1 MARTHA J. ROSETT, Counsel (SBN 142072) Department of Real Estate 2 320 West Fourth St. #350 Los Angeles, CA 90013 (213) 576-6982 (213) 620-6430 6 7 8 BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE 9 STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 In the Matter of the Accusation of No. H-37524 LA 12 DAVID ARTHUR CRUICKSHANK, ACCUSATION 13 14 Respondent. 15 16 The Complainant, Robin Trujillo, a Deputy Real Estate Commissioner, for the 17 Department of Real Estate of the State of California ("Department") for cause of Accusation 18 against DAVID ARTHUR CRUICKSHANK, is informed and alleges as follows: 19 1. 20 The Complainant, Robin Trujillo, a Deputy Real Estate Commissioner makes this 21 Accusation in her official capacity. 22 23 2. 24 DAVID ARTHUR CRUICKSHANK, aka Dave Cruickshank ("Respondent") has 25 license rights as a real estate salesperson. Respondent was first licensed by the Department as a 26 real estate salesperson on October 28, 2010. Prior to that time, Respondent had never been 27

licensed by the Department in any capacity.

3.

Fair Lending Review LLC ("FLR") is a Nevada limited liability company doing business in California, with offices at 3185 Airway, Suite C-2, Costa Mesa, CA 92626. FLR is not now and has never been licensed by the Department in any capacity.

4.

During a period of time beginning on or before February 5, 2009, and continuing through on or after July 9, 2009, Respondent engaged in the business of, acted in the capacity of, advertised or assumed to act as a real estate broker in the State of California, within the meaning of Business and Professions Code ("Code") Sections 10131(d) and 10131.2, for or in expectation of compensation. Respondent, in concert with affiliated unlicensed businesses and individuals, including but not necessarily limited to FLR, advertised and solicited borrowers on loans secured by real property and offered to negotiate and modify terms of loans and prevent foreclosure.

Respondent also collected advance fees within the meaning of Code Sections 10026 and 10131.2.

Unlicensed Loan Modification Activity

Raymond and Trudi E.

5.

On or about April 1, 2009, Raymond and Trudi E. entered into an agreement with FLR, by and through Respondent, for loan modification services in connection with mortgage loans secured by their home. FLR, doing business out of its office in Costa Mesa, California, promised to assist Raymond and Trudi E. in avoiding foreclosure and in negotiating with lenders to modify the terms of the loans. In April of 2009, Raymond and Trudi E. paid FLR in excess of \$1,900.00 as an up front fee towards loan services.

6.

Between April 1, 2009, and on or after August 24, 2009, Raymond and Trudi E. engaged in numerous communications with Respondent and other agents and representatives of FLR and/or its affiliates. Respondent held himself out as a branch manager for FLR and stated that Raymond and Trudi E.'s file and loan documents were under review by their lender as part of FLR's loan negotiation process. However, Raymond and Trudi E. discovered that this was not true. FLR failed to perform services as promised and the property went into foreclosure. FLR and CRUICKSHANK refused to refund or account for any of the fees paid.

Eric I.

7.

On or before February 5, 2009, Eric I. entered into an agreement with FLR and its affiliates for loan modification services in connection with mortgage loans secure by his home. FLR, through Respondent as its agent, promised to assist Eric I. in negotiating with lenders to modify the terms of the loans. Eric I. paid FLR \$3,000.00 in up front fees towards loan services.

8.

Eric I. engaged in numerous communications with FLR, through Respondent and other agents and representatives. FLR failed to perform any services as promised. FLR and Respondent refused to refund or account for any of the fees paid.

Thomas and Bonita S.

9.

On or about July 6, 2009, Thomas and Bonita S. entered into an agreement with FLR and its affiliates for loan modification and related services in connection with mortgage loans secured by their home. Respondent and others, as agents and/or affiliates of FLR,

promised to assist Thomas and Bonita S. in negotiating with lenders to modify the terms of the loans. Thomas and Bonita S. paid FLR, through Respondent, \$2327.00 in up front fees towards loan services.

10.

As set forth above, Respondent, as an agent of FLR, advertised, solicited and entered into loan modification agreements with borrowers in expectation of compensation when he was not licensed by the Department as a broker or as a salesperson employed by a broker.

Respondent also solicited advance fees from these borrowers. Respondent unlawfully engaged in activities requiring a real estate license prior to October 28, 2010, and was therefore not licensed by the Department in any capacity.

11.

No loan modification, loss mitigation or foreclosure avoidance services were ever provided to the borrowers listed above by Respondent and/or any of his associates and business affiliates, or by any lawyers or agents affiliated with those individuals or entities.

12.

The advance fees for loan modification services collected from borrowers described above, were not collected pursuant to written agreements submitted to or reviewed by the Department prior to use.

13.

At the time he collected advance fees from consumers, including the advance fees collected from the consumers set forth in Paragraphs 5 through 9 above, Respondent was not licensed as a broker or as a salesperson employed by a supervising employing broker. As such, Respondent was not authorized to conduct activities requiring a real estate broker license

independently, or as an employee or agent of any other broker or company, licensed or 1 unlicensed. Respondent was not authorized to conduct licensed activities as an agent of FLR, 2 and he was not authorized to receive compensation for acting as their agent. 3 4 14. 5 The conduct, acts and/or omissions of Respondent DAVID ARTHUR 6 CRUICKSHANK in soliciting borrowers and collecting advance fees from borrowers to perform 7 acts requiring a real estate license constitutes grounds to discipline the license and license rights 8 of Respondent DAVID ARTHUR CRUICKSHANK pursuant to Code Sections 10130, 10177(d), 9 and/or 10177(j). 10 WHEREFORE, Complainant prays that a hearing be conducted on the allegations 11 12 of this Accusation and that upon proof thereof, a decision be rendered imposing disciplinary 13 action against all licenses and/or license rights of Respondent DAVID ARTHUR 14 CRUICKSHANK under the Real Estate Law and for such other and further relief as may be 15 proper under other applicable provisions of law. 16 Dated at Los Angeles, California 17 this 7 day of September, 2011. 18 19 20 21 22 Deputy Real Estate Commissioner 23 24 25 David Arthur Cruickshank Robin Trujillo

26

27

Sacto.