MAY 1 1 2021

JUDITH B. VASAN, Counsel (SBN 278115) Department of Real Estate 320 West 4th Street, Suite 350 Los Angeles, California 90013-1105 Telephone: (213) 576-6982

Direct: 4

(213) 576-6904

Attorney for Complainant

5 6

1

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25 26

27

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

No. H-41978 LA

CARLOS MARTINEZ, doing business as Platinum Consulting Rental Service,

Respondent.

In the Matter of the Accusation Against

**ACCUSATION** 

The Complainant, Maria Suarez, a Supervising Special Investigator of the State of California, for cause of Accusation against CARLOS MARTINEZ, doing business as Platinum Consulting Rental Service, (sometimes referred to as "Respondent") alleges as follows:

1.

The Complainant, Maria Suarez, a Supervising Special Investigator of the State of California, makes this Accusation in her official capacity.

2.

All references to the "Code" are to the Real Estate Law, Part 1 of Division 4 of the California Business and Professions Code and all references to "Regulations" are to Title 10, Chapter 6, of the California Code of Regulations.

## **LICENSE HISTORY**

3.

- a. Respondent CARLOS MARTINEZ is presently licensed and/or has license rights under the Code as a restricted real estate broker, license ID 01325720.
- b. The Department of Real Estate ("Department") originally issued Respondent a broker license on or about April 15, 2008.
- c. According to the Department's records to date, since December 18, 2015,
  Respondent has maintained the licensed fictitious business name "Platinum Consulting Rental Service."

4.

On or about October 23, 2015, in Case No. H-39561 LA, the Real Estate Commissioner ("Commissioner") revoked the real estate broker license of Respondent and issued Respondent a restricted broker license for violations of Code sections 10145 and 10146 and Regulations 2831, 2831.1, 2832, and 2832.1.

5.

On or about January 4, 2018, in Case No. H-40888 LA, the Commissioner ordered Respondent, doing business as Platinum Consulting Rental Service, to desist and refrain from engaging in Prepaid Rental Listing Services ("PRLS") activities within the State of California which violate Code section 10167.10 by failing and refusing to refund advance fees paid by prospective tenants under circumstances entitling the prospective tenants to obtain a full or partial refund.

### **CAUSE FOR ACCUSATION**

6.

All further references to Respondent herein include Respondent, and also employees, agents and real estate licensees employed by or associated with Respondent who at the times herein mentioned were engaged in the furtherance of the business or operations of

Respondent and who were acting within the course and scope of their authority and employment.

7.

At all times mentioned herein, Respondent engaged in the business of supplying prospective tenants with a listing of residential real properties for tenancy, by publication or otherwise, pursuant to an arrangement under which the prospective tenants are required to pay an advanced or contemporaneous fee, which constitutes a PRLS, and is subject to the provisions of Code section 10167 et seq.

8.

At all times mentioned herein, Respondent engaged in the business of advance fee brokering within the definition of Code section 10131.2 by claiming, demanding, charging, receiving or collecting an advanced fee prior to fully completing the service the licensee contracted to perform or represented would be performed within the meaning of Code section 10026 in connection with any employment undertaken to provide a listing as that term is defined in Code section 10027.

9.

On or about March 23, 2016, Respondent filed the form of contract proposed to be used for Respondent's PRLS activities. Respondent's filed form included the clause setting forth the right to a full or partial refund of the fee paid as provided in Code section 10167.10.

10.

During the course of Respondent's PRLS activities, Respondent utilized a written agreement ("PRLS Agreement") which bore the name "Platinum Consulting Rental Service," and described Respondent as a prepaid rental listing service. This PRLS Agreement, however, is an unauthorized amended version of the 2016 contract submitted to the Department in that it failed to include the clause setting forth the right to a full refund of the fee paid as provided in Code section 10167.10, to wit:

If, within five days after payment of a fee, the licensee has not supplied the prospective tenant with at least three available rental properties meeting the specifications of the contract as to (i) type of structure; (ii) designated area; (iii) furnished or unfurnished; (iv) number of bedrooms; (v) maximum rental; and (vi) any other specification expressly set forth in the contract, the full amount of the fee paid shall be refunded to the prospective tenant upon presentation of evidence of that failure within 10 days after the expiration of the five-day period. The prospective tenant is not entitled to a refund if the prospective tenant obtain a rental through the services of the licensee.

11.

Respondent engaged in PRLS activities on behalf of numerous prospective renters, including but not limited to those set forth below, and utilized the unauthorized PRLS Agreement that failed to include the clause setting forth the right to a full refund of the fee paid as provided in Code section 10167.10.

a. On or about May 1, 2018, B.S.¹ entered the PRLS Agreement with Respondent. Respondent's receipt of the sum of \$200.00 in cash from B.S. is acknowledged in the PRLS Agreement. Upon visiting one of the rental properties provided by Respondent, B.S. discovered that the property was unavailable. B.S. requested a refund of the \$200.00 fee. Respondent refunded B.S. in the amount of \$150.00.

b. On or about March 15, 2019, J.L, entered the PRLS Agreement with Respondent. Respondent's receipt of the sum of \$200.00 in cash from J.L. is acknowledged in the PRLS Agreement. J.L. requested a refund of the \$200.00 fee. At no time did J.L. receive a refund of the payment made to Respondent.

c. On or about September 6, 2019, G.L. entered the PRLS Agreement with Respondent. Respondent's receipt of the sum of \$200.00 in cash from G.L. is acknowledged in the PRLS Agreement. Upon visiting the rental properties provided by Respondent, G.L. discovered that the properties were unavailable and had been rented two to three months prior.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Initials are used in place of individual's full name to protect their privacy.

G.L. subsequently obtained a rental without the assistance of Respondent. In response to G.L. request for a refund, Respondent advised G.L. to send Respondent the rental contract. G.L. asked Respondent for the form for the refund. Respondent replied that the check was in the mail. At no time did G.L. receive a refund of the payment made to Respondent.

d. On or about October 10, 2019, M.M. entered the PRLS Agreement with Respondent. Respondent's receipt of the sum of \$200.00 in cash from M.M. is acknowledged in the PRLS Agreement. M.M. subsequently obtained a rental without the assistance of Respondent. On or about October 17, 2019, M.M. returned to Respondent's office to request a refund. M.M. completed the refund form provided by Respondent's employee. Respondent's employee informed M.M. that the refund will be mailed in the form of a money order within 10 working days. At no time did M.M receive a refund of the payment made to Respondent.

e. On or about December 30, 2019, P.G. entered the PRLS Agreement with Respondent. Respondent's receipt of the sum of \$200.00 by money order is acknowledged in the PRLS Agreement. Upon visiting the rental properties provided by Respondent, P.G. discovered properties were unavailable. Respondent requested a refund. At no time did P.G. receive a refund of the payment made to Respondent.

# (PRLS AGREEMENT ADVANCE APPROVAL)

11.

Pursuant to Code section 10167.9(c), the form of contract proposed to be used by a licensee to effect compliance with the provisions of Code section 10167.9 shall be filed and approved by the Department prior to use. Respondent failed to submit the PRLS Agreement to the Department prior to its use in violation of Code section 10167.9(c).

## (REFUND OF PRLS ADVANCE FEE)

12.

Respondent failed to comply with the provisions of Code section 10167.10 setting forth a prospective renter's right to obtain a refund of an advance fee paid for PRLS services by failing and refusing to refund fees under circumstances entitling prospective

tenants, including but not limited to those listed in Paragraph 10, above, to receive a full or 1 2 partial refund of the advance fee. (FALSE, MISLEADING OR DECEPTIVE ADVERTISEMENT OR REFPRESENTATION) 3 4 13. Respondent violated Code section 10167.11 in that Respondent made false, 5 misleading and/or deceptive representations to prospective tenants, including but not limited to б those described in Paragraph 10, above, concerning their entitlement to receive a refund of the 7 fee and the availability of the property for tenancy. 8 9 14. The conduct, acts and/or omissions of Respondent as described above are 10 grounds for the suspension or revocation of the real estate license and license rights of 11 Respondent under the provisions of Code sections 10176(a), 10176(b), 10176(i), 10177(d), 12 10177(j), and/or 10177(g). 13 14 COSTS 15 (INVESTIGATION AND ENFORCEMENT COSTS) 16 15. 17 Section 10106 of the Code, provides, in pertinent part, that in any order issued in resolution of a disciplinary proceeding before the Department, the Commissioner may request 18 the administrative law judge to direct a licensee found to have committed a violation of this 19 20 part to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of investigation and enforcement of the 21 case. 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 the licenses and/or license rights of Respondent CARLOS MARTINEZ, doing business as Platinum Consulting Rental Service, under the Real Estate Law, for the costs 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 this 30 H day of Supervising Special Investigator **CARLOS MARTINEZ** cc: Maria Suarez

Sacto.