

FILED

NOV 04 2025

DEPT. OF REAL ESTATE

By- 

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

* * *

In the Matter of the Modified Citation against:)	DRE No. H-43073 LA
JORDAN DUANE BRIDGES,)	OAH No. 2025050088
Respondent.)	

DECISION

The Proposed Decision dated September 16, 2025, 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.

Pursuant to Section 11517(c)(2)(C) of the Government Code, the following corrections are made to the Proposed Decision, page 10, Order:

“Respondent shall pay \$125.00 for the modified citation and shall also pay \$2,244.00 for the Commissioner’s reasonable cost of the investigation and enforcement which led to this disciplinary action. Said payments shall be in the form of a cashier’s check made payable to the Department of Real Estate. The payments must be delivered to the Department of Real Estate, Flag Section at 651 Bannon St., Ste. 504, Sacramento, CA 95811, within 30 days of the effective date of this Decision and Order.

If Respondent fails to satisfy this condition in a timely manner as provided for herein, Respondent’s real estate license shall automatically be suspended until payment is made in full, or until a decision providing otherwise is adopted following a hearing held pursuant to this condition. The Commissioner shall afford Respondent the opportunity for a hearing pursuant to the Administrative

Procedure Act to present such evidence that payment was timely made. The suspension shall remain in effect until payment is made in full or until a decision providing otherwise is adopted following a hearing held pursuant to this condition.”

Pursuant to Government Code Section 11521, the Department of Real Estate may order reconsideration of this Decision on petition of any party. The party seeking reconsideration shall set forth new facts, circumstances, and evidence, or errors in law or analysis, that show(s) grounds and good cause for the Commissioner to reconsider the Decision. If new evidence is presented, the party shall specifically identify the new evidence and explain why it was not previously presented. The Department’s power to order reconsideration of this Decision shall expire thirty (30) days after mailing of this Decision, or on the effective date of this Decision, whichever occurs first.

The right to reinstatement of a revoked real estate license or to the reduction of a penalty is controlled by Section 11522 of the Government Code. A copy of Sections 11521 and 11522 and a copy of the Commissioner's Criteria of Rehabilitation are attached hereto for the information of respondent.

This Decision shall become effective at 12 o'clock noon on DEC 04 2025.

IT IS SO ORDERED 10/21/2025

Chika Sunquist
REAL ESTATE COMMISSIONER



By: Marcus L. McCarther
Chief Deputy Real Estate Commissioner

FILED

OCT 17 2025

DEPT. OF REAL ESTATE

**BEFORE THE
DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

By-

In the Matter of the Modified Citation Against:

JORDAN DUANE BRIDGES,

Respondent.

Agency No. H-43073 LA

OAH No. 2025050088

PROPOSED DECISION

Chris Ruiz, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH), State of California, heard this matter by videoconference on August 19, 2025.

Lisette Garcia, Staff Counsel, represented complainant L.S. Martin, a Compliance Officer with the Department of Real Estate (Department).

Respondent Jordan Duane Bridges represented himself.

Testimony and documents were received as evidence. The record closed and the matter was submitted for decision on August 19, 2025.

FACTUAL FINDINGS

The Underlying Events Leading to the Citation and Modified Citation

1. On April 10, 2019, the Department issued real estate salesperson license number S/02088172 (license) to respondent.

2. On May 19, 2022, respondent filed a Salesperson Change Application (SAC) with the Department (Ex. 3, p. A101). The SAC affiliated respondent's license with Compass California, a real estate broker, located at 9454 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 100, Beverly Hills, CA 90212 (Wilshire address).

3. On April 14, 2023, respondent filed a Salesperson Renewal Application (SRA) with the Department (Ex. 3, p. A102-A106). In the SRA, respondent changed his mailing address to 150 S. Rodeo Dr., Suite 100, Beverly Hills, 90212 (Rodeo address). The SRA also included a list entitled "Continuing Education Course Verification." Respondent listed 13 courses completed between April 3, 2023, and April 14, 2023. Respondent completed the required continuing education courses in a timely manner.

4. Sometime in April 2023, respondent's broker closed the office located at the Rodeo address, where respondent had been employed. Thereafter, respondent was relocated to his broker's office at the Wilshire address.

5. The evidence presented did not establish if respondent's broker, or respondent, requested the United States Postal Service to forward mail addressed to the Rodeo address to the Wilshire address.

6. On April 18, 2023, the Department mailed a letter to respondent, at the Rodeo address, which requested that he provide copies of his continuing education

course certificates. The Department is responsible for ensuring its licensees comply with continuing education requirements. Respondent did not respond to the Department's request.

7. On May 19, 2023, and June 20, 2023, the Department mailed two additional letters to respondent at the Rodeo address. Those letters also requested that respondent provide certificates of attendance for his continuing education courses. Respondent did not respond to these two letters.

8. Respondent testified he did not receive any of the Department's three letters discussed in Factual Findings 6 and 7.

9. On November 8, 2024, because respondent had not responded to any of the Department's three letters, complainant issued Citation Number C-4-24-1108-002 (Citation) against respondent. The Citation fined respondent \$250 and ordered him to correct the violation described therein. (Ex. 1, pages A83-A85.) The Department mailed the Citation to respondent's Rodeo address.

10. On December 16, 2024, respondent filed a "Notice of Intent to Request a Formal Hearing" which appealed the Citation and requested a Citation Review Conference (CRC) (Ex. 1, page A58.) Respondent wrote on this document that his mailing address was 9454 Wilshire Blvd., "FL 4," Beverly Hills, 90212 (Wilshire address). However, respondent did not file a Salesperson Change Application with the Department, which is required to formally change his mailing address with the Department.

11. On January 29, 2025, respondent attended the CRC and met with a Department representative. Respondent provided the certificates for his continuing education classes listed on his SAR.

12. After the CRC, the Department issued a "CRC Decision" which states, in pertinent part: "He [respondent] claims he did not receive the letters because his broker's address changed, but there is no proof in [the Department's records that he [respondent] has updated this address." However, because respondent had completed the required continuing education courses prior to submitting his SAR, the fine of \$250 was reduced to \$125, and Citation Number C-4-24-1108-002 was modified to reflect the reduced fine.

13. On February 7, 2025, the Department sent a letter to respondent, at the Rodeo address, which informed respondent that the Citation had been modified (Modified Citation), and the fine had been reduced to \$125. The letter also informed respondent of his right to appeal the Modified Citation. However, the letter also warned respondent that if he appealed, it could result in respondent having to pay costs to the Department, in addition to the \$125 fine, as follows:

If you request a formal administrative hearing, and one is conducted, the Department will request the administrative law judge to direct the party cited to pay the initially assessed administrative fine and the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case if the citation and fine are affirmed. This may result in an amount due the Department that is substantially greater than the assessed fine.

14. On March 4, 2025, respondent filed a "Request for Formal Hearing" which appealed the Modified Citation and requested a formal administrative hearing before an ALJ. In the request, the following language is stated:

I further understand that at hearing the Department, in addition to seeking enforcement of the citation and payment of the originally assessed administrative fine, will request the administrative law judge to order the payment of the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case. These additional costs, if approved, may increase substantially the amount owed the Department.

Respondent signed the form and acknowledged the above-stated language.

15. On April 9, 2025, counsel for the Department sent a letter to respondent at his Rodeo address. The letter acknowledged respondent's appeal of the Modified Citation and requested information regarding hearing dates. The letter concluded by stating, "[I]n addition, please note that pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 10106, the Department intends to seek reimbursement of the Department's enforcement and investigation costs in addition to payment of the \$125.00 citation."

16. The Department's three letters which inquired regarding respondent's continuing education classes, the Citation, and the Modified Citation, were all mailed to respondent at the Rodeo address. The evidence presented did not establish how, or why, respondent did not receive the first three letters sent by the Department, but then received the Citation and Modified Citation, all of which were mailed to the same Rodeo address.

17. The Department's reasonable cost of enforcement is \$2,244.00 (Exhibit 6.)

///

Respondent's Contentions

18. Respondent testified that shortly after filing his renewal license application, his broker changed his office location from the Rodeo address to the Wilshire address.

19. Respondent contended the Department was aware of his new address because he used the Wilshire address in his correspondence with the Department. However, respondent did not request that the Department send all correspondence to the Wilshire address. Further, respondent did not change his mailing address with the Department. Respondent's official mailing address of record with the Department is the Rodeo address (Ex. 2.)

20. Respondent contended that the Department mailed the "Notice of Hearing on Citation and Fine" to the Wilshire address and, therefore, the Department should have sent all prior correspondence to this address. However, respondent did not cite any authority to support his contention that the Department was required to mail any of the prior letters to him at any other address than his address of record.

21. Respondent also contended that it is unfair for the Department to seek \$2,244 in enforcement costs on a case involving a \$125 fine. However, the Department informed respondent, in writing, on three separate occasions, that it would be seeking costs which could amount to substantially more than the \$125 fine. Respondent acknowledged this possibility, by his signature (Factual Finding 14). Nevertheless, respondent decided to proceed with his appeal despite the potential risk.

22. The facts of this case are not in dispute. Respondent attended and completed his continuing education in a timely manner. He then submitted his SRA and listed those continuing education courses on his application. Thereafter, the

Department requested that respondent provide certificates of the continuing education classes. Respondent did not receive those letters because he did not inform the Department that his address had changed. At the CRC, respondent was able to have his fine reduced by half. Nevertheless, respondent requested an administrative hearing and appealed the Modified Citation. At hearing, respondent contended that the Department knew, or should have known, that his address had changed, and therefore, he should not be required to pay any fine. However, this is essentially the same contention respondent made at the CRC, when his fine was reduced by half. At hearing, respondent did not raise any new issues or offer any new evidence.

23. Respondent has earned approximately \$60,000 during the first seven months of 2025.

LEGAL CONCLUSIONS

Burden and Standard of Proof

1. The burden of proof in an administrative citation matter is on the agency that issued the citation. (*Owen v. Sands* (2009) 176 Cal.App.4th 985, 992.)

2. The standard of proof requires complainant to establish cause to support the issuance of the citation by a preponderance of the evidence. (*Owen v. Sands, supra*, 176 Cal.App.4th at p. 992.) This standard requires evidence that has more convincing force than that opposed to it. (*People ex rel. Brown v. Tri-Union Seafoods, LLC* (2009) 171 Cal.App.4th 1549, 1567.)

///

///

Governing Law

3. This case is governed by the Real Estate Law, found at Business and Professions Code (Code) section 10000, et seq.

4. Pursuant to Code section 10080.9, subdivision (a), a designated representative of the Commissioner may issue a citation to a Department licensee who has violated any provision of the Real Estate Law. A citation may contain an order to correct the violation identified and a reasonable time by which the violation must be corrected. A citation may assess an administrative fine not to exceed \$2,500. (*Ibid.*)

5. If a licensee appeals a citation, a CRC shall be held within 60 days. The licensee may request a formal hearing to contest the result of the conference, pursuant to California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 10, section 2907.3. All further references to title 10 of the CCR.

6. Pursuant to Code section 10177, subdivision (k), the Commissioner may discipline a real estate licensee who has violated any of the terms, conditions, restrictions, and limitations contained in an order granting a restricted license.

Cause for Citation and Modified Citation

7. Pursuant to CCR section 3013, Respondent was required to submit the certificates of attendance for the continuing education classes he listed on his SAR.

8. Pursuant to Code section 10162, subdivision (c)(2), respondent was required to inform the Department of any change to his office or mailing address no later than 30 days after making the change. Additionally, CCR section 2715 states, in pertinent part, "A real estate salesperson shall maintain on file with the Commissioner

his current mailing address. . . .” Respondent failed to inform the Department that his address had changed from the Rodeo address to the Wilshire address.

9. Pursuant to CCR section 2907.3, subdivision (f), “[T]he [Department] may seek, pursuant to Section 10106 of the Code, to recover its costs for investigation and enforcement of a citation should the case proceed to formal hearing.”

10. Code section 10106, subdivision (a) states, in pertinent part: “. . . the [Department] may request the administrative law judge to direct a licensee found to have committed a violation of this part to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case.”

11. Code section 10106, subdivision (d), states, in pertinent part: “[T]he administrative law judge shall make a proposed finding of the amount of reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution of the case when requested pursuant to subdivision (a).

12. Based on the above, complainant established by a preponderance of the evidence that respondent failed to keep the Department informed of his current mailing address. Because of respondent’s failure to respond, the Department issued a Citation, and then a Modified Citation after the CRC. After the CRC, the Department reduced respondent’s fine to \$125, which was reasonable.

13. Respondent did not present evidence, argument, or reason sufficient to further reduce the fine amount. It was respondent’s responsibility to keep the Department informed of his current mailing address. Because he failed to do so, he did not receive the Department’s three letters requesting information regarding his continuing education classes. Respondent’s fine was reduced to \$125 at the CRC after respondent explained the situation to the Department. Nevertheless, respondent

appealed the Modified Citation, but at hearing he did not establish any reason to further reduce the fine. Respondent requested the hearing despite knowing the potential risk that he might be required to pay the costs of enforcement if he was unsuccessful. For all of the above reasons, the Modified Citation, as modified, must be upheld and enforcement costs awarded.

ORDER

Modified Citation number C-4-24-1108-002 issued against respondent Jordan Duane Bridges is affirmed. Respondent shall pay \$125 to the Department of Real Estate within 30 days of the effective date of this Decision. Respondent shall also pay costs of \$2,244 to the Department of Real Estate within 30 days of the effective date of this Decision, or on a payment plan authorized by the Department of Real Estate.

DATE: **09/16/2025**



Christopher Ruiz (Sep 16, 2025 15:20:15 PDT)

CHRIS RUIZ

Administrative Law Judge

Office of Administrative Hearings