

FILED

JAN 06 2026

DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

By *R dew*

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation of:)	DRE No. H-7455 SAC
)	
BRYAN VICTOR MENEGON,)	OAH No. 2025070821
)	
Respondent.)	

DECISION

The Proposed Decision dated November 18, 2025, of the Administrative Law Judge of the Office of Administrative Hearings, is hereby adopted as the Decision of the Real Estate Commissioner in the above-entitled matter.

The Decision suspends or revokes one or more real estate licenses, but the right to a restricted salesperson license is granted to Respondent.

Pursuant to Government Code Section 11521, the Department of Real Estate (the Department) may order reconsideration of this Decision on petition of any party. The party seeking reconsideration shall set forth new facts, circumstances, and evidence, or errors in law or analysis, that show(s) grounds and good cause for the Commissioner to reconsider the Decision. If new evidence is presented, the party shall specifically identify the new evidence and explain why it was not previously presented. The Department's power to order reconsideration of this Decision shall expire thirty (30) days after mailing of this Decision, or on the effective date of this Decision, whichever occurs first. The right to reinstatement of a revoked real estate license or to the reduction of a penalty is controlled by Section 11522 of the Government Code. A copy of Sections 11521 and 11522 and a copy of the Commissioner's Criteria of Rehabilitation are attached hereto for the information of respondent.

This Decision shall become effective at 12 o'clock noon on JAN 27 2026.

IT IS SO ORDERED January 5, 2026

CHIKA SUNQUIST
REAL ESTATE COMMISSIONER



**BEFORE THE
DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**In the Matter of the Accusation Against:
BRYAN VICTOR MENEGON, Respondent.**

Agency Case No. H-7455 SAC

OAH No. 2025070821

PROPOSED DECISION

Administrative Law Judge Holly M. Baldwin, State of California, Office of Administrative Hearings, heard this matter on October 29, 2025, by videoconference.

Real Estate Counsel Jack Gonzalez, Jr., represented complainant Heather Nishimura, Supervising Special Investigator, Department of Real Estate, State of California.

Attorney Frank M. Buda represented respondent Bryan Victor Menegon, who was present.

The record closed and the matter was submitted for decision on October 29, 2025.

FACTUAL FINDINGS

1. Respondent Bryan Victor Menegon has held a real estate salesperson license since March 20, 2023. The license was in full force and effect at all times relevant to this matter, and is scheduled to expire on March 19, 2027. Respondent has no prior license discipline.

2. On June 11, 2025, complainant Heather Nishimura signed an accusation in her official capacity as Supervising Special Investigator, Department of Real Estate (Department), State of California. The accusation alleges that respondent is subject to discipline based on a conviction for a hit and run with permanent injury or death, fraud or dishonest dealing, and failure to notify the Department of the criminal charge or conviction. Respondent filed a notice of defense and this hearing followed.

Hit-and-Run Offense and Criminal Conviction

3. On October 15, 2020, at about 6:30 a.m., respondent was involved in a collision on SR-53 in an unincorporated area of Lake County, in which respondent's pickup truck hit a pedestrian, who subsequently died from his injuries. Respondent left the scene of the collision. The California Highway Patrol (CHP) report and respondent's credible testimony and written statements established the following facts.

Respondent was driving northbound on SR-53, on a roadway with two lanes in each direction, separated by a two-way left turn lane. The speed limit at this location is 45 miles per hour. The collision occurred before sunrise, and the area was very dark, with no streetlights. A pedestrian wearing dark, non-reflective clothing was crossing the roadway outside of any marked crosswalk. Respondent collided with something and pulled over near the scene of the collision. Respondent remained at that location

only briefly, and then continued driving toward his destination in the Chico area. He left his truck at the Chico-area location and got a ride home later that day.

Respondent was contacted by CHP officers at his residence the next day, October 16, 2020, at which time he provided a statement to officers. Respondent gave officers the keys to his truck and the combination to unlock the gate at the property where it was parked. Officers located the truck and observed collision damage including a large indentation to the hood, a broken grille, dented front bumper, and missing plastic trim below the bumper.

Respondent made consistent statements to the CHP officers, the Department, and in his testimony at hearing in this matter. At the time of the collision, respondent assumed he had hit an animal (such as a deer or a dog). Respondent pulled over and stopped his truck, rolled down the window and looked around. He did not see anything in the roadway or any other vehicles. Respondent did not get out of his truck, however. While respondent was stopped, he called his girlfriend (referred to in the CHP report as his wife) and told her he thought he had hit an animal. Respondent then continued driving toward his destination.

CHP officers identified the type of vehicle from debris found at the scene, and determined that respondent's vehicle was involved after reviewing surveillance video and obtaining credit card information from a nearby gas station.

When the CHP officers made contact with respondent the next day, they informed him that a pedestrian had been struck and had died from injuries sustained in the collision. (The pedestrian had been transported to the hospital and treated there, and was pronounced deceased shortly after 8:00 a.m.) The reporting officer described respondent as "candid, honest, and visibly upset regarding the collision."

One of the officers asked respondent "at what point he knew he hit a human." Respondent stated, "I saw legs, [it] was the only thing I saw. At the very last second, I hit the brakes." This statement was not further explained in the CHP report. At hearing, respondent clarified that his statement about seeing "legs" referred to him seeing what he had thought were the legs of an animal. The CHP report stated respondent was asked why he left the scene of the collision and respondent said he "panicked."

The CHP officers concluded that the pedestrian was the cause of the collision, and wrote that respondent could not have anticipated a pedestrian at that location. However, the CHP recommended the matter be referred to the District Attorney because respondent left the scene of the collision, did not contact emergency services, and left the truck behind a locked gate at the Chico-area property.

4. On June 9, 2022, a criminal complaint was filed, charging respondent with one felony count of a hit and run with permanent injury or death, in violation of Vehicle Code section 20001, subdivision (b)(2). Respondent was not arrested at that time. Court records indicate that an arrest warrant was issued on June 22, 2022. For unknown reasons, it appears that no further action occurred on the criminal matter until January 2024, when respondent was booked and posted bail.

5. On September 25, 2024, the charge was reduced to a misdemeanor and respondent was convicted in the Superior Court of California, County of Lake, on a plea of nolo contendere, of hit and run with permanent injury or death, in violation of Vehicle Code section 20001, subdivision (b)(2). Imposition of sentence was suspended and respondent was placed on summary probation for one year, on conditions that he serve one day in jail (with credit for one day served) and pay a fine of \$630.

///

Failure to Notify Department

6. Respondent had not yet sought a license from the Department at the time the felony criminal charges were filed against him. Therefore, he did not notify the Department within 30 days after the filing of those charges.

7. Respondent did not notify the Department within 30 days after his misdemeanor conviction on September 25, 2024.

Prior Conviction

8. Complainant alleges a prior conviction as a matter in aggravation. On March 6, 2014, respondent was convicted in the Superior Court of California, County of Napa, on a plea of nolo contendere, of renting a space for storage of controlled substances for sale or distribution, a felony, in violation of Health and Safety Code section 11366.5, subdivision (a). At sentencing on April 4, 2014, the imposition of sentence was suspended and respondent was placed on formal probation for a period of three years on conditions including serving 120 days in jail and paying fines and fees. The plea agreement reflects an intent to reduce the offense to a misdemeanor after two years if there were no probation violations or new offenses, and for the third year of probation to be court probation rather than formal probation.

9. There is no allegation that respondent failed to disclose his 2014 conviction to the Department prior to the issuance of his salesperson license in 2023.

10. The underlying offense occurred in October 2013. Arrest records state that respondent was growing 25 marijuana plants, in excess of his personal needs.

///

Respondent's Evidence

11. Respondent testified at hearing in a sincere, candid, and credible manner.

12. Respondent has two children, ages 10 and 5, and he maintains a close relationship with them. Respondent was in a relationship with the children's mother for 13 years, and they broke up three years ago.

13. Respondent has a high school education. Before becoming a real estate professional, respondent worked in the cannabis industry.

PREVIOUS CONVICTION

14. Respondent's 2014 conviction arose from his cultivation of a cannabis garden at a house he rented, of which the landlord was aware. He believed at the time that he was in compliance with the medical marijuana cultivation requirements. Respondent completed his three years of probation without any violations, and served his time in jail. It was respondent's prior understanding that his conviction would be automatically reduced to a misdemeanor after he successfully completed two years of probation, but he has recently been informed that he must file a petition, and he has spoken with an attorney about doing so.

15. After this conviction, respondent obtained a cannabis cultivation license in 2019, which is now inactive. He subsequently decided to pursue a real estate career.

16. Respondent disclosed his 2014 felony conviction to the Department and his then-broker when he applied for his real estate license.

///

///

HIT-AND-RUN OFFENSE AND CONVICTION

17. On the date of the collision, respondent left his home in Lake County very early in the morning, and was driving to help a friend work on a cannabis farm in Forest Ranch near Chico. Respondent stopped for gas in Lower Lake, about 6:15 a.m. After resuming his route on SR-53 northbound, respondent's truck struck what he thought was an animal. It was very dark outside and there were no streetlights at the location of the collision. Respondent is familiar with the area and has seen wildlife such as deer or dogs. After he hit something, he pulled over, and looked around. He did not see anything in the road or lights of another vehicle. The collision was loud and frightening to respondent. He called his girlfriend and told her he hit something, which he thought was an animal. He estimates that he spent three to five minutes stopped by the side of the road. Because he did not see anything in the road, he assumed it was an animal that had run off into the trees on the side of the road. Respondent continued on his drive to the Chico area, about another two hours.

18. At his destination, respondent assessed the damage to his truck and was trying to figure out what had happened. He called his girlfriend again and asked her to drive over to the collision area to see if she saw anything. She did so and saw nothing by the time she arrived, which was some hours after the collision. Respondent had problems starting the truck when he was ready to leave and got a ride home.

19. Respondent did not realize he had hit a person until the CHP officers contacted him the next day.

20. Respondent had parked his truck behind a locked gate at his friend's property, but this was not an attempt to conceal the vehicle, and it was visible from

the road through a wire fence. Respondent readily agreed to give the CHP officers access to the truck when they contacted him.

21. When the CHP officers spoke with respondent in October 2020, they told him that if the District Attorney filed charges, he would receive a letter in the mail. He never received such a letter. Respondent was unaware of the criminal charge until long after it was filed.

22. Respondent paid the fine at the time of his plea agreement. He successfully completed his probation on September 25, 2025.

23. Respondent's driver's license was suspended by the Department of Motor Vehicles for one year. It was reinstated on September 25, 2025.

24. Respondent has filed a petition for dismissal of his 2024 conviction under Penal Code section 1203.4 (commonly referred to as "expungement"), and a court hearing is set for December 15, 2025.

25. A civil lawsuit was filed by the victim's family, which was settled in August 2025 and has now been dismissed.

26. Respondent regrets not looking around the collision scene more thoroughly, staying at the scene, and contacting law enforcement to report the collision. He understands that it was his responsibility to do so, and that he should have verified his (mistaken) belief that he had hit an animal. He made the wrong choice. It was devastating to find out that he had hit and killed a person. Respondent is greatly remorseful for his actions, and is very sorry that someone died. This incident has humbled him. If respondent were to be involved in an accident now, he would pull over and contact the authorities, even if he could not find the other person involved.

FAILURE TO NOTIFY DEPARTMENT OF CONVICTION

27. Respondent now understands that he was required to notify the Department within 30 days after his misdemeanor conviction, and he regrets that he failed to make such a report. However, at the time he was unaware of the requirement. Respondent acknowledged this must have been covered in his pre-licensing training, but he did not remember the requirement, and his broker also did not inform him of it.

RESPONDENT'S REAL ESTATE EXPERIENCE

28. After receiving his real estate salesperson license, respondent worked for two years under broker Mark McDonald of Inland Properties, until McDonald's death in March 2025.

29. Respondent now works for broker Dennis Liebl, of Luxe Places International Realty (Luxe Places, a "doing business as" name of Full Spectrum Properties, Inc.) in Healdsburg. Respondent attends the brokerage's weekly Zoom meetings, which include discussions on topics such as changes in real estate law, and monthly in-person team meetings with guest speakers on real estate education topics.

30. There have been no complaints about respondent's performance as a real estate salesperson. Respondent loves the real estate field and helping people. Maintaining his real estate license is important to respondent, and if he lost his license he could not financially support his children. Respondent wishes to keep his license and is willing to obtain a restricted license if granted the opportunity to do so.

///

///

REFERENCES

31. McDonald, respondent's former (now deceased) broker, wrote a letter of support dated November 21, 2024.¹ McDonald described respondent as reliable, helpful, productive, honest, and diligent, and stated that respondent's clients have been satisfied with his performance. McDonald was willing to continue supervising respondent if he were to be issued a restricted license.

32. Liebl, respondent's current supervising broker at Luxe Places, wrote a letter of support dated October 23, 2025. Liebl is aware of respondent's convictions, failure to self-report the 2024 conviction, and the pending accusation. Liebl wrote that respondent has shown genuine remorse, is committed to ethical behavior, and deeply regrets his past actions. Liebl believes respondent to be honest, ethical, and professional, and wishes for respondent to remain in his employ. Liebl will closely supervise respondent if he is granted a restricted license.

33. Tom Larson, the founder and chief executive officer of Luxe Places, wrote a letter of support dated October 22, 2025. He is aware of respondent's convictions, failure to self-report the 2024 conviction, and the pending accusation. Larson wrote: "Despite these past issues, I want to highlight the positive transformation I have witnessed in [respondent]. He has shown a strong commitment to rehabilitation and has worked diligently to turn his life around." Larson "fully and wholeheartedly" supports respondent retaining his real estate license.

¹ Respondent explained at hearing that he submitted McDonald's letter to the Department in November 2024 along with his own conviction detail report.

34. Attorney Patrick M. Ciocca testified at hearing and wrote a letter dated October 22, 2025. Ciocca was respondent's criminal defense attorney for the hit-and-run offense. Respondent contacted and retained Ciocca in late October 2020, but no criminal charges had been filed at that time. Ciocca periodically checked with the District Attorney's office to see if charges had been filed, but stopped checking after about a year passed with no action. Respondent learned of the criminal charges filed against him in early 2024 and informed Ciocca. In their discussions, Ciocca was "deeply impressed" with respondent's forthrightness and by the level of remorse respondent expressed. Respondent shared with Ciocca the terrible remorse and feelings of guilt he experienced, and his distress at causing pain to the victim's family. Ciocca noted that respondent accepted a plea agreement despite being advised that he had a legally defensible case. Respondent consistently maintained that he had thought he struck an animal, not a person, and he thought what flashed in front of his vision was an animal.

35. Attorney Jonz Norine testified at hearing. Norine was retained by respondent's insurance company to defend respondent in a civil lawsuit filed by the victim's family members. Norine received the matter in late September 2023, and as a routine matter he searched the county court's online index of actions. When he did so, Norine found that there was a pending criminal case against respondent. Norine went to the Lake County courthouse on October 11, 2023, prior to his first client meeting with respondent, and copied documents from the court file, including the criminal complaint that had been filed in June 2022. Respondent had not been aware of the criminal complaint and was surprised when Norine provided him with it. Norine discussed the incident with respondent, and respondent explained that he thought he had hit an animal such as a dog or a deer. Norine found this explanation credible, as Norine had himself previously encountered and hit animals in similar rural areas.

Norine described respondent's sadness that he had struck and killed a person. The civil lawsuit has been settled and the matter was dismissed by the court in August 2025.

36. Daniel Cuschieri testified at hearing and wrote a letter of support. Cuschieri is respondent's first cousin, and their families spend time together. Cuschieri has discussed the hit-and-run offense with respondent multiple times, and respondent has expressed his deep remorse and his initial belief that what he had hit was an animal. Cuschieri has always found respondent to be a trustworthy and ethical person, and does not believe respondent would have left the scene if he thought he hit a person. Cuschieri described respondent as honest, kind, and compassionate, and he would be happy to hire respondent for real estate transactions.

37. Respondent's parents, Ron and Ann Menegon, wrote a letter of support. They have seen respondent's remorse for his past actions and sincere efforts toward rehabilitation, and have seen respondent show a renewed commitment to integrity and responsibility. They also emphasized that respondent is a devoted father who is committed to providing his children with a stable and loving home.

Costs

38. The Department incurred \$1,005.50 in investigation costs and \$720 in enforcement costs to prosecute this action, for a total costs claim of \$1,725.50. The above costs are supported by certifications that describe the tasks performed, time spent on each task, and method of calculating the cost, in compliance with California Code of Regulations, title 1, section 1042. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the above costs are found to be reasonable.

///

LEGAL CONCLUSIONS

1. The burden of proof is on complainant to show cause for discipline. The standard of proof applicable to prove cause for license discipline depends on whether the license is determined to be a professional license (clear and convincing evidence) or a non-professional license (preponderance of the evidence). That determination depends on the amount of education, training, or work entailed in obtaining the license at issue. (See *San Benito Foods v. Veneman* (1996) 50 Cal.App.4th 1889, 1892-95.) Here, neither party presented argument as to which standard of proof applies to a real estate salesperson. However, the facts of this matter are largely undisputed and were established by clear and convincing evidence.

2. Respondent bears the burden to show mitigation or rehabilitation, by a preponderance of the evidence. (Evid. Code, §§ 115, 500.)

Causes for Discipline

3. Respondent's counsel argued that the statute of limitations prohibits this disciplinary action, but that contention is not persuasive. Business and Professions Code section 10101 provides that an accusation must be filed within three years of the occurrence of the alleged grounds for disciplinary action, unless the acts involve fraud or misrepresentation, in which case the accusation must be filed within one year of discovery. Complainant's counsel confirmed at hearing that discipline is sought based on respondent's conviction in 2024, not the conduct that occurred in 2020. The accusation was filed less than one year after respondent's conviction, and was timely.

4. The Real Estate Commissioner (Commissioner) may suspend or revoke a real estate license if the licensee has been convicted of a crime that is substantially

related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a real estate licensee. (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 490, subd. (a), 10177, subd. (b)(1).) Respondent's hit and run conviction (Factual Findings 3, 5) is substantially related because it was an unlawful act with the threat of substantial injury to another person. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 10, § 2910, subd. (a)(8).) Accordingly, cause for discipline exists under Business and Professions Code sections 490, subdivision (a), and 10177, subdivision (b)(1).

5. The Commissioner may suspend or revoke a real estate license if the licensee has engaged in any conduct that constitutes fraud or dishonest dealing. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 10177, subd. (j).) The evidence did not establish that respondent engaged in conduct that constitutes fraud or dishonest dealing. Cause for discipline does not exist under Business and Professions Code section 10177, subdivision (j).

6. The Commissioner may suspend or revoke a real estate license if the licensee has willfully disregarded or violated the Real Estate Law. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 10177, subd. (d).) Real estate licensees are required to report to the Department within 30 days the bringing of a criminal complaint, information, or indictment charging a felony, or a conviction for any felony or misdemeanor. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 10186.2, subds. (a)(1)(A) & (B), (a)(2).) Failure to make such a report constitutes cause for discipline. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 10186.2, subd. (b).)

Respondent had not yet applied to the Department for a real estate license at the time the felony charges were filed against him. (Factual Finding 6.) Cause for discipline does not exist for his failure to report these charges to the Department.

Respondent failed to report his misdemeanor conviction to the Department within 30 days. (Factual Finding 7.) Cause for discipline exists under Business and Professions Code sections 10177, subdivision (d), and 10186.2, subdivision (b).

Determination of Discipline

7. The purpose of administrative proceedings regarding professional licenses is not to punish the applicant or licensee, but to protect the public. (*Hughes v. Board of Architectural Examiners* (1998) 17 Cal.4th 763, 785-786; *Griffiths v. Superior Court* (2002) 96 Cal.App.4th 757, 768.) The legislature intends that real estate licensees will be honest, truthful, and worthy of the fiduciary obligations they bear. (*Harrington v. Department of Real Estate* (1989) 214 Cal.App.3d 394, 402.)

8. The Commissioner has established criteria to be used in evaluating the rehabilitation of a licensee with a criminal record. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 10, § 2912.) The relevant criteria to be considered include: the time elapsed since the commission of the offense and conviction; restitution; expungement; successful completion of probation; payment of fines and monetary penalties; correction of business practices; new and different social and business relationships from those at the time of the offense; stability of family life and fulfillment of parental responsibilities; significant and conscientious involvement in community or church programs designed to provide social benefits or ameliorate social problems; and a change in attitude from that which existed at the time of the offense.

9. It has been less than two years since respondent's hit-and-run conviction, but the underlying offense occurred more than five years ago. The offense was serious, but the evidence also established mitigating circumstances. Respondent successfully completed the requirements of his probation and has applied for dismissal of the conviction. Respondent failed to notify the Department of his conviction, but the evidence did not establish any intent to mislead or deceive. Since the hit-and-run offense, respondent has continued to maintain close family relationships, and he has dedicated himself to a new career in the real estate industry.

Complainant alleged that respondent's 2014 conviction should be an aggravating factor in the determination of discipline. However, this conviction is more than 10 years old, and the Department knew about it when it issued respondent's license. The 2014 conviction is given little to no weight in this proceeding.

There is no indication of any misconduct committed in the course of respondent's real estate duties, and he has the continuing support of his broker and employer.

Respondent has demonstrated a change in attitude since the time of his offense, which of the rehabilitation criteria is "arguably the most important in predicting future conduct." (*Singh v. Davi* (2012) 211 Cal.App.4th 141, 149.)

Upon consideration of the record as a whole, it is determined that the public will be adequately protected by allowing respondent to maintain his real estate salesperson license on a restricted basis for a period of three years.

Costs

10. Business and Professions Code section 10106 authorizes the Department to recover its reasonable costs of investigation and enforcement in disciplinary proceedings if the licensee is found to have violated the Real Estate Law. As set forth in Legal Conclusions 4 and 6, respondent violated the Real Estate Law. As set forth in Factual Finding 38, complainant has reasonably incurred \$1,725.50 in costs in connection with the investigation and enforcement of this matter.

11. In *Zuckerman v. State Board of Chiropractic Examiners* (2002) 29 Cal.4th 32, 45, the California Supreme Court set forth standards for determining whether costs should be assessed in the particular circumstances of each case, to ensure that

licensees with potentially meritorious claims are not deterred from exercising their right to an administrative hearing. Those standards include whether the licensee has been successful at hearing in getting the charges dismissed or reduced, the licensee's good faith belief in the merits of his or her position, whether the licensee has raised a colorable challenge to the proposed discipline, the financial ability of the licensee to pay, and whether the scope of the investigation was appropriate to the alleged misconduct. These considerations do not support a reduction in the cost recovery.

ORDER

All licenses and licensing rights of respondent Bryan Victor Menegon under the Real Estate Law are revoked; provided, however, a restricted real estate salesperson license shall be issued to respondent pursuant to section 10156.5 of the Business and Professions Code if respondent makes application therefor and pays to the Department of Real Estate the appropriate fee for the restricted license within 90 days from the effective date of this decision. The restricted license issued to respondent shall be subject to all of the provisions of section 10156.7 of the Business and Professions Code and to the following limitations, conditions and restrictions imposed under authority of section 10156.6 of that code:

1. The restricted license issued to respondent may be suspended prior to hearing by Order of the Real Estate Commissioner in the event of respondent's conviction or plea of nolo contendere to a crime which is substantially related to respondent's fitness or capacity as a real estate licensee.

2. The restricted license issued to respondent may be suspended prior to hearing by Order of the Real Estate Commissioner on evidence satisfactory to the

Commissioner that respondent has violated provisions of the California Real Estate Law, the Subdivided Lands Law, Regulations of the Real Estate Commissioner, or conditions attaching to the restricted license.

3. Respondent shall not be eligible to apply for the issuance of an unrestricted real estate license nor for the removal of any of the conditions, limitations, or restrictions of a restricted license until three years have elapsed from the effective date of this Decision.

4. Respondent shall submit with any application for license under an employing broker, or any application for transfer to a new employing broker, a statement signed by the prospective employing real estate broker on a form approved by the Department of Real Estate which shall certify:

(a) That the employing broker has read the Decision of the Commissioner which granted the right to a restricted license; and

(b) That the employing broker will exercise close supervision over the performance by the restricted licensee relating to activities for which a real estate license is required.

5. Respondent shall, within nine months from the effective date of this Decision, present evidence satisfactory to the Real Estate Commissioner that respondent has, since the most recent issuance of an original or renewal real estate license, taken and successfully completed the continuing education requirements of Article 2.5 of Chapter 3 of the Real Estate Law for renewal of a real estate license. If respondent fails to satisfy this condition, the Commissioner may order the suspension of the restricted license until the respondent presents such evidence. The

Commissioner shall afford respondent the opportunity for a hearing pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act to present such evidence.

6. Respondent shall notify the Real Estate Commissioner in writing within 72 hours of any arrest by sending a certified letter to the Commissioner at the Department of Real Estate, 651 Bannon Street, Suite 507, Sacramento, CA 95811. The letter shall set forth the date of respondent's arrest, the crime for which respondent was arrested, and the name and address of the arresting law enforcement agency. Respondent's failure to timely file written notice shall constitute an independent violation of the terms of the restricted license and shall be grounds for the suspension or revocation of that license.

7. Respondent shall pay the Department's costs for the investigation and enforcement of this action under Business and Professions Code section 10106, in the amount of \$1,725.50 within 90 days from the effective date of this Decision.

DATE: 11/18/2025



HOLLY M. BALDWIN

Administrative Law Judge

Office of Administrative Hearings