

DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

* * * * *

In the Matter of the Accusation of)

No. H-30535 LA

L-2004010036

MARIA DE LOS ANGELES SANCHEZ,

Respondent.

DECISION

The Proposed Decision dated July 29, 2004, 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 on grounds of the conviction of a crime.

The right to reinstatement of a revoked real estate license or to the reduction of a suspension is controlled by Section 11522 of the Government Code. A copy of Section 11522 and a copy of the Commissioner's <u>Criteria</u> <u>of Rehabilitation</u> are attached hereto for the information of respondent.

This Decision shall become effective at 12 o'clock noon on October 19, 2004.

IT IS SO ORDERED September 3, 2004.

JOHN R. LIBERATOR Acting Real Estate Commissioner By: William E. Moran Assistant Commissioner

William F. Moran

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation of:

Case No.: H-30535 LA

MARIA DE LOS ANGELES SANCHEZ,

OAH No.: L2004010036

Respondent.

PROPOSED DECISION

This matter came on regularly for hearing before Ralph B. Dash, Administrative Law Judge with the Office of Administrative Hearings, on May 10 and July 20, 2004, at Los Angeles, California.

James R. Peel, Staff Counsel, represented Complainant.

Sean G. Erenstoft, Attorney at Law, represented Respondent.

Oral and documentary evidence having been received and the matter submitted, the Administrative Law Judge makes the following Proposed Decision.

* * * * *

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Maria Suarez made the First Amended Accusation in her official capacity as a Deputy Real Estate Commissioner of the State of California.

2. At all times pertinent hereto, Respondent Maria De Los Angeles Sanchez ("Respondent") was and now is licensed by the Department of Real Estate ("Department") as a real estate salesperson.

3. On March 19, 2002, in the Municipal Court of the State of California, County of Los Angeles, Los Angeles Criminal Judicial District, Respondent was convicted on her plea of nolo contendere to one count of violating Penal Code section 529, false personation of another, a crime involving moral turpitude and one that is substantially related to the functions, duties and qualifications of a Department licensee.

Imposition of sentence was suspended and Respondent was placed on summary probation for a period of 12 months on condition she perform 40 hours of community service and pay a of fine of \$100.

4. The facts and circumstances of the crime are as follows. Respondent was introduced to an individual who wished to sell a property he owned. The introduction was made by a notary public with whom Respondent was acquainted. The seller executed a grant deed in Respondent's favor, and the same was recorded. Respondent made monthly payments on the mortgage which encumbered the property, but which was in the seller's name. She also paid the homeowners' association fees. The lender was not notified of the sale, and the mortgage remained in the seller's name. The charge of "false personation" stems from Respondent's not having notified the lender that she was the new owner of the property.

For reasons not disclosed by the evidence, after four years of making payments on the mortgage, the seller demanded the property back. Respondent was required to and did reconvey the property. Respondent has had no further contact with the notary public who introduced her to the seller of the property.

5. Respondent successfully completed her probation. On March 19, 2004, the court entered its order under the provisions of Penal Code Section 1203.4 whereby Respondent's plea of nolo contendere was vacated, a plea of not guilty entered, and the criminal complaint against Respondent dismissed.

6. Respondent has been a licensed real estate salesperson for almost 10 years. She did not realize that her failure to notify the mortgage company would cause any problems. She was purchasing the property with no money down. Respondent was not familiar with the "due on sale" clause that is present in most mortgages, at least those with a fixed interest rate. Although it was not specifically documented at the hearing, it appears the seller had a due on sale clause in his mortgage and Respondent should have notified the lender that she was the new owner of the property. This, in retrospect, actually worked to Respondent's disadvantage. Interest rates were beginning to decline at the time of the transaction in question. With rates going down, it is highly likely the lender would have been delighted to allow Respondent to assume the mortgage, rather than refinance at a lower rate. In any event, Respondent clearly did not attempt to hide her purchase. The homeowners' association knew she had purchased the property and the deed thereto was properly recorded.

7. Respondent is a single mother of three children for whom she was the sole support, and each of whom was well raised and educated. Her youngest child still resides with her. Respondent is rightfully proud of her achievement with her children. She is now helping with the care of her grandchildren. Respondent obtained her license to enable her to better support her family. She is also active in the community. She has volunteered at a local school for handicapped children where she worked as a translator. She also volunteers as a math tutor at the local high school.

2

8. At the hearing of this matter, Respondent called a number of character witness who each attested to Respondent's good reputation for honesty and veracity. In particular, Respondent's current employing broker testified not only to Respondent's good character, but to her abilities as well. Respondent, who has worked for the broker for the past four years, is consistently on time and accurate with all her paperwork and accountings. Those who work with her, including other licensees, escrow agents and clients, are said to have a very high opinion of her professionalism and ethics. Respondent has learned from her mistake, and is even more careful and conscientious in her practice.

9. Respondent is exceptionally embarrassed by her conviction. She expressed deep remorse for her conduct, and did not try to hide behind the ignorance which led to it. Respondent was highly respectful of the Department and these proceedings. As the hearing progressed it became quite clear Respondent had not attempted to defraud anyone. The criminal court apparently recognized this as well, as evidenced by the exceptionally lenient sentence handed out, and the quick entry of the Penal Code section 1203.4 order. This conduct appears to have been an aberration that is not likely to recur. Respondent's broker, with full knowledge of the conviction, is nevertheless willing, even anxious, to have Respondent continue in her employ, and is ready to continue with her close supervision of Respondent's work.

* * * * *

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Cause for license discipline under the provisions of Business and Professions Code sections <u>490</u> and <u>10177</u>, subdivision (b), has been established based on the conviction set forth in Finding 3.

2. In California Code of Regulations, title 10, section 2912, the Department sets forth the criteria it considers relevant in making the determination as to whether a licensee who has been convicted of a crime is sufficiently rehabilitated to warrant continued licensure. Respondent has met every single criterion applicable to her, based on Findings 4 through 9. These include subdivisions (a) (passage of at least two years since the criminal conduct); (b) (restitution, in this case, the reconveyance); (c) (expungement of the conviction); (e) (successful completion of probation); (g) (payment of fine imposed); (h) (correction of business practices); (i) (different business relationships, i.e. no further contact with the notary); (j) (stability of family life); (l) (community activity); (m) (change in attitude as attested to by character witnesses).

3

ORDER

WHEREFORE, THE FOLLOWING ORDER is hereby made:

All licenses and licensing rights of Respondent Maria de Los Angeles Sanchez 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. <u>The restricted license issued to Respondent may be suspended prior to hearing by</u> 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. <u>The restricted license issued to Respondent may be suspended prior to hearing by</u> 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 two years have elapsed from the effective date of this Decision.

4. <u>Respondent shall submit with any application for license under an employing</u> 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.

Date: 7.29.04

PH B. DASH

Administrative Law Judge Office of Administrative Hearings

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTAPE ARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation of

JUN 1 0 2004

OAH No. L-2004010036

Case No. H-30535 LA

MARIA DE LOS ANGELES SANCHEZ

Respondent

CONTINUED NOTICE OF HEARING ON ACCUSATION

To the above named respondent:

You are hereby notified that a hearing will be held before the Department of Real Estate at Office of Administrative Hearings, 320 West Fourth Street, Suite 630, Los Angeles, California, on July 20, 2004, at the hour of 1:30 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter can be heard, upon the Accusation served upon you. If you object to the place of hearing, you must notify the presiding administrative law judge of the Office of Administrative Hearings within ten (10) days after this notice is served on you. Failure to notify the presiding administrative law judge within ten days will deprive you of a change in the place of the hearing.

You may be present at the hearing. You have the right to be represented by an attorney at your own expense. You are not entitled to the appointment of an attorney to represent you at public expense. You are entitled to represent yourself without legal counsel. If you are not present in person nor represented by counsel at the hearing, the Department may take disciplinary action against you based upon any express admission or other evidence including affidavits, without any notice to you.

You may present any relevant evidence and will be given full opportunity to cross-examine all witnesses testifying against you. You are entitled to the issuance of subpenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, documents or other things by applying to the Department of Real Estate.

The hearing shall be conducted in the English language. If you want to offer the testimony of any witness who does not proficiently speak the English language, you must provide your own interpreter and pay his or her costs. The interpreter must be certified in accordance with Sections 11435.30 and 11435.55 of the Government Code.

DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE By <u>JAMESR. PEEL, Counsel</u>

Dated: June 10, 2004

cc: Maria DLA Sanchez Steven J. Haber, Esq. J.M. Atherley/Sacto./OAH

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

MAR 1 0 2004

In the Matter of the Accusation of

Case No. H-30535 LA

OAH No. L-2004010036

MARIA DE LOS ANGELES SANCHEZ

Respondent

NOTICE OF HEARING ON ACCUSATION

To the above named respondent:

You are hereby notified that a hearing will be held before the Department of Real Estate at Office of Administrative Hearings, 320 West Fourth Street, Suite 630, Los Angeles, California, on May 10 2004, at the hour of 1:30 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter can be heard, upon the Accusation served upon you. If you object to the place of hearing, you must notify the presiding administrative law judge of the Office of Administrative Hearings within ten (10) days after this notice is served on you. Failure to notify the presiding administrative law judge within ten days will deprive you of a change in the place of the hearing.

You may be present at the hearing. You have the right to be represented by an attorney at your own expense. You are not entitled to the appointment of an attorney to represent you at public expense. You are entitled to represent yourself without legal counsel. If you are not present in person nor represented by counsel at the hearing, the Department may take disciplinary action against you based upon any express admission or other evidence including affidavits, without any notice to you.

You may present any relevant evidence and will be given full opportunity to cross-examine all witnesses testifying against you. You are entitled to the issuance of subpenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, documents or other things by applying to the Department of Real Estate.

The hearing shall be conducted in the English language. If you want to offer the testimony of any witness who does not proficiently speak the English language, you must provide your own interpreter and pay his or her costs. The interpreter must be certified in accordance with Sections 11435.30 and 11435.55 of the Government Code.

Dated: March 10, 2004

cc: Maria D. Sanchez Steven J. Haber, Esq. J. M. Atherley/Sacto./OAH

DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE Bν ES R. PEEL. Counsel

		· · ·
SNED:	1 2 3 4 5	JAMES R. PEEL, Counsel (SBN 47055) Department of Real Estate 320 West Fourth Street, Ste. 350 Los Angeles, California 90013-1105 Telephone: (213) 576-6982 -or- (213) 576-6913 (Direct)
	6 , 7	
	8	DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE
-	9	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
	10	* * *
	11	In the Matter of the Accusation of) No. H-30535 LA
	12) MARIA DE LOS ANGELES SANCHEZ) <u>FIRST AMENDED</u>
	13) Respondent.) <u>ACCUSATION</u>
	14)
	15	
	16	The Complainant, Maria Suarez, a Deputy Real Estate
	17	Commissioner of the State of California, for cause of accusation
	18	against MARIA DE LOS ANGELES SANCHEZ alleges as follows:
	19	· I
	20	The Complainant, Maria Suarez, a Deputy Real Estate
	21	Commissioner of the State of California, makes this Accusation in
	22	her official capacity.
	23	II
	24	MARIA DE LOS ANGELES SANCHEZ aka Angela Sanchez
	25	(hereinafter referred to as "Respondent") is presently licensed
	26	and/or has license rights under the Real Estate Law (Part 1 of
	27	Division 4 of the Business and Professions Code, hereinafter
		1 -

.

·

referred to as the "Code").

1

III

2 Respondent was licensed by the Department of Real 3 Estate of the State of California ("Department") as a real estate 4 salesperson from December 30, 1994, through February 9, 2003. 5 Respondent renewed her license effective February 10, 2003. 6 IV 7 On or about March 19, 2002, in the Municipal Court of 8 California, County of Los Angeles, Respondent was convicted of 9 violating Penal Code Section 529 (false personation of another), 10 11 a crime involving moral turpitude. 12 V 13 The crime of which Respondent was convicted bears a 14 substantial relationship to the qualifications, functions or 15 duties of a real estate licensee. 16 VI 17 Respondent's criminal conviction set forth in Paragraph 18 IV is cause under Code Sections 490 and 10177)b) for suspension 19 or revocation of all licenses and license rights of Respondent. 20 111 21 111 22 111 23 WHEREFORE, Complainant prays that a hearing be 24 conducted on the allegations of this Accusation and that upon 25 proof thereof, a decision be rendered imposing disciplinary 26 action against all licenses and license rights of Respondent 27

MARIA DE LOS ANGELES SANCHEZ under the Real Estate Law (Part 1 of 1 Division 4 of the Business and Professions Code) and for such 2 other and further relief as may be proper under other applicable 3 provisions of law. 4 5 6 7 8 Dated at Los Angeles, California, 9 this H day of 1 I I I 2004. 10 11 12 SUAREZ MAR ТΆ 13 Deputy Real Estate Commissioner 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 Maria de Los Angeles Sanchez cc: Jennifer M. Atherley 24 Maria Suarez Sacto. 25 EΕ Steven J. Haber, Esq. 26 27

- ANDI	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	JAMES R. PEEL, Counsel (SBN 47055) Department of Real Estate 320 West Fourth Street, Ste. 350 Los Angeles, California 90013-1105 Telephone: (213) 576-6982 -or- (213) 576-6913 (Direct)
8	DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE
9.	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10	* * *
11	In the Matter of the Accusation of) No. H-30535 LA
12	MARIA DE LOS ANGELES SANCHEZ,) <u>ACCUSATION</u>)
13	Respondent.)
14	
. 15	The Complainant, Maria Suarez, a Deputy Real Estate
16	Commissioner of the State of California, for cause of accusation
17	against MARIA DE LOS ANGELES SANCHEZ alleges as follows:
18	. I
19	The Complainant, Maria Suarez, a Deputy Real Estate
20	Commissioner of the State of California, makes this Accusation in
21	her official capacity.
22	II
23	MARIA DE LOS ANGELES SANCHEZ (hereinafter referred to
24	as "Respondent") is presently licensed and/or has license rights
25	under the Real Estate Law (Part 1 of Division 4 of the Business
26	and Professions Code, hereinafter referred to as the "Code").
27	· ·
	- 1 -

Respondent was licensed by the Department of Real 2 Estate of the State of California ("Department") as a real estate 3 salesperson from December 30, 1994, through February 9, 2003. 4 Respondent renewed her license effective February 10, 2003. 5 IV 6 In response to Question 3 of Respondent's renewal 7 application filed with the Department on January 6, 2003, to wit, 8 "Within the past four year period, have you been convicted of any 9 violation of law?", Respondent answered "Yes" and disclosed the 10 matter set forth in Paragraph V. 11 v 12 On or about March 19, 2002, in the Municipal Court of 13 California, County of Los Angeles, Respondent was convicted of 14 violating Penal Code Section 529 (false personation of another), 15 a crime involving moral turpitude. 16

17

22

7

1

ΠΛ

On or about June 14, 2002, in the Municipal Court of California, County of Los Angeles, Respondent was convicted of violating Penal Code Section 114 (use false document to conceal citizenship), a crime involving moral turpitude.

VII

The crimes of which Respondent was convicted bear a substantial relationship to the qualifications, functions or duties of a real estate licensee.

27

26

- 2 -

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

Respondent's criminal convictions set forth in Paragraphs V and VI are cause under Code Sections 490 and 10177(b) for suspension or revocation of all licenses and license rights of Respondent under the Real Estate Law.

IX

VIII

Respondent's failure to disclose the matter set forth in Paragraph VI, above, in said application constitutes the procurement of a real estate salesperson license by misrepresentation, fraud, or deceit, or by knowing misrepresentation of a material fact in said application which is cause under Sections 498 and 10177(a) of the Code for suspension or revocation of all licenses and license rights of Respondent under the Real Estate Law.

15

16 WHEREFORE, Complainant prays that a hearing be 17 conducted on the allegations of this Accusation and that upon 18 proof thereof, a decision be rendered imposing disciplinary 19 action against all licenses and license rights of Respondent 20 MARIA DE LOS ANGELES SANCHEZ under the Real Estate Law (Part 1 of 21 Division 4 of the Business and Professions Code) and for such 22 other and further relief as may be proper under other applicable 23 provisions of law. 24

- 25
- ---
- 26 27

Dated at Los Angeles, California, day of Moleline this 2003. ll. MARIA SUAREZ Deputy Real Estate Commissioner Maria de Los Angeles Sanchez cc: Maria Suarez Sacto. EΕ Jennifer M. Atherley