1 2	KYLE T. JONES, Counsel (SBN 300751) Bureau of Real Estate P.O. BOX 137007 Sacramento, CA 95813-7007 Telephone: (916) 263-8670	
3	Sacramento, CA 95813-7007	
4		
5	(916) 263-3767 (Fax) (916) 263-7303 (Direct)	
6		
7		
8	BEFORE THE BUREAU OF REAL ESTATE	
9 '	STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
10	* * *	
11	In the Matter of the Accusation of)	
12) No. H-12579 SF MIDTOWN REALTY, INC.	
13	and TIMOTHY JOSEPH FOY) <u>ACCUSATION</u>	
14	Respondents.)	
15 -	The Complainant, STEPHANIE YEE, acting in her official capacity as a	
16	Supervising Special Investigator of the State of California, for this Accusation against	
17	MIDTOWN REALTY, INC. ("MRI") and TIMOTHY JOSEPH FOY ("FOY"), sometimes	
18.	collectively referred to as Respondents, is informed and alleges as follows:	
19	1	
20	MRI is presently licensed and/or has license rights under the Real Estate Law, Par	
21	1 of Division 4 of the Business and Professions Code ("Code"), by the Department of Real Estate	
22	("Department") as a corporate real estate broker doing business as Midtown Management.	
23	2	
24	FOY is presently licensed and/or has license rights under the Code as a real estate	
25	broker.	
26		
27		

1

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

herein.

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

At all times mentioned, FOY was the designated broker-officer of MRI. As the designated broker-officer, FOY 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 MRI for which a real estate license is required to ensure the compliance of the corporation with the Real Estate Law and the Regulations.

4

At all times 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, Respondents 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 exchange 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

5

Complainant refers to Paragraphs 1 through 4, above, and incorporates the same,

Beginning on July 22, 2021, and continuing intermittently through August 12, 2021, an audit was conducted remotely via Microsoft Teams and email at the Department's district office located at 1515 Clay Street, Suite 702 in Oakland, California. The auditor examined property management records for the period of June 1, 2020, through May 31, 2021 ("the audit period").

While acting as a real estate broker as described in Paragraph 4, above, and within the audit period, Respondents 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 Respondents at First Republic Bank, 111 Pine Street, San Francisco, California, as described below:

TRUST ACCOUNT #1 ("T/A1")			
Account No.:	XXXXXXXX3155		
Entitled:	Midtown Realty, Inc. (Trust Account)		
GENERAL ACCOUNT #1 ("G/A1")			
Account No.:	XXXXXXXX0379		
Entitled:	Midtown Realty, Inc. Commercial Account		

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

In the course of the activities described in Paragraph 4, in connection with the collection and disbursement of trust funds, it was determined that:

- (a) An accountability was performed on account T/A1, and as of May 31,2021, a shortage of \$247,415.63 was revealed in violation of Section10145(a) (handling of trust funds) of the Code;
- (b) Respondents failed to obtain written permission from owners of trust funds in account T/A1, to allow the balances to drop below accountability, in violation of Section 2832.1 (trust fund handling for multiple beneficiaries) of Title 10, Chapter 6, California Code of Regulations ("Regulations");
- (c) Respondents deposited trust funds that totaled \$92,652.24 into account

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

G/A1 that were commingled with MRI's general funds in violation Sections 10145(a) and 10176(e) (commingling trust funds) of the Code;

- (d) Respondents over-disbursed at least \$14,236.31 of management fees from June 2020 to August 2020 in violation of Section 10176(i) (fraud or dishonest dealing)
- (e) Respondents received \$3,514.00 in interest from First Republic Bank for trust funds deposited into account T/A1 and did not disclose to the owners of the funds that Respondents were receiving interest from their funds in violation of Sections 10145(d) (trust funds-interest bearing accounts) and 10176(g) (secret profit) of the Code.

9

The act and/or omissions described above constitute violations of Section 2832.1 of the Regulations and Sections 10145, 10176(e), 10176(g), and 10176(i) of the Code, and are grounds for discipline under the aforementioned Section and/or Sections 10177(d) (willful disregard of real estate laws) and 10177(g) (negligence/incompetence licensee) of the Code.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

10

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

11

At all times mentioned above, FOY was responsible, as the supervising designated broker/officer for MRI, for the supervision and control of the activities conducted on behalf of MRI's business by its employees to ensure its compliance with the Real Estate Law and Regulations. FOY failed to exercise reasonable supervision and control over the property management activities of MRI. In particular, FOY permitted, ratified and/or caused the conduct

1 described above to occur, and failed to take reasonable steps, including but not limited to, the 2 handling of trust funds, supervision of employees, and the implementation of policies, rules, and 3 systems to ensure the compliance of the business with the Real Estate Law and the Regulations. 4 12 5 The above acts and/or omissions of FOY violate Section 2725 (broker 6 supervision) of the Regulations and Section 10159.2 (responsibility/designated officer) of the 7 Code and constitute grounds for disciplinary action under the provisions of Sections 10177(d), 8 10177(g) and 10177(h) (broker supervision) of the Code. 9 **AUDIT COSTS** 10 13 11 The acts and/or omissions of Respondents, as alleged above, entitle the 12 Department to reimbursement of the costs of its audits pursuant to Section 10148(b) (audit costs 13 for trust fund handling violations) of the Code. 14 COSTS OF INVESTIGATION AND ENFORCEMENT 15 14 16 Section 10106 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that in any order issued in 17 resolution of a disciplinary proceeding before the Department, the Commissioner may request the 18 Administrative Law Judge to direct a licensee found to have committed a violation of this part to 19 pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case. 20 /// 21 /// 22 /// 23 /// 24 /// 25 /// 26 /// 27 ///

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 and for such other and further relief as may be proper under other provisions of law.

STEPHANIE YEE

Supervising Special Investigator

Dated at Oakland, California,

this 1st day of March, 2022.

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.