	. COPY
. 1 2	DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE 185 Berry Street, Room 3400 San Francisco, CA 94107
3	
4. . 5	DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE
6	By Finde Montiel
7	
8	BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE
9	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10	* * *
11	In the Matter of the Accusation of)) NO. H-6762 SF
12	JAMES LEE ELLINGWOOD,) STEVE BLAIR, and) <u>STIPULATION AND</u>
13	SHELDON KEITH PERRY,) <u>AGREEMENT IN</u>) <u>SETTLEMENT AND ORDER.</u>
14	Respondents.)
15	It is hereby stipulated by and between JAMES LEE
16	ELLINGWOOD, STEVE BLAIR, and SHELDON KEITH PERRY, and their
17	attorney of record, Phillip M. Adleson, and the Complainant, acting
18	by and through David B. Seals, Counsel for the Department of Real
19	Estate, as follows for the purpose of settling and disposing of the
20	Accusation filed on July 31, 1992, in this matter as to all
51	Respondents:
22	1. All issues which were to be contested and all
23	evidence which was to be presented by Complainant and Respondents
24	JAMES LEE ELLINGWOOD, STEVE BLAIR, and SHELDON KEITH PERRY, at a
25	I UI MAL MEALING ON ONE OFFICIAL TO
26	accordance when end province is a
27	(APA), shall instead and in place thereof be submitted solely on
COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 8-72) 85 34759	H-6762 SF - 1 - JAMES LEE ELLINGWOOD, STEVE BLAIR, and SHELDON KEITH PERRY

1

ţ

٠

the basis of the provisions of this Stipulation and Agreement in
 Settlement.

3 2. Respondents JAMES LEE ELLINGWOOD, STEVE BLAIR, and
4 SHELDON KEITH PERRY have received, read and understand the
5 Statement to Respondent, the Discovery Provisions of the APA and
6 the Accusation filed by the Department of Real Estate in this
7 proceeding.

3. On August 20, 1992, Respondent JAMES LEE ELLINGWOOD 8 filed a Notice of Defense and on September 4, 1992, SHELDON KEITH 9 PERRY filed a Notice of Defense, both pursuant to Section 11505 of 10 the Government Code for the purpose of requesting a hearing on the 11 allegations in the Accusation. Respondents JAMES LEE ELLINGWOOD, 12 STEVE BLAIR, and SHELDON KEITH PERRY hereby freely and voluntarily 13 Respondents JAMES withdraw all and any such Notices of Defense. 14 LEE ELLINGWOOD, STEVE BLAIR, and SHELDON KEITH PERRY acknowledge 15 that they understand that by withdrawing said Notices of Defense 16 they will thereby waive their right to require the Commissioner to 17 prove the allegations in the Accusation at a contested hearing held 18 in accordance with the provisions of the APA and that they will 19 waive other rights afforded to them in connection with the hearing 20 such as the right to present evidence in defense of the allegations 21 in the Accusation and the right to cross-examine witnesses. 22

4. Respondents JAMES LEE ELLINGWOOD, STEVE BLAIR, and
SHELDON KEITH PERRY pursuant to the limitations set forth below,
hereby admit that the factual allegations or findings of fact as
set forth in Paragraphs I through XIII of the Accusation filed in
this proceeding are true and correct and the Real Estate

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

H-6762 SF

Commissioner shall not be required to provide further evidence of
 such allegations.

It is understood by the parties that the Real Estate 3 5. Commissioner may adopt the Stipulation and Agreement in Settlement 4 as his decision in this matter thereby imposing the penalty and 5 sanctions on Respondents JAMES LEE ELLINGWOOD, STEVE BLAIR, and 6 7 SHELDON KEITH PERRY real estate licenses and license rights as set forth in the below "Order". In the event that the Commissioner in 8 his discretion does not adopt the Stipulation and Agreement in 9 Settlement, it shall be void and of no effect, and Respondents 10 JAMES LEE ELLINGWOOD, STEVE BLAIR, and SHELDON KEITH PERRY shall 11 retain the right to a hearing and proceeding on the Accusation 12 under all the provisions of the APA and shall not be bound by any 13 14 admission or waiver made herein.

15 6. The Order or any subsequent Order of the Real Estate
16 Commissioner made pursuant to this Stipulation and Agreement in
17 Settlement shall not constitute an estoppel, merger or bar to any
18 further administrative or civil proceedings by the Department of
19 Real Estate with respect to any matters which were not specifical20 ly alleged to be causes for accusation in this proceeding.

7. Respondent Blair has received, read and understands
the "Notice Concerning Costs of Subsequent Audits". Respondent
Blair understands that by agreeing to this Stipulation and
Agreement in Settlement, the findings set forth below in the
DETERMINATION OF ISSUES become final, and that the Commissioner may
charge Respondent Blair for the costs of any audit conducted
pursuant to Section 10148 of the Business and Professions Code to

3 -

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

H-6762 SF

	• • •
1	determine if the violations have been corrected. The maximum costs
2	of said audit will not exceed \$1,400.00.
3	DETERMINATION OF ISSUES
4	I
5	The facts alleged above are grounds for the suspension or
6	revocation of the licenses and license rights of:
7	(1) Respondent JAMES LEE ELLINGWOOD under Section
8	10177(d) of the Code in conjunction with Section 2831.2, Title 10,
9	California Code of Regulations (Regulations);
10	(2) Respondent STEVE BLAIR under Section 10177(g) and
11	Section 10177(d) of the Code in conjunction with Sections 10145 and
12	10159.5 of the Code and 2731, 2831.1 and 2832.1 of the Regulations;
13	and,
14	(3) Respondent SHELDON KEITH PERRY under Section 10177(j)
15	of the Code.
16	ORDER
17	All licenses and licensing rights of Respondent JAMES LEE
18	ELLINGWOOD, Respondent STEVE BLAIR, and of Respondent SHELDON KEITH
19	PERRY under the Real Estate Law are suspended as to each Respondent
20	for a period of thirty (30) days from the effective date of this
21	Order; provided, however, that:
22	1. Respondent Blair shall pay, pursuant to Section 10148 of the
23	Business and Professions Code, the Commissioner's reasonable
24	cost for an audit to determine if Respondent Blair has
25	corrected the trust fund violations found in paragraph "2" of
26	the Determination of Issues. In calculating the amount of the
27	Commissioner's reasonable costs, the Commissioner may use the
8	

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 8-72) H-6762 SF

. .

estimated average hourly salary for all Department Audit Section personnel performing audits of real estate brokers, and shall include an allocation for travel costs, including mileage, time to and from the auditor's place of work, and per diem. The Commissioner's reasonable costs shall in no event exceed \$1,400.00;

- 7 (a) Respondent Blair shall pay such cost within 45 days of
 8 receipt of an invoice from the Commissioner detailing the
 9 activities performed during the audit and the amount of
 10 time spent performing those activities;
- Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs "2" and "3" 11 (b) of this Order, if Respondent Blair fails to pay within 45 12 days from receipt of the invoice specified above, the 13 Commissioner's reasonable costs for an audit to determine 14 if Respondent has corrected the violations found in 15 paragraph "2" of the Determinations of Issues, the 16 Commissioner may order the indefinite suspension of 17 Respondent Blair's real estate license and license rights. 18 The suspension shall remain in effect until payment is 19 made in full, or until Respondent Blair enters into an 20 agreement satisfactory to the Commissioner to provide for 21 such payment. The Commissioner may impose further 22 reasonable disciplinary terms and conditions upon 23 Respondent Blair's real estate license and license rights 24 25 as part of any such agreement.
- 26 ///

1

2

3

4

5

6

| |||

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 8-72) H-6762 SF

27

1	2.	As to the thirty (30) day suspension for each Respondent,
2		fifteen (15) days of said suspension shall be stayed for
3		one (1) year upon the following terms and conditions:
4		(a) Said Respondent shall obey all laws, rules and
5		regulations governing the rights, duties and
6		responsibilities of a real estate licensee in the
7		State of California; and,
8		(b) That no final subsequent determination be made, after
9		hearing or upon stipulation, that cause for disciplinary
10		action occurred within one (1) year from the effective
11		date of this Order. Should such a determination be made,
12		the Commissioner may, in his discretion, vacate and set
13		aside the stay order and reimpose all or a portion of the
14		stayed suspension. Should no such determination be made,
15		the stay imposed herein shall become permanent.
16	3.	The remaining fifteen (15) days of said 30-day suspension shall
17		be stayed as to each Respondent upon the condition that such
18		Respondent petitions pursuant to Section 10175.2 of the
19		Business and Professions Code and pays a monetary penalty
20		pursuant to Section 10175.2 of the Business and Professions
21		Code at a rate of \$125.00 for each day of the suspension for a
22	100111	total monetary penalty of \$1,875.00:
23		(a) Said payment shall be in the form of a cashier's check or
24		certified check made payable to the Recovery Account of
25		the Real Estate Fund. Said check must be delivered to the
26		Department prior to the effective date of the Order in

1

27

.

COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 8-72) H-6762 SF

this matter.

- 6 -

- (b) No further cause for disciplinary action against the Real Estate licenses of said Respondent occurs within one (1) year from the effective date of the decision in this matter.
- If any Respondent fails to pay the monetary penalty in 5 (C) accordance with the terms and conditions of the Order, the 6 7 Commissioner may, without a hearing, order the immediate 8 execution of all or any part of the stayed suspension as 9 to such Respondent in which event such Respondent shall 10 not be entitled to any repayment nor credit, prorated or 11 otherwise, for the money paid to the Department under the terms of this Order. 12
- (d) As to each Respondent who pays the monetary penalty and if
 no further cause for disciplinary action against the real
 estate licenses of said Respondent occurs within one (1)
 year from the effective date of the Decision, the stay
 hereby granted shall become permanent as to that
 Respondent.

DAVID B. SEALS, Counsel DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

I have read the Stipulation and Agreement, have discussed it with my counsel, 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

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

H-6762 SF

1

2

3

4

19

20

21

93

DATED

- 7 -

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

5 charges. 6 JAMES LEE ELLINGWOOD DATED 7 Respondent 8 9 Respondent STEVE BLAIR, 10 7, 1973 SepT. 11 SHELDON KEITH PERRY Respondent 12 I have reviewed the Stipulation and Agreement as to form 13 and content and have advised my client accordingly. 14 15 1993 hillip M! Adleson DATED 16 Attorney for Respondents 17 18 The foregoing Stipulation and Agreement in Settlement is 19 hereby adopted by the Real Estate Commissioner as Decision and 20 Order and shall become effective at 12 o'clock noon on 21 November 1st, 1993 IT IS SO ORDERED September 30, 1993 22 23 CLARK WALLACE Real Estate Commissioner 24 25 26 John R. Liberator of Deputy Commissioner 27 COURT PAPER

STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 8-72) H-6762 SF - 8 -

	FRANKAS COPY BILED
1	DAVID B. SEALS, Counsel Department of Real Estate
2	185 Berry Street, Room 3400 San Francisco, CA 94107-1770 DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE
3	Telephone: (415) 904-5917
4	Telephone: (415) 904-5917
5	
6	
7	
8	BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE
9	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10	* * *
11	In the Matter of the Accusation of)) NO. H-6762 SF
12	JAMES LEE ELLINGWOOD,) STEVE BLAIR and) <u>ACCUSATION</u>
13	SHELDON KEITH PERRY,)
14	Respondents.)
15	
16	The Complainant, EDWARD V. CHIOLO, a Deputy Real Estate
17	Commissioner of the State of California, for cause of Accusation
18	against JAMES LEE ELLINGWOOD (ELLINGWOOD), STEVE BLAIR (BLAIR),
19	and SHELDON KEITH PERRY (PERRY) is informed and alleges as
20	follows:
21	I
-22	That Respondents are presently licensed and/or have
23	license rights under the Real Estate Law, Part 1 of Division 4 of
24	the Business and Professions Code (hereinafter Code).
25	II
26	That the Complainant, EDWARD V. CHIOLO, a Deputy Real
27	Estate Commissioner of the State of California, acting in his
COURT PAPER	
COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD, 113 (REV. 8-72)	-1-
85 34759	

.

A

1 official capacity as such and not otherwise, makes this Accusation
2 against Respondents.

III

4 At all times mentioned herein until on or about October 5 31, 1990 ELLINGWOOD was licensed by the Department of Real Estate 6 ; (hereinafter Department) as a real estate broker doing business as 7 (dba) Excel Financial. On October 31, 1990 ELLINGWOOD cancelled 8 his dba of Excel Financial with the Department. 9 IV 10 On or about October 31, 1990 BLAIR and PERRY signed an 11 agreement providing that BLAIR would be the broker of record 12 (designated broker) for Excel Financial. However, BLAIR did not 13 register Excel Financial as a dba with the Department until April 14 14, 1992. 15 v 16 On or about October 31, 1990 ELLINGWOOD terminated PERRY 17 from his employ and in turn BLAIR employed PERRY. 18 VI 19 That at all times herein mentioned, Respondents 20 ELLINGWOOD and BLAIR engaged in the business of, acted in the 21: capacity of, advertised, or assumed to act as real estate brokers in the State of California within the meaning of Section 10131 of 22 23 the Code for or in expectation of compensation. 24 VII 25 That at all times mentioned herein, Respondents ELLINGWOOD and BLAIR accepted or received funds in trust 26 ' (hereafter trust funds) from and on behalf of their principals 27

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

ŕ

3

-2-

placing them in their operating account and at times thereafter made disbursements of such funds.

VIII

That from January 11 to January 22, 1991 and on April 10, 1992 investigative audits were made by the Department of the 5 records and bank records of Respondents ELLINGWOOD and BLAIR dba 6 Excel Financial for the period from April 1, 1990 to December 31, 7 1990 as said records related to its activities as a real estate 8 9 broker.

IX

11 That it was ascertained by said audit that Respondents ELLINGWOOD and BLAIR maintained two trust fund accounts - Trust 12 Account/CDG, Excel Financial (Trust #1) and Excel Financial Trust 13 Account (Trust #2) at Bank of the West, 1010 South First Street, 14 San Jose, California 95110. Trust #2 was used to deposit 15 borrowers' monthly payments and payoffs. Disbursements were made 16 from this account to investors and for servicing fees. 17 The adjusted balance of Trust #2 as of November 30, 1990 was a 18 negative TWO THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED SEVENTY NINE and 10/100 19 20 DOLLARS (-\$2,879.10).

х

That it was further ascertained by said audit that .22 Respondents ELLINGWOOD and BLAIR's accountability for Trust #2 as 23 of November 30, 1990, was TWO THOUSAND NINETY EIGHT and 96/100 24 DOLLARS (\$2,098.96) and that therefore Respondents ELLINGWOOD and 25 BLAIR as of November 30, 1990 had a shortage in Trust #2 of TWO 26 27

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

1

2

3

4

10

21

-3-

1 THOUSAND NINETY EIGHT and 96/100 DOLLARS (\$2,098.96). The 2 shortage was due to unauthorized withdrawals by Respondent PERRY. 3 XI 4 It was ascertained by said audits that on November 28, 5 1990 two checks in the amounts of \$3,500 and \$1,500 were written 6 to the IRA of PERRY's wife and to PERRY's IRA, respectively, from 7 : These withdrawals were made without the consent of all Trust #2. 8 the beneficiaries of Trust #2. 9 XII 10 It was further ascertained by said audits that 11 Respondents ELLINGWOOD and BLAIR failed to reconcile the balance of all separate beneficiary or transaction records with the record 12: of all trust funds received and disbursed as to Trust #2. 13 14 XIII 15 It was further ascertained by said audits that Respondent BLAIR used the fictitious name EXCEL FINANCIAL in his 16 real estate business without holding a license from the Department 17 18 in that name. 19 XIV That by reason of the facts as alleged in Paragraphs IX, 20 X and XI above, Respondent BLAIR violated Section 10145 of the 21 Code and Section 2832.1, Title 10, California Code of Regulations 22 (Regulations) and said acts and/or omissions constitute grounds 23 for disciplinary action under the provisions of Section 10177(d) 24 25 of the Code. 26 | | | | | | 27 1111 STATE OF CALIFORNIA STD. 113 (REV. 8-72)

85 34769

COURT PAPER

-4--

By reason of the facts alleged in Paragraph XI above, 2 Respondent BLAIR has been guilty of acts and/or omissions 3 constituting grounds for disciplinary action under the provisions 4 5 of Section 10177(h) of the Code. 6 XVI By reason of the facts alleged in Paragraph XI above, 7 Respondent PERRY has been guilty of acts and/or omissions 8 constituting grounds for disciplinary action under the provisions 9 of Section 10176(i) or 10177(j) of the Code. 10 11 XVII By reason of the facts as alleged in Paragraph XII 12 above, Respondents ELLINGWOOD and BLAIR violated Section 2831.2 of 13 the Regulations and Section 10177(g) of the Code and said acts 14 and/or omissions constitute grounds for disciplinary action under 15 the provisions of Section 10177(d) and 10177(g) of the Code, 16 17 respectively. 18 XVIII By reason of the facts as alleged in Paragraphs IV and 19 XIII above, Respondent BLAIR violated Sections 10159.5 and 20 10177(g) of the Code and Regulation 2731 and said acts and/or 21 omissions constitute grounds for disciplinary action under the 22provisions of Section 10177(d) and 10177(g) of the Code, as 23 24 appropriate. WHEREFORE, Complainant prays that a hearing be conducted 25^{+} on the allegations of this Accusation and that upon proof thereof, 26 a decision be rendered imposing disciplinary action against all 27

-5-

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

1

XV

4	· · · ·
1	licenses and license rights of Respondent under the Real Estate
2	Law (Part 1 of Division 4 of the Business and Professions Code),
3	and for such other and further relief as may be proper under other
4	provisions of law. Sword V. Chilo
5	EDWARD V. CHIOLO
6 7	Deputy Real Estate Commissioner
8	Dated at San Francisco, California this 31^{51} day of $_{50}$ July , 19 72 .
9	this $\frac{1}{2}$ day of $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{19}{4}$.
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20 21	
-22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
COURT PAPER STATE OF CALIFORNIA STO. 113 (REV. 8-72)	
85 347 69	-6-