COPY

Flag

1	DEIDRE L. JOHNSON, Counsel Department of Real Estate 185 Berry Street, Room 3400 San Francisco, CA 94107	FILEM
3	San Francisco, CA 94107	DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE
4	Telephone: (415) 904-5917	OF REAL ESTATE
5 .		By TANdactiontice
6		Lynda Montiel
7 :		
8	THE PERSONNEL OF I	מפאד שפייא ייני
9	BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE	
	STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
10	* * *	
11	In the Matter of the Accusation of)	No. H-6932 SF
12	CHUNG SHUNG LO and) ABLE-TAO FINANCIAL, INC.)	ACCUSATION
13	Respondents.)	•
14)	
1 5		
16	The Complainant, Edward V. Chiolo, a Deputy Real Estate	
17	Commissioner of the State of California, for causes of Accusation	
18	against CHUNG SHUNG LO and ABLE-TAO FINANCIAL, INC., is informed	
19	and alleges as follows:	
20	I	
21	The Complainant, Edward V. Chiolo, a Deputy Real Estate	
22	Commissioner of the State of California, makes this Accusation	
23	against Respondents in his official capacity and not otherwise.	
24	II	
25	Respondents CHUNG SHUNG LO (hereafter LO) and ABLE-TAO	
26	FINANCIAL, INC. (hereafter ATF) are presently licensed and/or have	
27		
	-1/1	

license rights under the Real Estate Law, Part 1 of Division 4 of the California Business and Professions Code (hereafter the Code).

III

At all times herein mentioned, respondent LO was licensed by the State of California Department of Real Estate (hereafter Department) as an individual real estate broker and as the designated broker-officer of ATF.

IV

At all times herein mentioned, respondent ATF was licensed by the Department as a real estate broker corporation acting by and through respondent LO as its designated broker-officer.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

V

On or about February 10, 1993, in the Superior Court of the State of California in and for the County of San Mateo, in Case Number 357456, a final judgment was entered against respondents LO and ATF upon grounds of fraud, misrepresentation, or deceit with reference to a transaction for which a real estate license is required.

VI

The facts set forth in Paragraph V above constitute cause under Section 10177.5 of the Code for suspension or revocation of all licenses and license rights of respondents LO and ATF under the Real Estate Law.

27 ///

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

VII

Effective November 24, 1990, a renewed real estate broker license was issued by the Department to respondent LO bearing a termination date of November 23, 1993, and authorizing her to transact business for which a real estate license is required at 1741 Taraval Street, San Francisco, California.

VIII

Effective September 27, 1989, a real estate broker corporation license was issued by the Department to respondent ATF bearing a termination date of September 26, 1993, and authorizing it to transact business for which a real estate license is required at 1741 Taraval Street, San Francisco, California.

IX

Subsequent to the above dates, and at least as of October 1, 1992, respondents LO and ATF had abandoned the above business address and failed to maintain on file with the Department a new address for the principal place of business for the real estate brokerage activities of each respondent. On or about March 19, 1993, respondent ATF registered a new principal place of business with the Department.

Х

The acts and/or omissions of respondents LO and ATF as alleged above constitute violation of Section 10162 of the Code and Section 2715 of Title 10 of the California Code of Regulations, and are grounds for disciplinary action under the provisions of Sections 10165 and 10177(d) of the Code.

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

. 1

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

XI

Beginning on or about August 27, 1992, and continuing through the present, respondents LO and ATF have failed to retain and make available for examination and inspection by a designated representative of the Commissioner of the Department, all documents executed or obtained by them in connection with transactions for which a real estate license is required, including but not limited to trust fund records, bank statements, cancelled checks, and loan files. The records produced by respondants and/or located by the Commissioner's representative were not sufficient to conduct an audit of the business.

IIX

The acts and/or omissions of respondents LO and ATF as alleged above violate Section 10148 of the Code and constitute grounds for disciplinary action under the provisions of Section 10177(d) of the Code.

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 Real Estate Law (Part 1 of Division 4 of the Business and

///

24 ///

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

.10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

Professions Code) and for such other and further relief as may be proper under other provisions of law. Showed U. chib EDWARD V. CHIOLO Deputy Real Estate Commissioner Dated at San Francisco, California, 41 day of JUNE