

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

**BEFORE THE
STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD
DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:
PAUL MONTECINO
5506 Zola Avenue
Pico Rivera, Ca. 90660
Operator License No. OPR 11243

Respondent.

Case No. 2010-39

DEFAULT DECISION AND ORDER

[Gov. Code, §11520]

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. On or about December 24, 2009, Complainant Kelli Okuma, in her official capacity as the Registrar/Executive Officer of the Structural Pest Control Board, Department of Pesticide Regulation, filed Accusation No. 2010-39 against Paul Montecino (Respondent) before the Structural Pest Control Board.

2. On or about January 12, 2006, the Structural Pest Control Board (Board) issued Operator License No. OPR 11243 to Respondent. The Operator License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on June 30, 2011, unless renewed.

3. On or about February 24, 2010, Teresa Sutton, an employee of the Department of Justice, served by Certified and First Class Mail a copy of the Accusation No. 2010-39, Statement to Respondent, Notice of Defense, Request for Discovery, and Government Code sections 11507.5, 11507.6, and 11507.7 to Respondent's address of record with the Board, which was and is:

1 5506 Zola Avenue, Pico Rivera, Ca. 90660.

2 A copy of the Accusation is attached as exhibit A, and is incorporated herein by reference.

3 4. Service of the Accusation was effective as a matter of law under the provisions of
4 Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c).

5 5. On or about February 25, 2010, the U.S. Postal Service delivered the Return Certified
6 Mail Receipt which was signed by Respondent.

7 6. Government Code section 11506 states, in pertinent part:

8 (c) The respondent shall be entitled to a hearing on the merits if the respondent
9 files a notice of defense, and the notice shall be deemed a specific denial of all parts
10 of the accusation not expressly admitted. Failure to file a notice of defense shall
11 constitute a waiver of respondent's right to a hearing, but the agency in its discretion
12 may nevertheless grant a hearing.

13 7. Respondent failed to file a Notice of Defense within 15 days after service upon him
14 of the Accusation, and therefore waived his right to a hearing on the merits of Accusation No.
15 2010-39.

16 8. California Government Code section 11520 states, in pertinent part:

17 (a) If the respondent either fails to file a notice of defense or to appear at the
18 hearing, the agency may take action based upon the respondent's express admissions
19 or upon other evidence and affidavits may be used as evidence without any notice to
20 respondent.

21 9. Pursuant to its authority under Government Code section 11520, the Board finds
22 Respondent is in default. The Board will take action without further hearing and, based on the
23 evidence on file herein, finds that the allegations in Accusation No. 2010-39 are true.

24 10. The total cost for investigation and enforcement in connection with the Accusation
25 are \$1035.00 as of March 29, 2010.

26 DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

27 1. Based on the foregoing findings of fact, Respondent Paul Montecino has subjected
28 his Operator License No. OPR 11243 to discipline.

2. A copy of the Accusation is attached.

3. The agency has jurisdiction to adjudicate this case by default.

Exhibit A
Accusation No. 2010-39

1 EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
Attorney General of California
2 ALFREDO TERRAZAS
Senior Assistant Attorney General
3 GREGORY J. SALUTE
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
4 State Bar No. 164015
300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702
5 Los Angeles, CA 90013
Telephone: (213) 897-2520
6 Facsimile: (213) 897-2804

FILED

Date 12/24/09 By Kelli Okuma

7 *Attorneys for Complainant*

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**BEFORE THE
STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD
DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:
PAUL I. MONTECINO
P. O. Box 9563
San Bernardino, CA 92427
Operator License No. OPR 11243, Branch 2
Respondent.

Case No. 2010-39

ACCUSATION

Complainant alleges:

PARTIES

1. Kelli Okuma ("Complainant") brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity as the Registrar/Executive Officer of the Structural Pest Control Board, Department of Pesticide Regulation.

License History

2. On or about January 12, 2006, the Structural Pest Control Board issued Operator License Number OPR 11243, Branch 2 to Paul I. Montecino ("Respondent"). The license was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on June 30, 2011, unless renewed.

JURISDICTION

1
2 3. This Accusation is brought before the Structural Pest Control Board ("Board"),
3 Department of Pesticide Regulation, under the authority of the following laws. All section
4 references are to the Business and Professions Code ("Code"), unless otherwise indicated.

5 4. Code section 8620 provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may suspend or revoke a
6 license when it finds that the holder, while a licensee or applicant, has committed any acts or
7 omissions constituting cause for disciplinary action or in lieu of a suspension may assess a civil
8 penalty.

9 5. Code section 8624 states:

10 "If the board suspends or revokes an operator's license and one or more branch
11 offices are registered under the name of the operator, the suspension or revocation may be applied
12 to each branch office."

13 6. Code section 8625 states:

14 The lapsing or suspension of a license or company registration by
15 operation of law or by order or decision of the board or a court of law, or the
16 voluntary surrender of a license or company registration shall not deprive the
17 board of jurisdiction to proceed with any investigation of or action or
18 disciplinary proceeding against such licensee or company, or to render a
19 decision suspending or revoking such license or registration.

20 7. Code section 8654 states:

21 Any individual who has been denied a license for any of the reasons
22 specified in Section 8568, or who has had his or her license revoked, or whose
23 license is under suspension, or who has failed to renew his or her license while
24 it was under suspension, or who has been a member, officer, director, associate,
25 qualifying manager, or responsible managing employee of any partnership,
26 corporation, firm, or association whose application for a company registration
27 has been denied for any of the reasons specified in Section 8568, or whose
28 company registration has been revoked as a result of disciplinary action, or
whose company registration is under suspension, and while acting as such
member, officer, director, associate, qualifying 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 revoked,
shall be prohibited from serving as an officer, director, associate, partner,
qualifying manager, or responsible managing employee of a registered
company, and the employment, election or association of such person by a
registered company is a ground for disciplinary action.

///

1 8. Code section 8593 states:

2 The board shall require as a condition to the renewal of each operator's
3 and field representative's license that the holder thereof submit proof
4 satisfactory to the board that he or she has informed himself or herself of
5 developments in the field of pest control by completion of courses of
6 continuing education in pest control approved by the board or equivalent
7 activity approved by the board.

8 **STATUTORY PROVISION**

9 9. Code section 8641 states:

10 Failure to comply with the provisions of this chapter, or any rule or
11 regulation adopted by the board, . . . is a ground for disciplinary action.

12 **REGULATORY PROVISION**

13 10. California Code of Regulations, section 1950, subdivision (a), states:

14 Except as provided in section 1951, every licensee is required, as a
15 condition to a renewal of a license, to certify that he or she has completed the
16 continuing education requirements set forth in this article. A licensee who
17 cannot verify completion of continuing education by producing certificates of
18 activity completion, whenever required to do so by the Board, may be subject to
19 disciplinary action under section 8641 of the code.

20 **COST RECOVERY**

21 11. Code section 125.3 states, in pertinent part, that a Board may request the
22 administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of
23 the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and
24 enforcement of the case.

25 **FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

26 **(Documentation of Continuing Education Requirements)**

27 12. Respondent's license is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Code sections 8620,
28 8593, and 8641, in that Respondent failed to comply with Regulation section 1950, subdivision
(a), by failing to provide the Board with verifiable documentation to demonstrate that he
completed 16 hours of continuing education requirements for the renewal period of July 1, 2005,
through June 30, 2008, as stated in his License Renewal Application, signed under penalty of
perjury and dated June 30, 2008.

