MARTHA J. ROSETT, Counsel (SBN 142072) FILED Department of Real Estate 320 West Fourth St. #350 MAR 1 4 2012 Los Angeles, CA 90013 3 DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE (213) 576-6982 BY: CB (213) 620-6430 8 BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE 9 STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 In the Matter of the Accusation of No. H-37967 LA 12 FIRST VISION FINANCIAL INC., <u>ACCUSATION</u> 13 a corporate real estate broker; and NELSON BURTON HUNT, individually 14 and as former designated officer of 15 First Vision Financial Inc., 16 Respondents. 17 The Complainant, Robin Trujillo, a Deputy Real Estate Commissioner, for cause of 18 19 Accusation against FIRST VISION FINANCIAL INC. and NELSON BURTON HUNT, 20 individually and as former designated officer of First Vision Financial Inc., is informed and 21 alleges as follows: 22 1. 23 The Complainant, Robin Trujillo, a Deputy Real Estate Commissioner of the 24 State of California, makes this Accusation in her official capacity. 25 /// 26

Respondent FIRST VISION FINANCIAL INC. ("FIRST VISION") is a California corporation. Yervand Yetaryan ("Yetaryan") is the CEO of FIRST VISION. Susanna Balyan is the Vice President.

3.

Respondent FIRST VISION is currently licensed by the Department of Real Estate ("Department") as a corporate real estate broker. FIRST VISION was first licensed by the Department on May 20, 2009. Respondent FIRST VISION was not licensed by the Department in any capacity prior to May 20, 2009. Since that time, FIRST VISION was authorized to act by and/or through the following broker-officers designated pursuant to Business and Professions Code ("Code") Section 10159.2 to be responsible for ensuring FIRST VISION's compliance with the Real Estate Law:

- a. From May 20, 2009 through December 7, 2009, NELSON BURTON HUNT was FIRST VISION's designated broker-officer.
- b. From December 8, 2009 through June 25, 2010, Michael Rudi Wyrzykowski was FIRST VISION's designated broker-officer.
- c. From December 26, 2010 through the present time, Dale R. Pratt was and is FIRST VISION's designated broker-officer.

4.

Respondent NELSON BURTON HUNT ("HUNT") is licensed by the

Department as a real estate broker. HUNT was originally licensed by the Department as a broker

on December 13, 1977. Between May 20, 2009 and December 7, 2009, Respondent HUNT was

the designated broker-officer of FIRST VISION.

5.

Jack Diamond is not currently and has never been licensed by the Department in any capacity. As described further below, at times relevant herein, Jack Diamond was employed by FIRST VISION to conduct activities relating to its loan modification business.

6.

All further references to "Respondents" include FIRST VISION and HUNT, as well as the officers, agents, affiliates and employees of the FIRST VISION and HUNT acting within the scope of their agency, employment, or affiliation.

7.

At all times relevant herein, Respondents engaged in the business of, acted in the capacity of, advertised or assumed to act as real estate brokers in the State of California within the meaning of Code Sections 10131(d) and 10131.2. Their activities included soliciting borrowers or lenders for and/or negotiating loans, collecting payments and/or performing services for borrowers or lenders in connection with loans secured by liens on real property. Their activities also included claiming, demanding, charging, receiving, collecting or contracting for the collection of advance fees within the meaning of Code Sections 10026 and 10085.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACCUSATION

(Advance Fee Violations and Unlicensed Activity)

8.

Beginning on or before March 4, 2009 and continuing through on or after August 11, 2009, Respondent FIRST VISION solicited, advertised and collected advance fees from mortgage loan clients in connection with loan modification services.

1

2 3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

2.4

25

26

7

6

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

Respondents FIRST VISION and designated officer HUNT never submitted an advance fee agreement and related promotional materials to the Department for review, and the Department never issued a No Objection Letter authorizing FIRST VISION to collect advance fees from consumers in relation to their loan modification or any real estate activities.

10.

Despite failure to obtain approval of the proposed advance fee agreements and related promotional materials, Respondent FIRST VISION collected advance fees in relation to loan modification services. The advance fees Respondent collected were not placed into a trust account, and trust accounting records were not maintained in compliance the Real Estate Law.

11.

On or about March 4, 2009, Respondent FIRST VISION, through unlicensed agent Jack Diamond, solicited consumers Robert and Nancy Quinn ("the Quinns"), and offered to provide them with assistance in avoiding foreclosure and in negotiating with their lenders to obtain a modification of their mortgage loans in exchange for payment of an up front fee.

12.

On or about March 9, 2009, Respondent FIRST VISION obtained the Quinn's signatures on a loan modification agreement. Between on or before March 27, 2009 and August 4, 2009, Respondents collected a total of \$4,836.00 in advance fees from the Quinns, made in five payments.

13.

At the time that Respondent FIRST VISION initially solicited the Quinns, and obtained their signatures on the loan modification agreement in March of 2009, FIRST VISION

was not licensed by the Department in any capacity. Respondent FIRST VISION collected the first two payments, \$1,200.00 paid on or about March 27, 2009, and \$675.00 paid on or about April 17, 2009, before it was licensed as a real estate broker.

14.

On or about June 5, 2009, June 30, 2009, July 30, 2009 and August 11, 2009, Respondent FIRST VISION sent the Quinns invoices reflecting payments the Quinns had made, and charging for payments alleged to be due.

15.

Respondent FIRST VISION and designated officer HUNT did not place the advance fees collected from the Quinns between May 20, 2009 and August 11, 2009 into a trust account. FIRST VISION failed to maintain and provide the Quinns with an accounting of the advance fees received and disbursed.

16.

Respondents did not obtain a loan modification for the Quinns, and did not provide a refund upon request.

17.

The conduct, acts and/or omissions of Respondents FIRST VISION and HUNT, as set forth above, in collecting advance fees from prospective borrowers pursuant to an agreement which was not authorized by the Department, was in violation of Code Section 10085 and Title 10, Ch. 6, California Code of Regulations, Regulation 2970, and constitutes grounds to discipline the licenses and license rights of Respondents FIRST VISION and HUNT pursuant to Code Sections 10177(d), 10176(i), 10177(j) and/or 10177(g).

///

25 |

The conduct, acts and/or omissions of Respondent FIRST VISION in employing and compensating unlicensed individuals to perform acts requiring a real estate license constitutes grounds to discipline the license and license rights of Respondent FIRST VISION pursuant to Code Sections 10137, 10177(d), 10176(i), 10177(j) and/or 10177(g).

19.

The conduct, acts and/or omissions of Respondent FIRST VISION in advertising and soliciting borrowers for loan modification services and collecting advance fees when not licensed by the Department as a real estate broker was in violation of Code Section 10130, and constitutes grounds to revoke or suspend Respondent FIRST VISION's real estate license pursuant to Code Sections 10177(d), 10177(j), and/or 10177(g).

20.

The conduct, acts and/or omissions of Respondent HUNT, in failing to exercise reasonable supervision over the activities of officers and employees of FIRST VISION for which a real estate license was required, was in violation of Code Section 10159.2 and constitutes grounds to discipline the license and license rights of Respondent HUNT pursuant to Code Sections 10177(h), 10177(d) and/or 10177(g).

|//

23 | /

24 | ,

///

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/or license rights of Respondents FIRST VISION FINANCIAL INC. and NELSON BURTON HUNT under the Real Estate Law, for the cost of investigation and enforcement as permitted by law, and for such other and further relief as may be proper under other applicable provisions of law. dated at Los Angeles, California 2 day of Deputy Real Estate Commissioner

First Vision Financial Inc. Nelson Burton Hunt Robin Trujillo Sacto.