BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

* * *

FILED

JUN 01 2026

DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

By

In the Matter of the Accusation of:	DRE No. H-7456 SAC
WILLIAM BENNETT MCCLURE,	OAH No. 2025090255
Respondent.	

AMENDED DECISION

The Proposed Decision dated March 17, 2026, 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 JUN 22 2026.

IT IS SO ORDERED 6/1/2026

Chika Sunquist
REAL ESTATE COMMISSIONER

By: Marcus L. McCarther
Chief Deputy Real Estate Commissioner

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

* * *

FILED

MAY 18 2026

DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

By dew

In the Matter of the Accusation of:	)	DRE No. H-7456 SAC
	)	
WILLIAM BENNETT MCCLURE,	)	OAH No. 2025090255
	)	
Respondent.	)	
	)	

DECISION

The Proposed Decision dated March 17, 2926, 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 _____.

IT IS SO ORDERED 5/15/2026

Chika Sunquist
REAL ESTATE COMMISSIONER

By: Marcus L. McCarther
Chief Deputy Real Estate Commissioner

BEFORE THE
DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

WILLIAM BENNETT MCCLURE, Respondent

Agency Case No. H-7456 SAC

OAH No. 2025090255

PROPOSED DECISION

Marcie Larson, Administrative Law Judge, Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH), State of California, heard this matter by videoconference on March 4, 2026, from Sacramento, California.

Jack Gonzalez, Real Estate Counsel, represented complainant Heather Nishimura, Supervising Special Investigator for the Department of Real Estate (Department), State of California.

Marglyn E. Paseka, Attorney at Law, represented respondent William Bennett McClure who was present at the hearing.

Evidence was received, the record closed, and the matter was submitted for decision on March 4, 2026.

FACTUAL FINDINGS

Jurisdictional Matters

1. On or about April 28, 2022, the Department issued respondent real estate salesperson license No. 02182446 (license). Respondent's license will expire on April 27, 2026, unless renewed or revoked.

2. On July 30, 2025, complainant made and thereafter filed, in her official capacity, an Accusation against respondent. Complainant seeks to discipline respondent's license based on two convictions that are substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a real estate licensee and his failure to report to the Department the filing of a felony complaint and convictions.

3. Respondent timely filed a Notice of Defense. The matter was set for an evidentiary hearing before an Administrative Law Judge of the OAH, an independent adjudicative agency of the State of California, pursuant to Government Code section 11500 et seq.

Respondent's Criminal Convictions

4. On January 31, 2023, in the Superior Court, County of Sacramento, respondent was convicted, on his plea of nolo contendere, of driving under the influence of alcohol (DUI), with a blood alcohol level (BAC) above 0.08 percent, a violation of Vehicle Code section 23152 subdivision (a), a misdemeanor, with enhancements under Vehicle Code sections 23578 for driving with a BAC above 0.15 percent and 23583, subdivision (b)(2) for driving with a BAC at 0.20 percent or more. Respondent was sentenced to serve four days in jail and placed on three years of

probation. Respondent was also ordered to complete a nine-month DUI program. Respondent did not report his conviction to the Department.

5. The circumstances underlying the conviction occurred on November 8, 2022, at approximately 4:00 p.m. An officer from the Folsom Police Department observed a vehicle "all over the road." The officer reported to dispatch that the driver of the vehicle was a possible "drunk driver." Another officer located the vehicle and conducted an enforcement stop. Respondent was identified as the driver of the vehicle.

Upon speaking with respondent, the officer smelled a strong odor of alcohol and noticed respondent's eyes were red, watery and bloodshot. When asked, respondent denied consuming alcohol before he drove his vehicle. The officer administered a series of Field Sobriety Tests which he failed to perform satisfactorily. Respondent was placed under arrest. Respondent agreed to perform a breath test. His BAC was 0.20 percent.

6. On or about January 23, 2024, in the Superior Court, County of Sacramento, a felony complaint was filed against respondent, alleging he committed assault and used force and violence upon victim R.A., resulting in the infliction of serious bodily injury, a violation Penal Code section 243, subdivisions (a)(4) and (d), felonies. The matter was resolved on October 29, 2024, when respondent pled nolo contendere to using force and violence upon victim R.A., resulting in the infliction of serious bodily injury, a violation of Penal Code section 243, subdivision (a)(4), a misdemeanor. Respondent was ordered to serve 90 days in jail, which he completed through work release. He was placed on one year of probation and ordered to pay restitution to R.A. Respondent did not report the felony complaint or his conviction to the Department.

7. The circumstances underlying the conviction occurred on December 30, 2022. An officer from the Folsom Police Department was patrolling a business area in Folsom, California, when he noticed a man lying on his back on the concrete in front of a business. The officer approached the man, later identified as R.A. and noticed a significant amount of blood around his head and body. The officer called for medical help. R.A. reported being "jumped" by three people. R.A. told the officer he did not want medical help. Rather, he wanted to go home. R.A. tried to get up several times. Eventually, medical help arrived and R.A. was transported to the hospital.

8. Over several weeks, officers from the Folsom Police Department investigated the incident. The officers obtained security camera footage from a local business and interviewed R.A. several times. While reviewing the security camera footage, respondent and respondent's brother were identified as two of the three individuals involved in an altercation with R.A. The security camera footage showed the altercation started when R.A. hit respondent's brother in his shoulder and head area. It caused respondent's brother to fall back and hit the ground. In response, respondent hit R.A. and the fight continued for a few minutes, until respondent and his companions left the area.

9. As a result of the investigation, a warrant was issued for respondent's arrest. Respondent learned of the warrant and turned himself into police. He did not provide a statement to the police.

Respondent's Evidence

10. Respondent is 29 years old. He grew up in Folsom, California. Respondent attended University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) and played football. In 2018, he graduated from UCLA and returned to Folsom to be closer to his family.

Respondent met several UCLA alumni who worked in real estate. Respondent's mother also had her real estate salesperson license. Respondent believed the real estate industry was a good fit for his skills, so he obtained his license in May 2022.

11. Shortly after respondent became licensed, he began working for EXP Realty in Roseville, California for Real Estate Broker Tom Daves. Respondent worked with a team of approximately 20 real estate salespeople. Within four months respondent was promoted to lead listing agent.

12. Respondent was working for Mr. Daves when the events underlying his convictions occurred. Respondent explained that several members of his family passed away in 2022, including respondent's grandfather. Respondent used alcohol to cope with the devasting loss. Respondent explained that his DUI arrest occurred after he met with several friends at a restaurant to celebrate the holidays. He had not planned to drive his vehicle after consuming alcohol but did so anyway.

13. Respondent also consumed alcohol for several hours before the incident involving R.A. Respondent visited several bars with family members in the downtown area of Folsom area. R.A. approached respondent and his companions several times at different bar. R.A. indicated that he wanted to "party" with respondent's group and offered to give them cocaine several times. Respondent and his companions declined and left several bars because R.A. continued to insert himself.

At approximately 1:30 a.m., respondent, his brother, another friend and respondent's fiancé were walking down the street to their vehicle. R.A. approached respondent's brother and asked him if he wanted cocaine. Respondent's brother told R.A. to leave him alone. R.A. then punched respondent's brother, which caused him to fall to the ground. Respondent explained that his instinct was to protect his brother.

Respondent immediately punched R.A. and they began to fight. At one point, respondent's fiancé tried to separate respondent and R.A. and R.A. bit respondent's fiancé on her arm.

Respondent explained that the fight lasted approximately two minutes and was very "chaotic." Respondent admitted that he punched, kicked and wrestled with R.A. Respondent had been drinking alcohol for several hours and was not thinking clearly. In hindsight, respondent believes that rather than fighting with R.A., he should have called the police after R.A. hit his brother. Respondent deeply regrets his conduct and wishes that he made different choices that night. Respondent understands he could have walked away, which would have spared R.A. from any injury.

14. Respondent admitted that he did not notify the Department about the felony complaint filed against him or his convictions. Respondent's criminal defense attorney informed him that he was not required to do so, and that the Department would automatically be notified of his convictions. Respondent did not learn he was required to notify the Department until he received correspondence from the Department in November 2024, explaining his obligation to report. Respondent understands it was his responsibility to ensure he complied with the Department's notification rules.

15. Respondent explained that after the incident with R.A., he stopped drinking alcohol for one year. He began attending the church and seeking support from his family and friends to deal with his grief. Respondent began volunteering at a football camp and is active in his community. Respondent's work with Mr. Daves expanded and he took on more responsibilities and became a top producer. In July 2024, Mr. Daves stepped away from full-time work. Respondent began working for Culbertson & Gray Group, which is part of EXP Realty in Roseville, California. There are

approximately 175 real estate salespeople who work for Culbertson & Gray Group. Respondent continues to be one of the highest producers.

16. Respondent recently bought a home with his fiancé. Respondent decided that he will no longer drink alcohol. He understands the negative impact it had on his life and wants to move forward to build a secure future. Respondent explained that real estate is his passion and he will not do anything to jeopardize his ability to retain his license. Respondent assures the Department he will not repeat his past mistakes.

CHARACTER WITNESSES AND LETTERS OF SUPPORT

17. Respondent submitted several letters of support from colleagues, family and friends. The authors of the letters describe respondent as dedicated and hardworking. The authors of the letters are aware of respondent's convictions and believe he has learned from his mistakes. Three character witnesses also testified at hearing and wrote letters of support.

18. Jeffrey Culbertson has been a licensed real estate salesperson since 1978, and real estate broker since 1982. Mr. Culbertson is one of the owners of Culbertson & Gray Group. Respondent has worked for Mr. Culbertson for approximately two years. During that time, respondent has demonstrated that he is a dedicated team player who strives to provide the highest quality of service to his clients. Mr. Culbertson explained that the real estate market has been challenging over the last few years. However, respondent has successfully completed over 25 transactions in the last two years.

Respondent shared with Mr. Culbertson the details of his convictions. Mr. Culbertson believes that respondent is very remorseful for his conduct. Respondent has never displayed any conduct at work that indicates he is under the influence of

alcohol or impaired. Mr. Culbertson has no reservation about employing respondent. Mr. Culbertson believes respondent made mistakes that he will not repeat.

19. Patrick Moher has known respondent since elementary school. They speak several times a week and see each other regularly. Mr. Moher works as a mortgage broker and often has opportunities to work with in a professional capacity. Mr. Moher has worked on approximately 15 transactions where respondent has served as the real estate salesperson. Mr. Moher described respondent as "reliable, honorable, trustworthy, ethical, and hardworking."

Mr. Moher is aware of respondent's conviction. Respondent shared the details of his conduct. Mr. Moher believes that respondent's conduct was "out of character." Respondent has shared with Mr. Moher his regret and remorse for his conduct. Mr. Moher has noticed changes in respondent since his convictions, the change in his alcohol consumption and attendance at church. Mr. Moher believes respondent is a "person of strong moral character who contributes positively to his profession and community."

20. Cameron McClure is respondent's cousin. Mr. McClure grew up with respondent as they have lived near each other most of their lives. Mr. McClure explained that in 2022, the family suffered several devasting losses which were particularly difficult for respondent. Their grandfather, who was an important role model, passed away. Mr. McClure explained that the grief respondent experienced was like a "dark cloud" over his head. Mr. McClure noticed that during this time, respondent began drinking alcohol more often.

Since the incidents that resulted in respondent's convictions, Mr. McClure has observed many changes in respondent. For example, respondent stopped drinking

alcohol. He also returned to their family church. Respondent has taken an active role in mentoring another cousin who recently obtained his real estate salesperson license. Mr. McClure believes respondent is committed to not repeating his past mistakes. Respondent is focused on strengthening his career and building a life with his fiancé.

Analysis

21. Pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 10, section 2912, the Department has adopted criteria to determine whether a licensee who has been convicted of a crime that is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a real estate licensee is sufficiently rehabilitated such that he is capable of continuing to engage in licensed activities in a manner consistent with public protection, safety, and welfare. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 482, subd. (b).) The relevant criteria include:

> (a) The time that has elapsed since commission of the act(s) or offense(s):
>
> (1) The passage of less than two years after the most recent criminal conviction or act of the licensee that is a cause of action in the Bureau's[1] Accusation against the licensee is inadequate to demonstrate rehabilitation.
>
> (b) Restitution to any person who has suffered monetary losses through "substantially related" acts or omissions of

[1] From 2013 until 2018, the Department was named the Bureau of Real Estate.

the licensee, or escheat to the State of these monies or other properties if the victim(s) cannot be located.

(c) Expungement of the conviction(s) which culminated in the administrative proceeding to take disciplinary action.

[¶] . . . [¶]

(e) Successful completion or early discharge from probation or parole.

[¶] . . . [¶]

(g) Payment of any fine imposed in connection with the criminal conviction that is the basis for revocation or suspension of the license.

(j) Stability of family life and fulfillment of parental and familial responsibilities subsequent to the criminal conviction.

(k) Completion of, or sustained enrollment in, formal educational or vocational training courses for economic self-improvement.

[¶] . . . [¶]

(l) Significant and conscientious involvement in community, church or privately-sponsored programs designed to provide social benefits or to ameliorate social problems.

(m) Change in attitude from that which existed at the time of the commission of the criminal acts in question as evidenced by any or all of the following:

(1) Testimony and/or other evidence of rehabilitation submitted by the licensee.

(2) Evidence from family members, friends and/or other persons familiar with the licensee's previous conduct and with subsequent attitudes and/or behavioral patterns.

(3) Evidence from probation or parole officers and/or law enforcement officials competent to testify as to licensee's social adjustments.

(4) Evidence from psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, sociologists or other persons competent to testify with regard to neuropsychiatric or emotional disturbances.

(5) Absence of subsequent felony convictions, misdemeanor convictions, or other conduct that provides grounds to discipline a real estate licensee, which reflect an inability to conform to societal rules when considered in light of the conduct in question.

22. Applying the Department's criteria, the incidents which gave rise to respondent's convictions occurred almost four years ago. Over two years have passed since his last conviction. Respondent complied with the terms of his probation, which ended over a year ago. Respondent has no further convictions. Respondent's conduct

occurred during a time when he was abusing alcohol to cope with the loss of several beloved family members. Respondent's last arrest was clearly a catalyst for change. Respondent stopped drinking alcohol. He returned to church and found support from his family and friends. He is active in his community and mentors others.

23. By all accounts respondent has excelled as a real estate salesperson for the past four years. His letters of support and character witnesses describe respondent as a dedicated team member who strives to provide the highest quality service to his clients. Respondent is committed to continuing this practice. Respondent understands that he is responsible for ensuring that he complies with the Department's rules and regulations. He will ensure that he does not repeat his past mistakes.

24. The objective of an administrative proceeding relating to licensing is to protect the public. Such proceedings are not for the primary purpose of punishment. (See *Fahmy v. MBC* (1995) 38 Cal.App.4th 810, 817.) The evidence demonstrates that respondent is capable of engaging in the duties of a real estate salesperson in a manner consistent with public health, safety, and welfare, with a restricted license.

Costs of Investigation and Enforcement

25. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 10106, the Department may recover reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of a case. The Department incurred $1,593.50 in total costs of investigation and enforcement of this matter. The costs of investigation and enforcement are supported by declarations that describe the general tasks performed, the time spent on each task, and the method of calculating the costs. As set forth in Legal Conclusion 8, the costs of investigation and enforcement totaling $1,593.50 are reasonable.

LEGAL CONCLUSIONS

Burden of Proof

1. Complainant has the burden of proving the grounds for discipline alleged in the Accusation by clear and convincing evidence to a reasonable certainty. (*Realty Projects, Inc. v. Smith* (1973) 32 Cal.App.3d 204, 212.) Clear and convincing evidence is evidence that leaves no substantial doubt and is sufficiently strong to command the unhesitating assent of every reasonable mind. (*In re Marriage of Weaver* (1990) 224 Cal.App.3d 478.) If the complainant meets this burden, rehabilitation is akin to an affirmative defense; consequently, the burden of proof of establishing an affirmative defense is on the respondent. (*Whetstone v. Board of Dental Examiners* (1927) 87 Cal.App. 156, 164.)

Applicable Law

2. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 490, a professional license may be suspended or revoked if the "licensee has been convicted of a crime, if the crime is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the license was issued."

3. Business and Professions Code section 10177 provides in relevant part that:

> The commissioner may suspend or revoke the license of a real estate licensee, delay the renewal of a license of a real estate licensee, or deny the issuance of a license to an applicant, who has done any of the following, or may suspend or revoke the license of a corporation, delay the

renewal of a license of a corporation, or deny the issuance of a license to a corporation, if an officer, director, or person owning or controlling 10 percent or more of the corporation's stock has done any of the following:

[¶] . . . [¶]

(b)(1) Entered a plea of guilty or no contest to, or been found guilty of, or been convicted of, a felony, or a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a real estate licensee, and the time for appeal has elapsed or the judgment of conviction has been affirmed on appeal, irrespective of an order granting probation following that conviction, suspending the imposition of sentence, or of a subsequent order under Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code allowing that licensee to withdraw that licensee's plea of guilty and to enter a plea of not guilty, or dismissing the accusation or information.

[¶] . . . [¶]

(d) Willfully disregarded or violated this part or Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 11000) of Part 2 or the rules and regulations of the commissioner for the administration and enforcement of this part and Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 11000) of Part 2.

4. Business and Professions Code section 10186.2 provides in relevant part:

> (a)(1) A licensee shall report any of the following to the department:
>
> (A) The bringing of a criminal complaint, information, or indictment charging a felony against the licensee.
>
> (B) The conviction of the licensee, including any verdict of guilty, or plea of guilty or no contest, of any felony or misdemeanor.
>
> [¶] . . . [¶]
>
> (2) The report required by this subdivision shall be made in writing within 30 days of the date of the bringing of the indictment or the charging of a felony, the conviction, or the disciplinary action.
>
> (b) Failure to make a report required by this section shall constitute a cause for discipline.

5. In California Code of Regulations, title 10, section 2910, the Department has set forth criteria for determining whether a conviction is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a licensee and provides in relevant part:

> (a) When considering whether a license should be denied, suspended or revoked on the basis of the conviction of a crime, or on the basis of an act described in Section 480(a)(2) of the Code, the crime or act may be deemed to

be substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a licensee of the Department within the meaning of Sections 480 and 490 of the Code if it involves:

[¶] . . . [¶]

(8) Doing of any unlawful act with the intent of conferring a financial or economic benefit upon the perpetrator or with the intent or threat of doing substantial injury to the person or property of another.

[¶] . . . [¶]

(11) Two or more convictions involving the consumption or use of alcohol or drugs when at least one of the convictions involve driving and the use or consumption of alcohol or drugs.

Cause for Discipline

6. Respondent's convictions for DUI in violation of Vehicle Code section 23152 subdivision (a), with enhancements under Vehicle Code sections 23578 for driving with a BAC above 0.15 percent and 23583, subdivision (b)(2) for driving with a BAC at 0.20 percent or more and using force and violence resulting in the infliction of serious bodily injury, a violation of Penal Code section 243, subdivision (a)(4), misdemeanors, are substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a licensee. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 10, § 2910, subds. (a)(8) and (a)(11).) Therefore, respondent's convictions establish cause to discipline his real estate salesperson license under Business and Professions Code sections 490 and 10177, subdivision (b).

7. Respondent did not report the filing of a felony complaint or misdemeanor convictions to the Department within 30 days of the date of the filing of the felony complaint or convictions. Therefore, cause exists to discipline respondent's real estate salesperson license pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 10186.2, subdivision (b) and 10177, subdivision (d).

Costs of Enforcement and Investigation

8. The Commissioner may also request the administrative law judge to direct a licensee found to have committed a violation of part of the Real Estate laws to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 10106, subd. (a).) The Department established that it incurred $1,593.50 in attorney and investigation charges in connection with the enforcement of this case.

In *Zuckerman v. State Board of Chiropractic Examiners* (2002) 29 Cal.4th 32, the California Supreme Court set forth factors for determining whether the costs should be assessed in the particular circumstances of each case. There is no basis to reduce or eliminate the costs in this matter. As set forth in the Order, respondent shall pay the Department $1,593.50 for the total cost of investigation and enforcement of this matter.

Conclusion

9. When all the evidence is considered, to protect the health, safety, or welfare of the public, respondent's license shall be revoked and respondent shall be issued a restricted license for three years pursuant to terms of probation.

ORDER

All licenses and licensing rights of respondent William Bennett McClure 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 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 500, 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 or its designee $1,593.50 within 60 days of the effective date of this Decision, or pursuant to an installment plan approved by the Department or its designee.

DATE: March 17, 2026

Marcie Larson
Marcie Larson (Mar 17, 2026 16:20:13 PDT)

MARCIE LARSON

Administrative Law Judge

Office of Administrative Hearings