirement to file annua	l threshold reports) a	und 10232.25(d)
3	(Requirement to file stateme	ent of non-receipt of trust	t funds by broker) of	the Code.
4	(b) FIRS'	Γ CAPITAL failed to not	tify the Department a	about its multi-lender
5	activity within thirty (30) da	ys of the first such transa	action, including the	first multi-lender loan
6	transaction which was the M	langrove loan that closed	l in October 2007. II	n addition, FIRST
7	CAPITAL did not have a pe	rmit issued by the Depar	tment of Corporation	ns to exempt the offer
8	and sale of securities. Such	acts and/or omissions vi	olate Section 10238(a) (Reporting
9	Requirements for Multi-Len	der Transactions) of the	Code.	
10	(c) FIRS	T CAPITAL failed to pro	ovide investors with	the proper
11	Lender/Purchaser Disclosur	e Statements (hereafter "	LPDS"), including th	ne following loan
12	transactions:			
13		Borrower	Investment	Closing
14	Lender	Property Address	Amount	Date
15	Harold Gomes	Dave Collinsworth	\$165,000	08/15/07
16		1430 Irene Drive Woodland, CA		
17		-The initial Collinswor	rth loan was followed	d by an Extension and
18	· · ·	Modification Agreeme to September 1, 2010,	ent extending the mat	turity date by one year
19		12%. However, FIRS	T CAPITAL negotia	ted that extension and
· 20		modification without p	providing a new LPD	S to the lender.
21	Derek Gilchrist	KLR Fidelity LLC 3912 23 rd Avenue	\$100,000	08/15/07
22		Sacramento, CA		
23	Stephen Dougan	KLR Fidelity LLC	\$ 65,000	12/07/07
24		3912 23 rd Avenue Sacramento, CA		
25				
26	Stephen Dougan	KC Development East Avenue	\$1,050,000	12/27/07
27		Chico, CA		
		Λ		
		- 4 -	• • • •	
ļ	l			

1	I	,		1
1		-On or about February 5, Development loan was ex		-
2	FIRST CAPITAL negotiated that extension without providing a new LPDS to any of the three lenders.			
3				
4	Stephen R. Carroll	KC Development East Avenue	\$400,000	12/27/07
5		Chico, CA		
6	J. Jay Corbett	KC Development East Avenue	\$250,000	12/27/07
7		Chico, CA		
8	Bordigioni Family	Philip Holmes	\$400,000	03/07/08
9	Trust	1515 Wood Duck Lane Meadow Vista, CA		
10		-The initial Holmes loan	was followed by	a Modification of Note
11		increasing the principal b	alance to \$466,10	00. FIRST CAPITAL
12		negotiated that modificat: lender.	ion without provi	ding a new LPDS to the
13	W. Michael Layman	Jack Paquin	\$150,000	05/09/08
14 15		448-B Ramona Avenue Monterey, CA		
15				
17	Jeffry Quandt	Jack Paquin	\$100,000	05/09/08
18		448-B Ramona Avenue Monterey, CA	·	
19	In addition, FIRST CAPITAL arranged a \$280,000 construction loan for Judy			
20	Dancy secured by investment property located at 5609 Odea Drive, Sacramento, California.			-
21	Both LPDS's on file for the Judy Dancy loan were incomplete because the broker or his			
22	designated representative failed to sign Page 6, acknowledging that the information contained in			
23	each LPDS and its attachments were true and correct to the best of his knowledge.			
24	Such acts and/or omissions violate of Sections 10232.4 (Provision of disclosure			Provision of disclosure
25	statement to lender/purchaser) and 10238(1) (Written disclosure of material facts of transaction			rial facts of transaction
26	to lender/purchaser) of the C	ode.		
27	///			
		- 5-		
		· · · · ·		
	1			

•

1	(d) FIRST CAPITAL failed to obtain signed Investor Qualification Statements
2	(hereafter "IQS") from lenders investing in fractionalized notes for multi-lender loan
3	transactions. The loans extended to KLR Fidelity LLC, KC Development, Judy Dancy and Jack
4	Paquin were all multi-lender transactions. However, signed IQS's for lenders Derek Gilchrist,
5	Stephen Dougan, Jay Corbett, Steven Carroll, Michael Hanrihan, Raymond Frink, Michael
6	Layman and Jeffry Quandt were not on file with FIRST CAPITAL. In addition, Respondent has
7	not provided sufficient evidence to show that each lender's investment did not exceed 10% of
8	his net worth or that his investment did not exceed 10% of his adjusted gross income for federal
9	income tax purposes.
10	Such acts and/or omissions violate Section 10238(f) (Requirement of investor
11	qualification statement on notes or interests) of the Code.
12	(e) FIRST CAPITAL failed to record deeds of trust in the name of the lender
13	or the lender's nominee for the following transactions:
14	-David Collinsworth loan secured by the property located at 1430 Irene
15	Drive in Woodland, California;
16	-KLR Fidelity LLC loan secured by the property located at 3912 23 rd
17	Street in Sacramento, California;
18	-KC Development loan secured by the property located on East Street in Chico, California;
19	
20	-Philip Holmes loan secured by the property located at1515 Wood Duck Lane in Meadow Vista, California;
21	-Judy Dancy loan secured by the property located at 5609 Odea Drive in
22	Sacramento, California; and
23	-Jack Paquin loan secured by the property located at 448 Ramona Avenue,
24	Monterey, California.
25	Such acts and/or omissions violate Section 10234 (Recordation requirement for
26	trust deeds on real property) of the Code.
27	///
	- 6-
11	

.

.

.

1 (f) FIRST CAPITAL failed to provide borrowers with complete Mortgage 2 Loan Disclosure Statements (hereafter "MLDS") by failing to have the broker or his 3 representative sign the MLDS or failing to disclose information regarding prepayment 4 provisions, including the following transactions:

2		Property	Loan	Closing
6	Borrower	Address	Amount	Date
7	Dave Collinsworth	1430 Irene Drive	\$165,000	08/15/07
8		Woodland, CA		
9	KLR Fidelity LLC	3912 23 rd Avenue Sacramento, CA	\$165,000	12/07/07
10		,		
11	KC Development	East Avenue Chico, CA	\$1,700,000	12/27/07
12	Philip Holmes	1515 Wood Duck Lane	\$400,000	03/07/08
13		Meadow Vista, CA		
14	Jack Paquin	448-B Ramona Drive	\$250,000	05/09/08
15		Monterey, CA		

In addition, FIRST CAPITAL failed to disclose prepayment provisions for the proposed loan for 16 17 the Judy Dancy under Section V of that MLDS.

18 Such acts and/or omissions violate Section 10240 (Provision of mortgage loan 19 disclosure statement to borrower) of the Code.

20

c

11

21 The acts and/or omissions as alleged in Paragraph 10; above, violate Sections 10131(d), 10232(e), 10132.2(b), 10132.25(d), 10232.4, 10234, 10238, 10238(f), 10238(l) and 22 23 10240, and are grounds for discipline under Sections 10177(d) (Willful disregard/violation of Real Estate Law) and 10177(g) (Negligence or incompetence performing acts for which license is 24 required) of the Code. In addition, the Department is entitled to reimbursement for the costs of 25 its audit pursuant to Section 10148 (Cost of audit in final decision following disciplinary hearing) 26 27 of the Code.

7 -

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

12

Complainant refers to Paragraphs 1 through 11, above, and incorporates them herein by reference.

13

6 The Broker-Salesman Relationship Agreement between EMERSON and MILLER 7 failed to address material aspects of their relationship. In particular, the wording of the 8 Agreement shows that MILLER conducted licensed activity under EMERSON's individual 9 broker's license from EMERSON's main office located at 5641 Frontier Way, Carmichael. 10 California. However, according to the Department's licensing information, MILLER was never 11 employed as a salesperson under EMERSON's individual broker's license. Instead, MILLER's 12 sole employer since January 2004 has been FIRST CAPITAL. The Broker-Salesman 13 Relationship Agreement also failed to mention FIRST CAPITAL or its main office located at 14 2400 Professional Drive, Suite 150, Roseville, California.

In addition, under the original Broker-Salesman Relationship Agreement,
EMERSON received \$3,500 as an annual fee from MILLER. However, on or about
December 21, 2009, an updated and signed Independent Contractor Agreement was faxed to the
Department for its review. That document was backdated to September 7, 2009. The new
Agreement modified the financial arrangement between EMERSON and MILLER to fee
payment of \$833.33 per month from MILLER to EMERSON.

Neither of the above agreements addressed the issue of any compensation to be
paid to MILLER.

23

1

2

3

4

5

14

The acts and/or omissions as alleged in Paragraph 13, above, violate Section 2726
(Required contents of broker-salesperson relationship agreements) of the California Code of
Regulations (hereafter "the Regulations"), and are grounds for discipline under Section 10177(d)
of the Code.

- 8 -

•	
*	
1	THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
2	15
3	
4	Complainant refers to Paragraphs 1 through 14, above, and incorporates them herein by reference.
5	16
6	At all times relevant herein, EMERSON was responsible, as the designated
7	broker/officer for FIRST CAPITAL, for the supervision and control of the activities conducted
8	on behalf of the corporation by its officers and employees. EMERSON failed to exercise
9	reasonable supervision and control over the property mortgage loan brokering activities of
10	FIRST CAPITAL. In particular, EMERSON permitted, ratified and/or caused the conduct
11	described in the First and Second Causes of Action, above, to occur, and failed to take
12	reasonable steps, including, but not limited to, the supervision of employees and the
13	implementation of policies, rules, procedures and systems to ensure the compliance of the
14	corporation with the Real Estate Law and the Regulations.
15	17
16	The acts and/or omissions of EMERSON as set forth in Paragraph 16, above,
17	violate Sections 10159.2 (Responsibilities of corporate officer in charge) of the Code and
18	Section 2725 (Broker supervision of salespersons) of the Regulations, and constitute grounds for
. 19	disciplinary action under Sections 10177(h) (Failure by broker to provide reasonable supervision
20	of activities of salespersons and/or corporation) and 10177(d) of the Code.
21	///
22	
23	///
24	///
25	/// · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
26	
27	
	- 9 -
	II

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 under the Code, and for such other and further relief as may be proper under applicable provisions of law. nmenel D. SOMMERS Deputy Real Estate Commissioner Dated at Sacramento, California, XMEM 13en, 2010. this MM day of 10 -