FILED

1	KYLE T. JONES, Counsel (SBN 300751)	OCT 05 2017
2	Bureau of Real Estate	BUREAU OF REAL ESTATE
3	P.O. BOX 137007 Sacramento, CA 95813-7007	By H. Maz
4		
	Telephone: (916) 263-8672 (916) 263-3767 (Fax)	
5	(916) 263-7303 (Direct)	
6		
7		
8	BEFORE THE BUREAU OF REAL ESTATE	
9	STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
10	* * *	
11	In the Matter of the Application of)
12	DATRICIO TOMA C DANCA ONOME) NO. H-12137 SF
13	PATRICIO TOMAS PANGA ONQUIT,) STATEMENT OF ISSUES
14	Respondent.	
15	The Complainant, ROBIN S. TAI	NNER, acting in her official capacity as a
16	Supervising Special Investigator of the State of California, for this Statement of Issues against	
17	PATRICIO TOMAS PANGA ONQUIT ("Respondent"), is informed and alleges as follows:	
18		1
19	On or about February 13, 2017, Respondent made application to the Bureau of	
20	Real Estate of the State of California for a real estate salesperson license.	
21	FAILURE TO DISCLOSE CONVICTIONS	
22	2	
23	In response to Question 28 of said application to wit: "HAVE YOU EVER BEEN	
24	CONVICTED (SEE PARAGRAPH ABOVE) OF ANY VIOLATION OF THE LAW AT THE	
25	MISDEMEANOR OR FELONY LEVEL? IF YES, COMPLETE ITEM 34 WITH	
26	///	
27	/// ///	
-/		

INFORMATION ON EACH CONVICTION," Respondent concealed and failed to disclose the convictions described below in Paragraphs 4, 6, 7, 9, and 10.

CRIMINAL CONVICTIONS

On or about June 11, 2015, in the Municipal Court of the State of Arizona, County of Maricopa, Case No. 14-019578-2, Respondent was convicted of violating Section 13-2904(A)(1) of the Arizona Revised Statutes (disorderly conduct), a misdemeanor and a crime that bears a substantial relationship to the qualifications, functions or duties of a real estate licensee pursuant to Section 2910, Title 10, of the California Code of Regulations ("Regulations").

On or about June 9, 2015, in the Municipal Court of the State of Arizona, County of Pinal, Case No. M1149TR2015001239, Respondent was convicted of violating Section 28-3473(A) of the Arizona Revised Statutes (driving on a suspended/revoked/cancelled license), a misdemeanor and a crime that bears a substantial relationship to the qualifications, functions or duties of a real estate licensee pursuant to Section 2910 of the Regulations.

On or about July 29, 2011, in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Alameda, Case No. 242575, Respondent was convicted of violating Section 23152(b) of the California Vehicle Code (driving under the influence), a misdemeanor and a crime that bears a substantial relationship to the qualifications, functions or duties of a real estate licensee pursuant to Section 2910 of the Regulations.

On or about March 2, 2011, in the Municipal Court of the State of California, County of Santa Clara, Case No. C1092255, Respondent was convicted of violating Section 14601.5(a) of the California Vehicle Code (driving while license suspended/revoked), a

1 2 3

27 ///

misdemeanor and a crime that bears a substantial relationship to the qualifications, functions or duties of a real estate licensee pursuant to Section 2910 of the Regulations.

On or about August 9, 2010, in the Superior Court of the State of California,
County of San Diego, Case No. M105463, Respondent was convicted of violating Section 415(3)
of the California Penal Code (offensive words in a public place), a misdemeanor and a crime that
bears a substantial relationship to the qualifications, functions or duties of a real estate licensee
pursuant to Section 2910 of the Regulations.

On or about April 27, 2010, in the Superior Court of the State of California,

County of San Diego, Case No. S237511, Respondent was convicted of violating Section

23152(b) of the California Vehicle Code (driving under the influence), a misdemeanor and a

crime that bears a substantial relationship to the qualifications, functions or duties of a real estate

licensee pursuant to Section 2910 of the Regulations.

On or about July 11, 2006, in the Municipal Court of the State of California, County of Santa Clara, Case No. CC631015, Respondent was convicted of violating Section 14601.1(a) of the California Vehicle Code (driving while license suspended/revoked), a misdemeanor and a crime that bears a substantial relationship to the qualifications, functions or duties of a real estate licensee pursuant to Section 2910 of the Regulations.

On or about November 13, 2003, in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Santa Clara, Case No. CC328035, Respondent was convicted of violating Section 23109(c) of the California Vehicle Code (exhibition of speed), a misdemeanor and a crime that bears a substantial relationship to the qualifications, functions or duties of a real estate licensee pursuant to Section 2910 of the Regulations.

GROUNDS FOR DENIAL Respondent's failure to disclose the convictions described above in Paragraphs 4, 6, 7, 9, and 10 constitutes cause for denial of Respondent's application for a real estate salesperson license pursuant to the provisions of Business and Professions Code ("Code") sections 480(d) (false statement of fact required to be revealed in application) and 10177(a) (attempted procurement of real estate license by fraud, misrepresentation, or deceit). Respondent's criminal convictions described above in Paragraphs 3 through 10 constitute cause for denial of Respondent's application for a real estate salesperson license pursuant to the provisions of Code sections 480(a)(1) (conviction of crime) and 10177(b) (conviction of crime). WHEREFORE, the Complainant prays that the above-entitled matter be set for hearing and, upon proof of the charges contained herein, that the Commissioner refuse to authorize the issuance of, and deny the issuance of, a real estate salesperson/broker license to Respondent, and for such other and further relief as may be proper under applicable provisions of law. ROBIN S. TANNER Supervising Special Investigator Dated at Oakland, California,

DISCOVERY DEMAND

Pursuant to Sections 11507.6, et seq. of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Department hereby makes demand for discovery pursuant to the guidelines set forth in the Administrative Procedure Act. Failure to provide Discovery to the Department may result in the exclusion of witnesses and documents at the hearing or other sanctions that the Office of Administrative Hearings deems appropriate.