10 m	11	
Flag		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	BEFORE THE DEPARTMEN STATE OF CAL *** In the Matter of the Accusation of	
_		a construction of the second se
12	JACQUELINE CONTRERAS,	No. H-40168 LA
13	Respondent.	
15	ORDER DENYING REINSTATEMENT OF LICENSE	
15	On September 19, 2016, a Decision was rendered in Case No. H-40168 LA	
10	revoking the real estate salesperson license of Respondent effective October 11, 2016, but	
18	granting Respondent the right to the issuance of a restricted real estate salesperson license. A	
19	restricted real estate salesperson license was issued to Respondent on September 12, 2017, and	
20	Respondent has held a restricted licensee since that time.	
21	On December 31, 2020, Respondent petitioned for reinstatement of said real	
22	estate salesperson license, and the Attorney General of the State of California has been given	
23	notice of the filing of said petition.	
24	The burden of proving rehabilitation rests with the petitioner (<i>Feinstein v. State</i>	
25	Bar (1952) 39 Cal. 2d 541). A petitioner is required to show greater proof of honesty and integrity than an applicant for first time licensure. The proof must be sufficient to overcome the	
26		
27	prior adverse judgment on the applicant's character (7	araiff v. State Bar (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 395).
	- 1 -	

	- P	П	
-	a h h de në dë		
	1		
	1	I have considered the petition of Respondent and the evidence submitted in	
	2	support thereof.	
	3	The Department has developed criteria in Section 2911 of Title 10, California	
	4	Code of Regulations (Regulations) to assist in evaluating the rehabilitation of an applicant for	
	5	reinstatement of a license. Among the criteria relevant in this proceeding are:	
	6	2011 Critaria for Dahakilitation	
	7	2911. Criteria for Rehabilitation	
	8	(a)(10)Discharge of, or bona fide efforts toward discharging, adjudicated debts or monetary obligations to others.	
	9		
	10	On January 13, 2014, before the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, Case No. 13V08904, a judgement for \$2,127.50 was entered against	
	11	Respondent, in favor of Myriam Wunder. Respondent has presented no evidence of discharging this debt.	
	12		
	13	Respondent has failed to demonstrate to my satisfaction that Respondent has	
	14	undergone sufficient rehabilitation to warrant the reinstatement of Respondent's real estate	
	15	salesperson license at this time.	
	16		
	17	Given the violations found and the fact that Respondent has not established that	
	18	Respondent has satisfied Regulations 2911(a)(10), I am not satisfied that Respondent is	
	19	sufficiently rehabilitated to receive a real estate salesperson license.	
	20	NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that Respondent's petition for	
	21	reinstatement of Respondent's real estate salesperson license is denied.	
	22	This Order shall become effective at 12 o'clock noon on SEP 29 2021	
	23	IT IS SO ORDERED 7.15.21	
	24	DOUGLAS R. McCAULEY	
	25	REAL ESTATE COMMISSIONER	
	26	Amiorn P. marc.	
	27	Por sor R. melyer	
		- 2 -	