1 2 3 4 5 6 7	KAMALA D. HARRIS Attorney General of California Karen B. Chappelle Supervising Deputy Attorney General GREGORY J. SALUTE Supervising Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 164015 300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702 Los Angeles, CA 90013 Telephone: (213) 897-2520 Facsimile: (213) 897-2804 Attorneys for Complainant	I E D 3/14/12 By William H. Daughas
8	BEFORE 1	THE
9	STRUCTURAL PEST CO	ONTROL BOARD
10	DEPARTMENT OF PESTIC STATE OF CAL	
11	In the Matter of the Accuration Assist:	Case No. 2012-43
12	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case 110. 2012-43
13	IAM-US, Inc. dba INTEGRATED ASSET MANAGEMENT, MOORE GREENBERG, CHIEF EXECUTIVE	ACCUSATION
14	OFFICER/QUALIFYING MANAGER	
15	12031 Ventura Boulevard, Ste. #4 Studio City, California 91604	
16	-and-	
17 18	12501 Burbank Blvd., Ste. #200, Valley Village, Ca, 91607	
18 19	Company Registration Certificate No. PR 5786, Br. 3	
20	and	
21	MOORE GREENBERG	
22	12031 Ventura Boulevard, Ste. #4 Studio City, California 91604	
23	Operator's License No. OPR 11050, Br. 3	
24	and	
25	KRIS STANLEY CRUDUP 12031 Ventura Boulevard, Ste. #4	
26	Studio City, California 91604 Operator's License No. OPR 8172, Br. 2 and 3	•
. 27	Respondents	
28		
	1	
		Accusation

.

Complainant alleges:

PARTIES

William H. Douglas ("Complainant") brings this Accusation solely in his official 1. capacity as the Interim Registrar/Executive Officer of the Structural Pest Control Board ("Board"), Department of Pesticide Regulation.

6

7

1

2

3

4

5

IAM-US, Inc. dba Integrated Asset Management

On or about March 9, 2009, the Board issued Company Registration Certificate 2. Number PR 5786 in Branch 3 (termite) to IAM-US, Inc. dba International Asset Management, 8 with Moore Greenberg ("Respondent Greenberg" or "Greenberg"), as Chief Executive Officer 9 and Qualifying Manager. On or about August 24, 2009, the business name was changed to IAM-10 US, Inc dba Integrated Asset Management ("Respondent Integrated" or "Integrated Asset 11 Management"). 12

13

Moore Greenberg

On or about March 11, 2005, the Board issued Operator's License Number OPR 3. 14 11050 in Branch 3 to Respondent Greenberg. On or about March 9, 2009, Respondent Greenberg 15 became the Branch 3 Qualifying Manager of Respondent Integrated Asset Management. On or 16 about April 12, 2011, Respondent Greenberg disassociated as Branch 3 Qualifying Manager of 17 Respondent Integrated Asset Management. On or about August 9, 2011, Respondent Greenberg 18 became the Branch 3 Qualifying Manager of Respondent Integrated Asset Management. 19 Respondent's operator's license is currently in effect and renewed through June 30, 2013. 20

21

Kris Stanley Crudup

On or about June 23, 1988, the Board issued Operator's License Number OPR 8172 4. 22 in Branch 2 to Respondent Kris Stanley Crudup, ("Respondent Crudup" or "Crudup"). On or 23 about September 6, 1994, Operator's License Number OPR 8172 was upgraded to include 24 Branches 2 and 3. On or about April 12, 2011, Respondent Crudup became the Branch 2 and 3 25 Qualifying Manager of Respondent Integrated Asset Management. On or about July 25, 2011, 26 Respondent Crudup disassociated as Branch 2 and 3 Qualifying Manager of Respondent 27

1	Integrated Asset Management. Respondent's operator's license is currently in effect and renewed
2	through June 30, 2014.
3	JURISDICTION
4	5. Business and Professions Code ("Code") section 8620 provides, in pertinent part, that
5	the Board may suspend or revoke a license when it finds that the holder, while a licensee or
6	applicant, has committed any acts or omissions constituting cause for disciplinary action or in lieu
7	of a suspension may assess a civil penalty.
8	6. Code section 8625 states:
9	The lapsing or suspension of a license or company registration by
10	operation of law or by order or decision of the board or a court of law, or the voluntary surrender of a license or company registration shall not deprive the board of
.11	jurisdiction to proceed with any investigation of or action or disciplinary proceeding against such licensee or company, or to render a decision suspending or revoking
12	such license or registration.
13	7. Code section 8624 states, in pertinent part:
14	••••
15	If the operator is the qualifying manager, a partner, responsible officer, or
16	owner of a registered structural pest control company, the suspension or revocation may be applied to the company registration.
17	The performance by any partnership, corporation, firm, association, or
18	registered company of any act or omission constituting a cause for disciplinary action, likewise constitutes a cause for disciplinary action against any licensee who, at the
19	time the act or omission occurred, was the qualifying manager, a partner, responsible officer, or owner of the partnership, corporation, firm, association, or registered
20	company whether or not he or she had knowledge of, or participated in, the prohibited act or omission.
21	8. Code section 8654 states:
22	Any individual who has been denied a license for any of the reasons
23	specified in Section 8568, or who has had his or her license revoked, or whose license is under suspension, or who has failed to renew his or her license while it was under
24	suspension, or who has been a member, officer, director, associate, qualifying manager, or responsible managing employee of any partnership, corporation, firm, or
25	association whose application for a company registration has been denied for any of the reasons specified in Section 8568, or whose company registration has been
26	revoked as a result of disciplinary action, or whose company registration is under suspension, and while acting as such member, officer, director, associate, qualifying
27	manager, or responsible managing employee had knowledge of or participated in any of the prohibited acts for which the license or registration was denied, suspended or
28	revoked, shall be prohibited from serving as an officer, director, associate, partner, qualifying manager, or responsible managing employee of a registered company, and
	3

1	the employment, election or association of such person by a registered company is a ground for disciplinary action.	
2		
3	STATUTORY AND REGULATORY PROVISIONS	
4	(Statutory Provisions)	
5	9. Code section 8514 states, in pertinent part:	
6	No registered company shall commence work on a contract, or sign, issue, or deliver any	
7	documents expressing an opinion or statement relating to the control of household pests, or wood	
8	destroying pests or organisms until an inspection has been made.	
9		
10	A registered company shall not subcontract structural fumigation work, as permitted in this	
11	section, without the written consent of the consumer. The consumer must be informed in advance,	ĺ
12	in writing, of any proposed work which the registered company intends to subcontract and of the	
13	consumer's right to select another person or entity of the consumer's choosing to perform the	
14	work. The consumer may authorize the subcontracting of the work as proposed or may contract	
15	directly with another registered company licensed to perform the work. Nothing in this paragraph	
16	shall be construed to eliminate any otherwise applicable licensure requirements, nor permit a	
17	licensed contractor to perform any work beyond that authorized by Section 8556.	
18	••••	
19	Subcontracting of work, as permitted herein, shall not relieve the prime contractor or the	
20	subcontractor from responsibility for, or from disciplinary action because of, an act or omission	
21	on its part, which would otherwise be a ground for disciplinary action. However, the registered	
22	company making the initial proposal including proposed work that the registered company	
23	intends to subcontract shall not be subject to disciplinary action or otherwise responsible for an	
24	act or omission in the performance of the work that the consumer directly contracts with another	
25	registered company to perform, as permitted by this section.	
26	10. Code section 8516 states, in pertinent part:	
27		
28	(b) No registered company or licensee shall commence work on a	
	4	

contract, or sign, issue, or deliver any documents expressing an opinion or statement relating to the absence or presence of wood destroying pests or organisms until an inspection has been made by a licensed Branch 3 field representative or operator. The address of each property inspected or upon which work is completed shall be reported on a form prescribed by the board and shall be filed with the board no later than 10 business days after the commencement of an inspection or upon completed work.

A written inspection report conforming to this section and a form approved by the board shall be prepared and delivered to the person requesting the inspection or to the person's designated agent within 10 business days of the inspection, except that an inspection report prepared for use by an attorney for litigation purposes is not required to be reported to the board. The report shall be delivered before work is commenced on any property. The registered company shall retain for three years all original inspection reports, field notes, and activity forms.

Reports shall be made available for inspection and reproduction to the executive officer of the board or his or her duly authorized representative during business hours. Original inspection reports or copies thereof shall be submitted to the board upon request within two business days. The following shall be set forth in the report:

(6) A foundation diagram or sketch of the structure or structures or portions of the structure or structures inspected, indicating thereon the approximate location of any infested or infected areas evident, and the parts of the structure where conditions that would ordinarily subject those parts to attack by wood destroying pests or organisms exist.

(7) Information regarding the substructure, foundation walls and footings, porches, patios and steps, air vents, abutments, attic spaces, roof framing that includes the eaves, rafters, fascias, exposed timbers, exposed sheathing, ceiling joists, and attic walls, or other parts subject to attack by wood destroying pests or organisms. Conditions usually deemed likely to lead to infestation or infection, such as earth-to-wood contacts, excessive cellulose debris, faulty grade levels, excessive moisture conditions, evidence of roof leaks, and insufficient ventilation are to be reported.

(10) Recommendations for corrective measures . . .

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

11. Code section 8518 states, in pertinent part:

. . . .

When a registered company completes work under a contract, it shall prepare, on a form prescribed by the board, a notice of work completed and not completed, and shall furnish that notice to the owner of the property or the owner's agent within 10 working days after completing the work. The notice shall include a statement of the cost of the completed work and estimated cost of work not completed.

1 Notices of work completed and not completed shall be made available for inspection and reproduction to the executive officer of the board or his or her duly 2 authorized representative during business hours. Original notices of work completed 3 or not completed or copies thereof shall be submitted to the board upon request within two business days. 4 12. Code section 8519 states, in pertinent part: 5 Certification as used in this section means a written statement by the 6 registered company attesting to the statement contained therein relating to the absence 7 or presence of wood-destroying pests or organisms and, listing such recommendations, if any, which appear on an inspection report prepared pursuant to Section 8516, and which relate to (1) infestation or infection of wood-destroying 8 pests or organisms found, or (2) repair of structurally weakened members caused by 9 such infestation or infection, and which recommendations have not been completed at the time of certification. 10 Any registered company which makes an inspection report pursuant to 11 Section 8516, shall, if requested by the person ordering the inspection report, prepare and deliver to that person or his or her designated agent, a certification, to provide: 12 13 (b) When the inspection report prepared pursuant to Section 8516 14 discloses infestation or infection and the notice of work completed prepared pursuant to Section 8518 indicates that all recommendations to remove that infestation or 15 infection and to repair damage caused by that infestation or infection have been completed: "This is to certify that the property described herein is now free of evidence of active infestation or infection in the visible and accessible areas ... 16 Code section 8622 states, in pertinent part: 13. 17 When a complaint is accepted for investigation of a registered company, 18 the board, through an authorized representative, may inspect any or all properties on which a report has been issued pursuant to Section 8516 or a notice of completion has 19 been issued pursuant to Section 8518 by the registered company to determine 20 compliance with the provisions of this chapter and the rules and regulations issued thereunder. If the board determines the property or properties are not in compliance, 21 a notice shall be sent to the registered company so stating. The registered company shall have 30 days from the receipt of the notice to bring such property into compliance, and it shall submit a new original report or completion notice or both and 22 an inspection fee of not more than one hundred twenty five dollars (\$125) for each property inspected. If a subsequent reinspection is necessary, pursuant to the board's 23 review of the new original report or notice or both, a commensurate reinspection fee 24 shall also be charged. If the board's authorized representative makes no determination or determines the property is in compliance, no inspection fee shall be -25 charged . . . Code section 8641 states: 14. 26 Failure to comply with the provisions of this chapter, or any rule or 27 regulation adopted by the board, or the furnishing of a report of inspection without the making of a bona fide inspection of the premises for wood destroying pests or 28 6

Accusation

	. 1	
1	organisms, or furnishing a notice of work completed prior to the completion of the work specified in the contract, is a ground for disciplinary action.	
2	15. Code section 8642 states that "[t]he commission of any grossly negligent or	
3	fraudulent act by the licensee as a pest control operator, field representative, or applicator or by a	
4	registered company is a ground for disciplinary action."	
5	16. Code section 8644 states:	
6	Fraud or misrepresentation, after inspection, by any licensee or registered	
7	company engaged in pest control work of any infestation or infection of wood destroying pests or organisms found in property or structures, or respecting any conditions of the structure that would ordinarily subject structures to attack by wood	
8	conditions of the structure that would ordinarily subject structures to attack by wood- destroying pests or organisms, whether or not a report was made pursuant to Sections 8516 and 8517 of this code, is a ground for disciplinary action.	
9	8516 and 8517 of this code, is a ground for disciplinary action.	
10	(Regulatory Provisions)	
11	17. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section ("Regulation") 1990 states, in	
12	pertinent part:	
13	(a) All reports shall be completed as prescribed by the board. Copies filed	
14 15	with the board shall be clear and legible. All reports must supply the information required by Section 8516 of the Code and the information regarding the pesticide or pesticides used as set forth in Section 8538 of the Code, and shall contain or describe the following:	
16	ine following.	
17	(3) Infestations.	
18		
18	(4) Wood members found to be damaged by wood destroying pests or organisms.	
20	(b) Conditions usually deemed likely to lead to infestation or infection include, but are not limited to:	
21		
22	(2) Inaccessible subareas or portions thereof and areas where there is less	
23	than 12 inches clear space between the bottom of the floor joists and the unimproved ground area.	
24	(3) Excessive Cellulose Debris. This is defined as any cellulose debris of	
25	a size that can be raked or larger. Stumps and wood imbedded in footings in earth contact shall be reported.	
26	(4) Earth-to-wood contacts.	
27	(5) Commonly controllable moisture conditions which would foster the	
28	growth of a fungus infection materially damaging to woodwork.	
	7	
	Accusation	

1 2 3	(e) Information regarding all accessible areas of the structure including but not limited to the substructure, foundation walls and footings, porches, patios and steps, stairways, air vents, abutments, stucco walls, columns, attached structures or other parts of a structure normally subject to attack by wood-destroying pests or
4	organisms
5	18. Regulations, Title 16, section 1996.3, states:
6	
7	(a) The address of each property inspected and/or upon which work was completed shall be reported on a form prescribed by the Board and designated as the
8	WDO Inspection and Completion Activity Report Form (see Form No. 43M-52 Rev. 5/03) at the end of this section. This form shall be prepared by each registered
9	company and shall comply with all of the requirements pursuant to Section 8516(b), and 8518.
10	(b) The form shall contain the following information for each property inspected and/or upon which work was completed.
11	(1) Company Name
12	(2) Company registration number
13	(3) Branch office registration number (when a branch office issues an
14	inspection report or notice of work completed
15	(4) Date of Activity
16 17	(5) Address of property inspected or upon which work was completed, including zip code
18	(6) Activity Code
19	(7) License number of licensee performing the inspection
	(c) Failure of a registered company to report and file with the Board the
20 21	address of any property inspected or upon which work was completed pursuant to Section 8516(b) or 8518 are grounds for disciplinary action and subject to a fine of not more then two thousand five hundred dollars (\$2,500).
22	
23	COST RECOVERY
24	19. Code section 125.3 states, in pertinent part, that a Board may request the
25	administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of
26	the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and
27	enforcement of the case.
28	
	8
	Accusation

20. Government Code section 11519(d) provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may
 require restitution of damages suffered as a condition of probation in the event probation is
 ordered.

BOARD'S INVESTIGATION OF RESPONDENT INTEGRATED

21. On or about June 2011, the Board began an investigation into the practices of 5 Respondent Integrated based upon information given to the Board that Respondent Integrated was 6 7 subcontracting with pest control companies throughout the State of California but failing to identify the subcontractors in the completed Wood Destroying Pests and Organisms Inspection 8 Reports (hereinafter "inspection reports") and Standard Notice of Work Completed and Not 9 Completed (hereinafter "notice(s) of completion"). In order to implement this business practice, 10 Respondent Integrated subcontracted with various pest control companies who would then 11 complete their work and send the completed inspection reports to Respondent Integrated's office 12 in Studio City, Ca. Respondent Integrated would then remove the subcontracted pest control 13 company's name from the completed inspection report, and then cut and paste their name onto the 14 inspection report and/or notice of completion as if to represent that Respondent Integrated had 15 completed the work contained within the report(s) when in fact it had not completed the work. 16 Respondent Integrated would then send these documents to their client Altisource¹, for escrow 17 purposes without informing Altisource that the aforementioned pest control work had been 18 subcontracted and/or had been completed by a company other than Respondent Integrated. 19

20 22. If work or repairs were needed on the properties that were inspected, Respondent
21 Integrated would then contact the subcontracted pest control company which completed the
22 original inspection, have that company complete the work, and then cut and paste Respondent
23 Integrated's name on the notice of completion and send this along with a higher billing amount to
24 their client Altisource. Respondent Integrated would then get the higher amount, pay the pest

25

4

26

27

28

¹ Altisource is a company that specializes in selling bank owned properties. Lenders in most real estate transactions in California require wood destroying pests and organisms inspection reports, prior to the commenced sale of property.

control company the lower amount, and keep the difference without ever inspecting or performing any pest control work at any of these properties.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

23. On or about July 20, 2011, Board investigator Steve Winfrey ("Investigator Winfrey") met with Respondent Greenberg who confirmed to investigator Winfrey that Respondent Integrated did not physically inspect any of the properties contained within the completed Wood Destroying Pests and Organisms Inspection Reports and Standard Notice of Work Completed and Not Completed but instead would rely on information (i.e., documents and photos) from the pest control companies that he subcontracted with to then complete the information which he then sent to Altisource.

24. On or about July 22, 2011, investigator Winfrey met with Respondent Crudup and
Respondent Crudup told investigator Winfrey that he had full knowledge that Respondents
Integrated and Greenberg were cutting and pasting their names and altering inspection reports and
notices of completion completed by other companies without ever having physically been to the
properties. Respondent Crudup told investigator Winfrey that "he wouldn't do an inspection
report that way" but said that this was the way Respondent Greenberg did inspections.

25. Between July and August 2011, investigator Winfrey obtained copies of various
inspection reports where Respondents Greenberg and Integrated Asset had cut and pasted the
Integrated Asset Management name over the names of the pest control operators who actually
performed the inspection and/or completed the work. Investigator Winfrey confirmed that this
occurred on the following properties:

A. 30499 S. Koster Road, Tracy, Ca. 95304-Inspection report done by Take Care Termite, Inc., dated 9/29/10, Respondent Integrated created an inspection report dated 9/29/10.

B. 9672 Pacific Avenue, Anaheim, Ca. 92804-Inspection report done by Empire
 Exterminators, Inc., dated 11/9/10, Respondent Integrated created an inspection
 report dated 11/9/10.

 C. 905 33rd Street, Bakersfield, Ca. 93301-Inspection report done by Burdette and Sons Termite Control, dated 12/14/10, Respondent Integrated created an inpsection report dated 12/14/10, Notice of Completion done by Burdette and Sons Termite Control, dated 1/5/11, Respondent Integrated created a Notice of Completion dated 1/5/11.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

 D. 131 Orit Avenue, Parlier, Ca. 93648- Inspection report done by Burdette and Sons Termite Control, dated 12/29/10, Respondent Integrated created an inspection report dated 12/29/10. Notice of Completion done by Burdette and Sons Termite Control, dated 1/10/11, Respondent Integrated created a Notice of Completion, dated 1/10/11.

 E. 1249 East Yale Avenue, Fresno, Ca. 93704, Inspection report done by Burdette and Sons Termite Control, dated 12/29/10, Respondent Integrated created an inspection report dated 12/29/10. Notice of Completion done by Burdette and Sons Termite Control, dated 1/24/11, Respondent Integrated created a Notice of Completion, dated 1/24/11.

F. 1017 7th Street, Ripon, Ca. 95366, Inspection report done by Western Exterminator Company, dated 4/18/11, Respondent Integrated created an inspection report dated 4/18/11.

On or about June 6, 2011, Respondent Integrated issued an inspection report for a 17 26. property located at 21925 Fallview Drive, Sonora, Ca. 95370. Respondent Greenberg was listed 18 on the report as having completed the inspection of this property. Respondent Integrated's 19 physical description of the property contained in its inspection report did not match the property 20 located at 21925 Fallview Drive, Sonora, Ca. 95370. For instance, Respondent Integrated's 21 report described the property as a "one story wood sided frame single family residence, vacant, 22 slab foundation composite roof," when in fact, the property was clearly a multi-story structure 23 with some portion of the structure as a raised foundation with a wood shake roof. Further, the 24 25 diagram listed in Respondent Integrated's report did not match the foundation and deck shape, or the locations and appearance of the structure. The diagram showed an attached deck as if it were 26 at the rear of the structure when, in fact, the main attached deck is located at the front or left of 27 the structure. 28

27. On or about July 20, 2011, investigator Winfrey met with Respondent Greenberg and 1 asked Greenberg if he could inspect the company's Wood Destroying Organism (WDO) activities 2 since June 10, 2011. Based upon his inspection, Winfrey concluded that 197 WDO activities were 3 completed that were not submitted to the Board no later than 10 business days after the 4 commencement of the inspection or upon completion of the work. 5 FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE 6 (Failure to Issue Bona Fide Wood Destroying Pest and Organisms Inspection Reports and 7 Standard Notice of Work Completed Documents) 8 28. Respondents Integrated, Greenberg, and Crudup are subject to disciplinary 9 action pursuant to Code section 8641 in that they failed to comply with Code sections 8514 and 10 8516, subdivision (b) and 1990 of the California Code of Regulations in that Respondents issued 11 Wood Destroying Pests and Organisms Inspection Reports and Notices of Completion expressing 12 opinions or statements relating to the absence or presence of wood destroying pests or organisms 13 prior to, and/or without conducting a physical inspection on properties listed in paragraphs 21-27 14 set forth above which paragraphs are incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein. 15 Moreover, Respondents Integrated, Greenberg, and Crudup are subject to 29. 16 disciplinary action pursuant to Code section 8641 in that they failed to comply with Code section 17 8514 in that Respondents subcontracted structural fumigation work without the written consent of 18 their client, i.e. the consumer, Altisource. Likewise, Respondents failed to inform Altisource in 19 advance, in writing, of any proposed work which the registered company intended to subcontract 20 and of Altisource's right to select another person or entity of the consumer's choosing to perform 21 the work. Paragraphs 21-27 set forth above are hereby incorporated by reference as though fully 22 set forth herein. 23 SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE 24 (Gross Negligence and/or Fraud) 25 Respondents Integrated, Greenberg, and Crudup are subject to disciplinary action 26 30. pursuant to Code section 8641 in that as to the following properties, Respondents failed to 27 28 12 Accusation

11	
1	comply with Code section 8642, and California Code of Regulations section 1990 in that they
2	committed grossly negligent and/or fraudulent acts as follows:
3	a. Respondents issued a report for the property located at 21925 Fallview Drive,
4	Sonora, Ca. 95370 which contained gross errors and/or false or misleading
5	statements in that Respondents' report contains a detailed description of a
6	completely different property other than the property referenced to in the report.
7	Complainant incorporates paragraphs 20-25 by reference as though fully set
8	forth herein.
9	b. By cutting and pasting their name and contact information over reports issued
10	by other pest control operators, Respondents represented to their client
11	Altisource that they had inspected and completed the inspections referenced in
12	the following properties when in fact, Respondents had subcontracted the work
13	without telling Altisource and/or failing to obtain their client's written informed
14	consent prior to subcontracting and prior to issuance of reports on the
15	properties referred to in paragraphs 21-27 set forth above which paragraphs are
16	incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein.
17	THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE
18	(Failure to File WDO Activity Statement Within 10 Days After Commencement of
19	Inspection or Upon Work Completed)
20	31. Respondents Integrated Asset Management and Greenberg are subject to disciplinary
21	action pursuant to Code section 8641 in that they failed to comply with Code sections 8516
22	subdivision (b) and 8518 and California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1996.3, in that
23	Respondents failed to file with the Board on approximately 197 occasions the address of each
24	property inspected by Respondents or upon which work was completed on a Wood Destroying
25	Organisms Inspection and Completion Activity Form (WDO Activity Statement) prescribed by
26	the Board no later than 10 business days after the commencement of an inspection by
27	Respondents or upon completed work as further set forth in paragraphs 21-27 above which are
28	incorporated herein.
	12

OTHER MATTERS

32. Code section 8620 provides, in pertinent part, that a respondent may request that a civil penalty of not more than \$5,000 be assessed in lieu of an actual suspension of 1 to 19 days, or not more than \$10,000 for an actual suspension of 20 to 45 days. Such request must be made at the time of the hearing and must be noted in the proposed decision. The proposed decision shall not provide that a civil penalty shall be imposed in lieu of a suspension.

Pursuant to Code section 8624, the causes for discipline established as to Respondent 7 33. Integrated Asset Management likewise constitute causes for discipline against Respondent 8 9 Greenberg and/or Respondent Crudop regardless of whether they had knowledge of or participated in the acts or omissions which constitute causes for discipline against Respondent 10 Integrated Asset Management. .11

12

13

18

1

2

3

4

5

6

Pursuant to Code section 8624, if Operator's License Number OPR 11050, issued to 34. Respondent Moore Greenberg, or Operator's License Number OPR 8172 issued to Respondent Kris Stanley Crudup, is suspended or revoked, the Board may suspend or revoke Company 14 Registration Certificate Number PR 5786, issued to Respondent Integrated Asset Management. 15 Respondent Moore Greenberg, the owner and qualifying manager for Respondent 35. 16 Integrated Asset Management, had knowledge of and participated in, the acts or omissions which 17

Respondent Kris Stanley Crudup, the former qualifying manager for Respondent 36. 19 Integrated Asset Management, had knowledge of and participated in, the acts or omissions which 20 constitute causes for discipline against Respondent Integrated Asset Management. 21

constitute causes for discipline against Respondent Integrated Asset Management.

Pursuant to Code section 8654, if discipline is imposed on Company Registration 22 37. Certificate Number PR 5786, issued to Respondent Integrated Asset Management, Respondents 23 Moore Greenberg and/or Kris Stanley Crudup shall be prohibited from serving as an officer, 24 director, associate, partner, qualifying manager, or responsible managing employee for any 25 registered company during the time the discipline is imposed, and any registered company which 26 employs, elects, or associates Moore Greenberg or Kris Stanley Crudup shall be subject to 27 disciplinary action. 28

1	38. Code section 8622 provides, in pertinent part, that Respondents shall submit an
2	inspection fee of not more than \$125. If a reinspection is necessary, a commensurate reinspection
3	fee shall be charged.
4	PRAYER
5	WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged,
6	and that following the hearing, the Structural Pest Control Board issue a decision:
7	1. Revoking or suspending Company Registration Certificate Number PR 5786, issued
8	to IAM-US, Inc. dba International Asset Management;
9	2. Revoking or suspending Operator's License Number OPR 11050, issued to
10	Respondent Moore Greenberg;
11	3. Prohibiting Moore Greenberg from serving as an officer, director, associate, partner,
12	qualifying manager or responsible managing employee of any registered company during the
13	period that discipline is imposed on Company Registration Certificate Number PR 5786, issued to
14	IAM-US, Inc. dba International Asset Management;
15	4. Revoking or suspending Operator's License Number OPR 8172 issued to Respondent
16	Kris Stanley Crudup;
17	5. Prohibiting Kris Stanley Crudup from serving as an officer, director, associate,
18	partner, qualifying manager or responsible managing employee of any registered company during
19	the period that discipline is imposed on Company Registration Certificate Number PR 5786,
20	issued to IAM-US, Inc. dba International Asset Management;
21	6. Ordering Integrated Asset Management, Moore Greenberg and/or Kris Stanley
22	Crudup to pay the Structural Pest Control Board the reasonable costs of the investigation and
23	enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 125.3;
24	
25	/// ·
26	
27	
28	
	15
	Accusation Accusation

