

LISSETE GARCIA, Counsel (SBN 211552)
Department of Real Estate
320 West 4th Street, Suite 350
Los Angeles, California 90013-1105
Telephone: (213) 559-5990
Direct: (213) 559-5933
Fax: (213) 576-6917
Staff Counsel for Department of Real Estate

FILED

SEP - 4 2025

DEPT. OF REAL ESTATE

By: [REDACTED]

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

* * *

In the Matter of the Accusation against

DRE No. H-43112 LA

ELIZABETH YANG,

ACCUSATION

Respondent.

The Complainant, Ray Dagnino a Supervising Special Investigator for the Department of Real Estate¹ ("Department") of the State of California, makes this Accusation in his official capacity, for cause of Accusation against ELIZABETH YANG ("Respondent"), is informed and alleges as follows:

1. All references to the "Code" are to the California Business and Professions Code, all references to the "Real Estate Law" are to Part 1 of Division 4 of the Code, and all references to "Regulations" are to Title 10, Chapter 6, California Code of Regulations.
2. Respondent is licensed and/or has license rights under the Real Estate Law (Part 1 of Division 4 of the Code).

¹ Between July 1, 2013, and July 1, 2018, the Department of Real Estate operated as the Bureau of Real Estate under the Department of Consumer Affairs.

1 10. Since 2016, Respondent was the principal at her law firm, the Law Offices of
2 Elizabeth Yang ("law offices"), where she provides law services including patent, copyright,
3 and trademark law.

4 11. In or around October of 2019, the Respondent entered into an agreement with an
5 overseas company ("Sellingrowth") which allowed Sellingrowth to use the Respondent's name
6 and signature to file applications and receive trademark certificates from the USPTO as a
7 domestic representative. The Respondent would act as the attorney of record on behalf of
8 Sellingrowth's customers on trademark applications filed with the USPTO. In exchange, the
9 Respondent was paid \$1,500 a month for one year for a total of \$18,000 from Sellingrowth.

10 12. Over the course of their business relationship with Respondent, Sellingrowth
11 began preparing and filing an exponentially larger number of trademark applications than the
12 number of monthly applications that Respondent and Sellingrowth had agreed upon. The
13 Respondent did not review or regularly monitor the trademark applications prepared by and
14 filed by Sellingrowth with the USPTO.

15 13. On or about August 31, 2021, the Office of Enrollment and Discipline for the
16 USPTO filed a complaint against the Respondent stemming from Sellingrowth's filings of
17 trademark applications with the USPTO, which listed the Respondent as the attorney of record.

18 14. The parties entered into a settlement agreement submitted before the Under
19 Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and
20 Trademark Office. The settlement agreement contained the parties' stipulated facts, legal
21 conclusion, and sanctions.

22 15. On or about December 17, 2021, the Respondent was suspended by USPTO for
23 acts of professional misconduct in their jurisdiction including assisting others in the
24 unauthorized practice of law before the USPTO. Findings of culpability in USPTO proceedings

1 require clear and convincing evidence.

2 State Bar Disciplinary Action

3 16. Respondent was admitted to practice law in the State of California on or about
4 June 4, 2007.

5 17. On May 31, 2022, the Office of the Chief Counsel ("OCTC") for the State Bar of
6 California filed a Notice of Disciplinary Charges against Respondent in Case No. SBC-22-J-
7 30501. The OCTC initiated the reciprocal discipline matter, seeking to discipline Respondent's
8 license to practice law, based upon the Respondent's professional misconduct found in the
9 USPTO proceeding described above in Paragraphs 9 through 15.

10 18. On June 27, 2022, Respondent filed an Answer to the Notice of Disciplinary
11 Charges.

12 19. On August 25, 2022, the parties filed a stipulation as to the facts, conclusions of
13 law, mitigation, and admission of exhibits. An amended stipulation was filed on October 5,
14 2022. At a pre-trial status conference held on October 5, 2022, the parties jointly requested that
15 the case be submitted for decision on the pleadings without a hearing. The court granted the
16 parties' request and the matter was submitted for decision on October 5, 2022.

17 20. On December 1, 2022, the State Bar Court of California Hearing Department
18 issued an Order for Case No. SBC-22-J-30501. The court found that Respondent's culpability
19 as determined in the USPTO proceeding indicated that the Respondent violated the following
20 California Rules of Professional Conduct:

- 21 1) Rule 1.1 [failure to perform with competence];
22 2) Rule 1.3 [failure to perform with diligence];
23 3) Rule 1.4 [failure to communicate with clients];
24 4) Rule 3.3(a)(1) [lack of candor toward the tribunal];

- 1 5) Rule 5.3(b) [failure to supervise non-lawyer];
2 6) Rule 5.5(a) [unauthorized practice of law]; and
3 7) Rule 8.4(d) [prejudice to the administration of justice].

4 21. On or about March 22, 2023, Respondent was suspended from the practice of
5 law for one year, the suspension was stayed, and Respondent was placed on probation for one
6 year, subject to certain terms and conditions including the suspension from the practice of law
7 for the first 30 days of probation. Respondent was ordered to comply with other terms of
8 probation and ordered to pay a monetary sanction and costs. Respondent's license is currently
9 active.

10 FIRST CAUSE OF ACCUSATION

11 22. There is hereby incorporated in this First, Cause of Accusation, all of the
12 allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 21, above, with the same force and effect as if
13 herein fully set forth.

14 23. Respondent's failure to disclose the disciplinary actions filed against Respondent
15 and the suspension of Respondent's license to practice law in California, as described above in
16 Paragraphs 6 through 21, on Respondent's February 24, 2024, real estate Broker Renewal
17 Application constitutes the procurement of a real estate license by fraud, deceit, making a
18 material misstatement, or omission of a material fact, in said application which constitutes cause
19 for the suspension or revocation of all licenses and license rights of Respondent pursuant to
20 Code sections 498 and 10177, subdivision (a).

21 SECOND CAUSE OF ACCUSATION – CODE SECTION 10186.2

22 24. There is hereby incorporated in this Second, separate and distinct Cause of
23 Accusation, all of the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 23, above, with the same
24 force and effect as if herein fully set forth.

1 25. Code section 10186.2, subdivision (a)(1)(C), requires that licensees report any
2 disciplinary action taken by another licensing entity or authority of this state or another state or
3 an agency of the federal government. Code section 10186.2, subdivision (a)(2), requires that
4 licensees make a report in writing to the Department within 30 days of the disciplinary action.
5 Failure to make a report constitutes cause for discipline under Code section 10186.2,
6 subdivision (b).

7 26. A diligent search was made of the Department's records for Respondent and no
8 record or written notice was found to have been received from Respondent notifying the
9 Department of the disciplinary actions against Respondent or the suspension of Respondent's
10 license to practice law, as described above in Paragraphs 9 through 21, within 30 days of said
11 actions.

12 27. Respondent's failure to provide timely written notice to the Department pursuant
13 to Code section 10186.2 of the suspension of Respondent's license to practice law constitutes
14 cause for the suspension or revocation of Respondent's real estate license and license rights
15 under Code section 10186.2, subdivision (b), and section 10177, subdivisions (d) and/or (g).

16 THIRD CAUSE OF ACCUSATION – CODE SECTION 10177(F)

17 28. There is hereby incorporated in this Third, separate and distinct Cause of
18 Accusation, all of the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 27, above, with the same
19 force and effect as if herein fully set forth.

20 29. Code section 10177, subdivision (f), provides that the Real Estate Commissioner
21 may suspend or revoke the license of a real estate licensee if a licensee has acted or conducted
22 himself in a manner that would have warranted the denial of his application for a license, or
23 either had a license denied or had a license issued by another agency of this state revoked or
24 suspended for acts that, if done by a real estate licensee, would be grounds for the suspension or

1 revocation of a California real estate license, if the action of denial, revocation, or suspension by
2 the other agency was taken only after giving the licensee or applicant fair notice of the charges,
3 an opportunity for a hearing, and other due process protections comparable to the
4 Administrative Procedure Act, and only upon an express finding of a violation of law by the
5 agency or entity.

6 30. Respondent's acts, as described above in Paragraphs 9 through 21, if done by a
7 real estate licensee, would be grounds for the suspension or revocation of a real estate license
8 pursuant to Code sections 10130 (unlicensed activity), 10137 (unlicensed activity), 10177,
9 subdivisions (h) (broker supervision) and (d) (violation of the Real Estate Law), and Regulation
10 2725 (broker supervision).

11 31. The suspension of Respondent's license to practice law constitutes cause for the
12 suspension or revocation of Respondent's real estate license and license rights pursuant to Code
13 section 10177, subdivision (f).

14 COST RECOVERY

15 32. Code Section 10106 provides, in pertinent part, that in any order issued in
16 resolution of a disciplinary proceeding before the Department, the Commissioner may request
17 the Administrative Law Judge to direct a licensee found to have committed a violation of this
18 part to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the
19 case.

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

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 license rights of Respondent under the Real Estate Law (Part 1 of Division 4 of the Business and Professions Code), for the cost of investigation and enforcement as permitted by law, and for such other and further relief as may be proper under other provisions of law.

Dated Sep 2, 2025 at Los Angeles, California.

RAY DAGNINO
Supervising Special Investigator

cc: Elizabeth Yang
Ray Dagnino
Sacto.