

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE

FILED

JAN - 9 2026

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DEPT. OF REAL ESTATE

By _____

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:)	DRE No. H-43130 LA
)	
TERRILL ANDRE WRIGHT,)	OAH No. 2025080187
)	
Respondent.)	

DECISION

The Proposed Decision dated November 3, 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) of the Government Code, the following corrections are made to the Proposed Decision,

Page 13, *Order*, reads as, "Terrill Andre Wrigiht," corrected to read as, "Terrill Andre Wright."

Page 15, Paragraph 6, line 3 reads as "Post Office Box 13700, Sacramento, CA 95813-7000," corrected to read as, "651 Bannon Street, Suite 504, Sacramento, CA 95811."

The Decision suspends or revokes one or more real estate licenses, but the right to a restricted salesperson license is granted to Respondent.

Pursuant to Government Code Section 11521, the Department of Real Estate (the Department) 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 1/29/20.

IT IS SO ORDERED 1/6/2021

CHIKA SUNQUIST
REAL ESTATE COMMISSIONER



By: Marcus L. McCarther
Chief Deputy Real Estate Commissioner

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

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

TERRILL ANDRE WRIGHT, Respondent.

Agency Case No. H-43130 LA

OAH No. 2025080187

PROPOSED DECISION

Julie Cabos Owen, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH), State of California, heard this matter by videoconference on October 23, 2025. Veronica Kilpatrick (Complainant) was represented by Judith Buranday, Counsel for the Department of Real Estate (Department). Terrill Andre Wright (Respondent) represented himself.

Testimony and documents were received in evidence. The ALJ left the record open to allow Respondent to submit documentation that he completed a 16-week parenting course and to allow Complainant to submit any written response. Respondent timely submitted documentation of completing 16 sessions of family counseling, which was marked as Exhibit B. Complainant submitted a Reply to Respondent's Additional Documentation (Reply), which was marked as Exhibit 9. In the Reply, Complainant noted no objection to Exhibit B, and Exhibit B was admitted into evidence.

In addition to Exhibit B, Respondent submitted three letters of reference, which he offered as Exhibits C, D, and E. However, he never requested permission for, nor did the ALJ invite, submission of these additional exhibits. In the Reply, Complainant objected to proposed Exhibits C, D, and E on the grounds that: (1) the additional exhibits were outside the scope of documents for which the ALJ kept the record open; (2) all three exhibits lacked foundation and were not authenticated by Respondent; and (3) all three documents constituted hearsay. Complainant's first two objections are sustained, and proposed Exhibits C, D, and E shall not be marked or admitted into evidence.

The record closed and the matter was submitted for decision on October 31, 2025.

FACTUAL FINDINGS

Jurisdictional Matters

1. On June 26, 2025, Complainant signed and subsequently filed the Accusation while acting in her official capacity as a Supervising Special Investigator of the State of California.
2. Respondent filed a Notice of Defense requesting a hearing.

Respondent's License History

3. Respondent holds a real estate salesperson license, Number 02165676, originally issued on January 13, 2022. The license is scheduled to expire on January 12, 2026.

Respondent's Criminal Conviction

4. On July 31, 2023, a felony complaint was filed in the Riverside County Superior Court, Case Number SWF2301112, alleging three felony counts against Respondent for possession of a short-barreled rifle, possession of an assault weapon, and infliction of cruel and inhumane corporal punishment and injury upon a child.

5. On November 4, 2024, in Case Number SWF2301112, Respondent pled guilty to and was convicted of violating Penal Code section 242 (battery), a misdemeanor. The court placed Respondent on summary probation for 12 months and ordered Respondent to serve 90 days in custody, 86 of which were to be served in a work release program.

6. Respondent's criminal conviction arose from a March 24, 2023 incident involving one of his sons.

7. To establish the circumstances of Respondent's crime, Complainant submitted as evidence the police report detailing the investigation of the March 24, 2023 incident. The police report was admitted into evidence pursuant to *Lake v. Reed* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 448. Under *Lake*, an officer's personal observations are admissible for all purposes, but all other statements are admitted as administrative hearsay unless they fall within a hearsay exception, such as party admissions (e.g., Respondent's statements). Consequently, witness statements are admissible only to explain or supplement other direct evidence but cannot be used, by themselves, to establish any fact. Nevertheless, the witness statements obtained by police in this case are set forth below to illustrate the investigation into the March 24, 2023 incident and to provide context for Respondent's testimony.

8. On March 25, 2023, Respondent's ex-wife contacted police who responded to her home. When the officers arrived, she told them her eight-year-old son (the victim) had called her the night before from Respondent's home and told her Respondent hit him when he called Respondent a "bitch." She immediately went to Respondent's residence and retrieved her children. When she and her sons arrived at her residence, she saw a red mark in the shape of a handprint on the left side of the victim's head.

9. Respondent's ex-wife showed the police officers photographs she took of the victim's injuries. They observed that the photographs depicted a red mark in the shape of a hand on the left side of the victim's face. The officers also personally observed bruising and redness on the left side of the victim's head, a small "dot" on the right side of his head, and a cut to his upper lip. (Exhibit 4, p. A60.)

10. The police officers asked the victim what happened to his face because they could see the marks on the left side of his head. The victim said he was "play fighting" with Respondent in the living room of Respondent's home, and the victim called Respondent "bitch." The victim stated he got in trouble because he called his father a bad word, and Respondent hit him several times with an open hand on the left and right side of his face. After Respondent stopped hitting him, they talked about why he should not say bad words.

11. Police officers interviewed the victim's brother, and his report mirrored his brother's, except that he reported a different number of slaps that Respondent administered.

12. When police questioned Respondent, he denied hitting the victim. He recalled wrestling with the victim, and he noted the victim liked to fight because he

was taking Taekwondo lessons. Respondent also recalled the victim becoming upset because Respondent told him he had to go to bed. According to Respondent, the victim called his mother, and his mother was angry that they were "rough housing," and she came to retrieve the children. When the officer asked how the victim sustained bruising to his face and a cut on his lip, Respondent stated they were "rough housing." When the officer told Respondent the victim reported he sustained the injuries from Respondent, Respondent denied causing any injury to the victim. He also denied ever seeing bruising on the victim's face. Respondent denied striking the victim's face when they were "play fighting." When asked again how the victim sustained his injuries, Respondent stated he did not know, but noted the victim was taking kickboxing and wrestling lessons. Respondent admitted that kickboxing participants are not allowed to hit each other in the face.

13. At the administrative hearing, Respondent denied hitting the victim on March 23, 2023. Respondent insisted he disciplined the victim for saying a bad word only by taking away his electronics and making him go to his room. Respondent maintained, "They did not able to prove that I battered him, and I think [Respondent's ex-wife] used this to attack me." Respondent is "still not able to explain" how the victim sustained his injuries. He noted that both of his sons take martial arts classes, and "any of the marks could have been from that and I did not notice it."

14. Although Respondent denied hitting the victim, by his guilty plea and conviction of violating Penal Code section 242, Respondent is guilty of the willful and unlawful use of force or violence upon the person of another. (*Arneson v. Fox* (1980) 28 Cal.3d 440, 449 [holding that "[r]egardless of the various motives which may have impelled the plea, the conviction which was based thereon stands as conclusive evidence of appellant's guilt of the offense charged".])

Failure to Disclose Felony Complaint and Criminal Conviction

15. Respondent was required to report to the Department, within 30 days, the filing of a felony criminal complaint against him and his incurring any criminal conviction. Respondent failed to do so.

Respondent's Testimony Regarding Mitigation and Rehabilitation

16. Respondent testified at the administrative hearing. His demeanor was professional, calm, and respectful.

17. Despite his denial of hitting the victim, Respondent nevertheless expressed remorse for his wrongdoing. He stated he did not want to make excuses for his actions, and he wanted to "learn and move on and not let it happen again."

18. Respondent also expressed regret and provided an explanation in a written statement to the Department, which states, in pertinent part:

I take full responsibility for my mistake and understand the seriousness of the situation. This was a one-time mistake, and I've learned a great deal from it. I'm not here to make excuses, only to give you honest context and show that I've taken this as a serious lesson that will guide me for the rest of my career.

During that time, I faced one of the most challenging periods of my life navigating a difficult separation, retiring after 21 years of active-duty military service, and beginning a new career in real estate. While these challenges do not excuse my actions, they remind me that even a moment of

stress can cloud judgment, but that moment does not define who I am. I have dedicated my entire adult life to serving my country, leading with integrity, and doing right by others, and that commitment remains unchanged.

(Exhibit A, p. B1.)

19. Respondent noted that his arrest was "rock bottom" for him, and he never wants to experience anything like that again. After his arrest, Respondent made changes to his life to "strengthen [his] foundation both personally and professionally." (Exhibit A, p. B1.) He strives to live a better life and be a better person.

20. On the day he was released from jail, Respondent joined and began attending a church. Through his church, Respondent attends Bible study twice a week, and he volunteers at the church and in his community. He has participated in several community volunteer programs including clothes donation events and helping veterans with needed handyman work. Respondent also continues to volunteer for the organization at which he completed his 86 days of work release; the program assists men suffering from addiction.

21. On April 18, 2023, Respondent enrolled in a family counseling program. From June 16 to October 9, 2023, Respondent completed 16 sessions of family counseling. In a December 12, 2023 progress report, therapist Neal Collins noted, "[Respondent] has come to accept responsibility for decisions/actions that led to the referral incident and worked to adopt reasonable expectations for his children's behavior, abilities, and level of maturity." (Exhibit B.)

22. Respondent's sons do not reside with him, but they stay with him regularly. Respondent has worked hard to rebuild his relationship with his sons, and he

has learned "patience and understanding," and not to let other's actions affect his thoughts and behavior. He also incorporates practices such as prayer, affirmations, and physical fitness that help him deal with personal stressors.

23. Respondent admitted he failed to report the felony complaint or his criminal conviction to the Department. He noted he was a "new agent and did not know" he was supposed to make such reports. While this is a mitigating circumstance, it does not excuse Respondent's failure to comply with the statutory reporting requirement. Nevertheless, Respondent assured the Department he now understands if he has any interaction with police, he must "inform the Department immediately."

24. Professionally, Respondent has implemented an "accountability system" that includes mentorship meetings with his broker and other mentors. He has also incorporated ongoing education including ethics training. Respondent noted, "These steps have reinforced the importance of compliance, integrity, and professionalism in every aspect of my business, and I remain fully committed to conducting myself with honesty, transparency, and respect." (Exhibit A, pp. B1-B2.)

25. Respondent's mentors and friends, William King, Ph.D., and Anthony Glenn II, testified on Respondent's behalf. They collectively characterized Respondent as a man of good character.

26. Respondent suffered no prior or subsequent arrests or criminal convictions other than his March 2023 arrest and November 2024 criminal conviction.

///

///

///

Costs

27. Complainant submitted evidence of the costs of investigation and enforcement of this matter totaling \$1,463. This total included \$473 in investigation costs and \$990 in attorney costs. All costs are deemed reasonable.

LEGAL CONCLUSIONS

1. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 490 and 10177, subdivision (b)(1), the Department has the authority to suspend or revoke the licensing rights of a real estate salesperson if the licensee has "entered a plea of guilty or no contest to, or been found guilty of, or been convicted of, a felony, or a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a real estate licensee."

2. California Code of Regulations, title 10, section 2910, subdivision (a)(8), provides a "crime or act shall be deemed to be substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a licensee if it involves . . . any unlawful act with the intent of conferring a financial or economic benefit upon the perpetrator or with the intent or threat of doing substantial injury to the person or property of another."

3. Respondent was convicted of battery. This constitutes an unlawful act with the intent or threat of doing substantial injury to another person. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 10, section 2910, subd. (a)(8).) Consequently, Respondent's criminal conviction is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a real estate licensee.

4. Cause exists to suspend or revoke Respondent's real estate salesperson's license, pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 490 and 10177,

subdivision (b), and California Code of Regulations, title 10, section 2910, subdivision (a)(8), because he was convicted of battery, which is a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a real estate licensee. (Factual Findings 4, 5, and 14; Legal Conclusions 1 through 3.)

5. Business and Professions Code section 10186.2 requires a licensee to report specified occurrences to the Department as follows:

(a) (1) A licensee shall report any of the following to the department:

(A) The bringing of a criminal complaint, information, or indictment charging a felony against the licensee.

(B) The conviction of the licensee, including any verdict of guilty, or plea of guilty or no contest, of any felony or misdemeanor.

(C) Any disciplinary action taken by another licensing entity or authority of this state or of another state or an agency of the federal government.

(2) The report required by this subdivision shall be made in writing within 30 days of the date of the bringing of the indictment or the charging of a felony, the conviction, or the disciplinary action.

(b) Failure to make a report required by this section shall constitute a cause for discipline.

6. Cause exists to suspend or revoke Respondent's real estate salesperson's license, pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 10186.2, for his failure to report either the filing of the felony complaint against him or his criminal conviction to the Department within 30 days of either the filing of the felony criminal complaint or within 30 days of his criminal conviction. (Factual Findings 15 and 23; and Legal Conclusion 5.)

7. California Code of Regulations, title 10, section 2912, lists criteria developed by the Department to evaluate the rehabilitation of a licensee following the licensee's conviction of a crime. The criteria include: (1) The passage of not less than two years from the most recent criminal conviction that is "substantially related" to the qualifications, functions or duties of a licensee (subd. (a)); (2) Restitution to any person who has suffered monetary losses through "substantially related" acts or omissions of the licensee (subd. (b)); (3) Expungement of the conviction or convictions which culminated in the administrative proceeding to take disciplinary action (subd. (c)); (4) Expungement or discontinuance of a requirement of registration pursuant to the provisions of Section 290 of the Penal Code (subd. (d)); (5) Successful completion or early discharge from probation or parole (subd. (e)); (6) Abstinence from the use of controlled substances or alcohol for not less than two years if the criminal conviction was attributable in part to the use of a controlled substance or alcohol (subd. (f)); (7) Payment of any fine imposed in connection with the criminal conviction that is the basis for revocation or suspension of the license (subd. (g)); (8) Correction of business practices responsible in some degree for the crime or crimes of which the licensee was convicted (subd. (h)); (9) New and different social and business relationships from those which existed at the time of the commission of the acts that led to the criminal conviction or convictions in question (subd. (i)); (10) Stability of family life and fulfillment of parental and familial responsibilities subsequent to the criminal

conviction (subd. (j)); (11) Completion of, or sustained enrollment in, formal educational or vocational training courses for economic self-improvement (subd. (k)); (12) Significant and conscientious involvement in community, church or privately sponsored programs designed to provide social benefits or to ameliorate social problems (subd. (l)); and (13) Change in attitude from that which existed at the time of the commission of the criminal acts in question as evidenced by the absence of further criminal convictions, by the testimony of the licensee, and by evidence from family, friends, probation or parole officers, psychiatrists, or clinical psychologists (subd. (m)).

8. Respondent has substantially complied with several of the Department's rehabilitation criteria. While just under one year has passed since his criminal conviction, over two years have passed since Respondent's crime (subd. (a)); Respondent is expected to successfully complete criminal probation on November 4, 2025 (subd. (e)); he has a stable family life and a good relationship with his children, including the victim (subd. (j)); he has significant and conscientious involvement in community, church, and other programs designed to provide social benefits or to ameliorate social problems (subd. (l)); and he has a change in attitude from that which existed at the time of the commission of his crime, as evidenced by the absence of further criminal convictions, by his testimony (regarding his remorse and his concerted efforts to address stressors calmly), and the confirmation by his therapist that he completed 16 weeks of family counseling and "has come to accept responsibility for decisions/actions that led to the referral incident and worked to adopt reasonable expectations for his children's behavior, abilities, and level of maturity" (subd. (m)).

9. Rehabilitation is a qualitative determination, not quantitative. One cannot just add up specified criteria, met and unmet, in order to determine whether or not a person has been rehabilitated. These factors are merely indicators that a person may

have changed his or her ways and is, therefore, unlikely to reoffend. No one of them alone – in fact not all of them together – can guarantee that an individual is truly rehabilitated.

10. Respondent has a short history of licensure without prior criminal convictions, and his single criminal conviction appears to be an anomaly in his otherwise law-abiding life. Since March 2023, Respondent has made significant progress in his rehabilitation such that, in this case, outright revocation of all licensing rights would be overly harsh discipline.

11. The purpose of this administrative proceeding is not to impose punishment on Respondent. Rather, its purpose is to protect the public. (*Camacho v. Youde* (1979) 95 Cal.App.3d 161, 164.) Given the foregoing, a restricted license is consistent with the Department's public protection mandate.

12. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 10106, the Department may recover its reasonable costs of investigation and enforcement of this matter in the amount of \$1,463, as set forth in Factual Finding 27.

ORDER

All licenses and licensing rights of Respondent, Terrill Andre Wrigjht, under the Real Estate Law are revoked; provided, however, a restricted real estate salesperson license shall be issued to Respondent pursuant to Section 10156.5 of the Business and Professions Code if Respondent applies and pays to the Department of Real Estate the appropriate fee for the restricted license within 90 days from the effective date of this Decision. The restricted license issued to Respondent shall be subject to all the provisions of Section 10156.7 of the Business and Professions Code and to the

following limitations, conditions, and restrictions imposed under authority of Section 10156.6 of that Code:

1. The restricted license issued to Respondent may be suspended prior to hearing by Order of the Real Estate Commissioner in the event of Respondent's conviction or plea of nolo contendere to a crime which is substantially related to Respondent's fitness or capacity as a real estate licensee.

2. The restricted license issued to Respondent may be suspended prior to hearing by Order of the Real Estate Commissioner on evidence satisfactory to the Commissioner that Respondent has violated provisions of the California Real Estate Law, the Subdivided Lands Law, Regulations of the Real Estate Commissioner, or conditions attaching to the restricted license.

3. Respondent shall not be eligible to apply for the issuance of an unrestricted real estate license nor for the removal of any of the conditions, limitations, or restrictions of a restricted license until two years have elapsed from the effective date of this Decision.

4. Respondent shall submit with any application for license under an employing broker, or any application for transfer to a new employing broker, a statement signed by the prospective employing real estate broker on a form approved by the Department of Real Estate which shall certify:

(a) That the employing broker has read the Decision of the Commissioner which granted the right to a restricted license; and

///

///

(b) That the employing broker will exercise close supervision over the performance by the restricted licensee relating to activities for which a real estate license is required.

5. Respondent shall, within nine months from the effective date of this Decision, present evidence satisfactory to the Real Estate Commissioner that Respondent has, since the most recent issuance of an original or renewal real estate license, taken and successfully completed the continuing education requirements of Article 2.5 of Chapter 3 of the Real Estate Law for renewal of a real estate license. If Respondent fails to satisfy this condition, the Commissioner may order the suspension of the restricted license until the Respondent presents such evidence. The Commissioner shall afford Respondent the opportunity for a hearing pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act to present such evidence.

6. Respondent shall notify the Real Estate Commissioner in writing within 72 hours of any arrest by sending a certified letter to the Commissioner at the Department of Real Estate, Post Office Box 137000, Sacramento, CA 95813-7000. The letter shall set forth the date of Respondent's arrest, the crime for which Respondent was arrested and the name and address of the arresting law enforcement agency. Respondent's failure to timely file written notice shall constitute an independent violation of the terms of the restricted license and shall be grounds for the suspension or revocation of that license.

///

///

///

7. Respondent shall pay costs of \$1,463 to the Real Estate Commissioner in the form of a cashier's check or certified check within 30 days of the effective date of this Decision, or on a payment plan by agreement with the Commissioner.

DATE: 11/03/2025



JULIE CABOS OWEN

Administrative Law Judge

Office of Administrative Hearings