1	RICHARD K. UNO, Counsel III (SBN 98275) Department of Real Estate			
2	P. O. Box 137007 Sacramento, CA 95813-7007			
3				
4	Telephone: (916) 576-8700 JAN 2 2 2021 (916) 263-3767 (Fax)			
5	(916) 576-7849 (Direct) DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE By . (2020)			
6	J. wyfard			
7				
8	BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE			
9	STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
10				
11	* * * In the Matter of the Accusation of			
12	STEP UP PM, INC., No. H-7018 SAC			
13	ANN THERESA BRENNAN, ACCUSATION SHANNON M. KENT, ACCESS ASSET			
14	MANAGEMENT, INC. and			
15	JARROD VINCENT WHITEHORN,			
16	Respondents.)			
17	The Complainant, TRICIA D. PARKHURST, a Supervising Special Investigator			
18	of the State of California, for Accusation against Respondents STEP UP PM, INC. (SUPM),			
19	ANN THERESA BRENNAN (BRENNAN), SHANNON M. KENT (KENT), ACCESS ASSET			
20	MANAGEMENT, INC. (AAM), and JARROD VINCENT WHITEHORN (WHITEHORN),			
21	sometimes collectively referred to as Respondents, is informed and alleges as follows:			
22	1			
23	The Complainant makes this Accusation against Respondents in her official			
24	capacity.			
25	<i> </i>			
26	<i> </i>			
27	/// ///			
- 11				

SUPM is presently licensed and/or has license rights under the Real Estate Law, Part 1 of Division 4 of the California Business and Professions Code (Code), by the Department of Real Estate (Department) as a corporate real estate broker.

BRENNAN is presently licensed and/or has license rights under the Code, by the Department as a real estate broker.

KENT is presently licensed and/or has license rights under the Code, by the Department as a real estate salesperson.

AAM is presently licensed and/or has license rights under the Code, by the Department as a corporate real estate broker.

WHITEHORN is presently licensed and/or has license rights under the Code, by the Department as a real estate broker.

At all times mentioned herein, BRENNAN was the designated broker-officer of SUPM. As the designated broker-officer, BRENNAN was responsible, pursuant to Section 10159.2 of the Code, for the supervision of the activities of officers, agents, real estate licensees and employees of SUPM for which a real estate license is required to ensure the compliance of the corporation with the Real Estate law and the Regulations.

At all times mentioned herein, WHITEHORN was the designated broker-officer of AAM. As the designated broker-officer, WHITEHORN was responsible, pursuant to Section 10159.2 of the Code, for the supervision of the activities of officers, agents, real estate licensees

and employees of AAM for which a real estate license is required to ensure the compliance of the corporation with the Real Estate law and the Regulations.

At all times herein mentioned, Respondents engaged in the business of, acted in the capacity of, advertised, or assumed to act as a real estate broker within the State of California within the meaning of Section 10131(b) of the Code, including the operation and conduct of a property management business with the public wherein, on behalf of others, for compensation or in expectation of compensation, Respondent leased or rented or offered to lease or rent, or placed for rent, or solicited listings of places for rent, or solicited for prospective tenants, or negotiated the sale, purchase or exchanges of leases on real property, or on a business opportunity, or collected rents from real property, or improvements thereon, or from business opportunities.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Complainant refers to Paragraphs 1 through 9, above, and incorporates the same, herein by reference.

Beginning on May 15, 2020 and continuing intermittently through October 29, 2020, an audit was conducted of SUPM's trust fund and other records at the Department's principal office located at 1651 Exposition Blvd., Sacramento, California, where the auditor examined records for the period of January 1, 2019, through December 31, 2019 (the audit period).

While acting as a real estate broker as described in Paragraph 9, above, and within the audit period, SUPM accepted or received funds in trust (trust funds) from or on behalf of property owners, lessees and others in connection with property management

activities, and deposited or caused to be deposited those funds into bank accounts maintained by SUPM at Umpqua Bank, 111 Wall Street, Spokane, Washington, as described below:

	TRUST ACCOUNT #1
Account No.:	XXXXX9165
Entitled:	Step UP PM Inc. Client Trust Account

and thereafter from time-to-time made disbursement of said trust funds.

In the course of the activities described in Paragraph 9, in connection with the collection and disbursement of trust funds, it was determined that:

- (a) An accountability was performed on Trust Account #1 and as of October 31, 2019, a shortage of \$421,160.05 was revealed, in violation of Section 10145 of the Code;
- (b) SUPM failed to obtain written permission from owners of trust funds in Bank Account #1 and Bank Account #2, to allow the balance to drop below accountability, in violation of Section 2832.1 of the Regulations;
- (c) SUPM failed to deposit trust funds received into a trust fund account within three (3) business days in violation of Section 2832 of the Regulations and Section 10145 of the Code;
- (d) While SUPM's corporate real estate broker license was expired on September 18, 2018, until it was renewed on October 21, 2019, SUPM continued to conduct property management activities in violation of Sections 10130 and 10131 of the Code.

The acts and/or omissions described above constitute violations of Sections 2731 2832 (trust account handling) and 2832.1 (written permission balance below accountability) of the Regulations, and of Sections 10145 (trust fund handling) and are grounds for discipline

under Sections 10177(d) (willful disregard of real estate laws) and 10177(g) (negligence/ 1 incompetence licensee) of the Code. 2 3 SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION 4 15 5 Complainant refers to Paragraphs 1 through 14, above, and incorporates the 6 same, herein, by reference. 7 16 8 In 2020 an audit was conducted of AAM's trust fund and other records at the Department's principal office located at 1651 Exposition Blvd., Sacramento, California, where 9 the auditor examined records for the period of January 1, 2019, through April 30, 2020 (the audit 10 11 period). 12 17 13 While acting as a real estate broker as described in Paragraph 9, above, and within the audit period, AAM accepted or received funds in trust (trust funds) from or on behalf 14 of property owners, lessees and others in connection with property management activities, and 15 deposited or caused to be deposited those funds into bank accounts maintained by AAM at 16 Seacoast Commerce Bank, San Diego, California, as described below: 17 18 TRUST ACCOUNT #1 19 Account No.: XXXX2640 20 Access Asset Management, Inc., DBA Step Up Property Management as Entitled: 21 Trustee Client Trust 22 and thereafter from time-to-time made disbursement of said trust funds. 23

- 5 -

18

collection and disbursement of trust funds, it was determined that:

In the course of the activities described in Paragraph 9, in connection with the

24

25

26

27

1	(a) AAM deposited non-trust funds belonging to AAM into Trust Account
2	#1 in the amount of \$202,933.66 on or about April 30, 2020, in violation of Sections 10145 and
3	10176(e) of the Code;
4	(b) AAM's control records did not include entries for a mistaken deposit of
5	\$20,878.72 and related withdrawal on February 13, 2020, as required by Section 2831 of the
6	Regulations and in violation of Section 10145 of the Code;
7	(c) AAM failed to make a separate record of the mistaken deposit of
8	\$20,878.72 on February 13, 2020, as required by Section 2831.1 of the Regulations and in
9	violation of Section 10145 of the Code;
10	(d) AAM did not have a broker-salesperson relationship agreement for real
11	estate salesperson Kent as required by Section 2726 of the Regulations;
12	(e) AAM failed to obtain a branch office license for 19518-A Hillsdale
13	Drive, Sonora, California before opening that office as required by Section 2715 of the
14	Regulations and Section 10163 of the Code;
15	19
16	The acts and/or omissions described above constitute violations of Sections 2715
17	(branch office), 2726 (broker-salesperson agree.), 2831 (control records), and 2831.1 (separate
18	beneficiary records) of the Regulations and Sections 10145 and 10176(e) (commingling) of the
19	Code, and are grounds for discipline under Sections 10176(e), 10177(d), and 10177(g) of the
20	Code.
21	THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
22	20
23	Complainant refers to Paragraphs 1 through 19, above, and incorporates the
24	same, herein, by reference.
25	21
26	Robert B. had a property management agreement with SUPM for a property
27	commonly known as 951 Shaws Flat. He made an owner contribution of \$3,000 for repairs on

that property that were not done. Despite his request of SUPM and KENT, Robert B. has not received a refund of the \$3,000. Elwyn P. had a property management agreement with SUPM for a property commonly known as 590 S. Stewart. She was due \$3,300 from SUPM. Despite her request of SUPM and KENT, Elwyn P., has not received a refund of the \$3,300. Jane B. had a property management agreement with SUPM for a property commonly known as 420 Baretta. She was due \$2,750 from SUPM for the security deposit and reserve. Despite her request of SUPM and KENT, Jane B. has not received a refund of the \$2,750. Cheryl S. had a property management agreement with SUPM for a property commonly known as 20677 Steven. She was due \$5,537 from SUPM. Despite her request of SUPM and KENT, Cheryl S. has not received a refund of the \$5,537. The acts and/or omissions of SUPM and KENT, described above, constitute violations of Sections 10176(e) and 10176(i) (other conduct: fraud or dishonest dealing) of the Code, and are grounds for discipline under Sections 10176(e), 10176(i), 10177(d), 10177(g) and 10177(i) (other conduct fraud or dishonest dealing) of the Code. **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION** Complainant refers to Paragraphs 1 through 25, above, and incorporates them herein by reference.

At all times herein above mentioned, BRENNAN was responsible, as the supervising designated broker/officer for SUPM, for the supervision and control of the activities conducted on behalf of SUPM's business by its employees to ensure its compliance with the Real Estate Law and Regulations. BRENNAN failed to exercise reasonable supervision and control over the property management activities of SUPM. In particular, BRENNAN permitted, ratified and/or caused the conduct described above to occur, and failed to take reasonable steps, including but not limited to, the handling of trust funds, supervision of employees, and the implementation of policies, rules, and systems to ensure the compliance of the business with the Real Estate Law and the Regulations.

The above acts and/or omissions of BRENNAN violate Section 2725 (broker supervision) of the Regulations and Section 10159.2 (responsibility/designated officer) of the Code and constitute grounds for disciplinary action under the provisions of Sections 10177(d), 10177(g), and 10177(h) (broker supervision) of the Code.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Complainant refers to Paragraphs 1 through 28, above, and incorporates them herein by reference.

At all times herein above mentioned, WHITEHORN was responsible, as the supervising designated broker/officer for AAM, for the supervision and control of the activities conducted on behalf of AAM's business by its employees to ensure its compliance with the Real Estate Law and Regulations. WHITEHORN failed to exercise reasonable supervision and control over the property management activities of AAM. In particular, WHITEHORN permitted, ratified and/or caused the conduct described above to occur, and failed to take reasonable steps, including but not limited to, the handling of trust funds, supervision of

employees, and the implementation of policies, rules, and systems to ensure the compliance of 1 the business with the Real Estate Law and the Regulations. 2 3 31 4 The above acts and/or omissions of WHITEHORN violate Section 2725 (broker supervision) of the Regulations and Section 10159.2 (responsibility/designated officer) of the 5 Code and constitute grounds for disciplinary action under the provisions of Sections 10177(d), 6 10177(g) and 10177(h) (broker supervision) of the Code. 7 8 32 9 Audit Costs 10 The acts and/or omissions of Respondents, as alleged above, entitle the Department to reimbursement of the costs of its audits pursuant to Section 10148(b) (audit costs 11 for trust fund handling violations) of the Code. 12 13 33 14 Costs of Investigation and Enforcement 15 Section 10106 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that in any order issued in resolution of a disciplinary proceeding before the Department, the Commissioner may request 16 the Administrative Law Judge to direct a licensee found to have committed a violation of this 17 part to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the 18 19 case. 20 WHEREFORE, Complainant prays that a hearing be conducted on the allegations of this Accusation and that upon proof thereof a decision be rendered imposing 21 22 /// 23 /// 24 /// 25 /// 26

27

disciplinary action against all licenses and license rights of Respondents under the Real Estate Law, and for such other and further relief as may be proper under other provisions of law. TRICIA D. PARKHURST Supervising Special Investigator Dated at Sacramento, California, this 20th day of January, 2021. **DISCOVERY DEMAND** The Department of Real Estate hereby requests discovery pursuant to Section 11507.6 of the California Government Code. Failure to provide discovery to the Department may result in the exclusion of witnesses and/or documents at the hearing, and other sanctions as the Administrative Law Judge deems appropriate.