

1 EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
Attorney General of California
2 GREGORY J. SALUTE
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
3 DESIREE TULLENERS
Deputy Attorney General
4 State Bar No. 157464
300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702
5 Los Angeles, CA 90013
Telephone: (213) 897-2578
6 Facsimile: (213) 897-2804
Attorneys for Complainant
7

FILED

Date 10/11/10 By Kelli Okuma

8 BEFORE THE
9 STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD
10 DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION
11 STATE OF CALIFORNIA

12 In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

Case No. 2011-12

13 **ZAPPEN EXTERMINATING**
14 **JOSEPH W. ZAPPEN, Owner and QM**
511 South 1st Avenue #476
Arcadia, California 91006
15 **Company Registration License No. PR 3982, Br. 3**
16 **Operator License No. OPR 10234, Br. 3**

ACCUSATION

Respondent.

17
18 Kelli Okuma ("Complainant") alleges:

19 **PARTIES**

20 1. Complainant brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity as the Registrar of
21 the Structural Pest Control Board ("Board"), Department of Pesticide Regulation.

22 **Company Registration Certificate No. PR 3982**

23 2. On or about June 26, 2001, the Board issued Company Registration Certificate
24 Number PR 3982 ("registration") to Zappen Exterminating in Branch 3, with Joseph W. Zappen
25 ("Respondent") as the owner and Qualifying Manager. On or about October 13, 2009, the
26 registration was suspended pursuant to Business and Professions Code ("Code") section 8697
27 (failure to maintain a surety bond). On or about October 19, 2009, the registration was reinstated.

28 ///

1 pursuant to Section 8518 by the registered company to determine compliance with the
2 provisions of this chapter and the rules and regulations issued thereunder. If the board
3 determines the property or properties are not in compliance, a notice shall be sent to the
4 registered company so stating. The registered company shall have 30 days from the receipt
5 of the notice to bring such property into compliance, and it shall submit a new original
6 report or completion notice or both and an inspection fee of not more than one hundred
7 twenty-five dollars (\$125) for each property inspected. If a subsequent reinspection is
8 necessary, pursuant to the board's review of the new original report or notice or both, a
9 commensurate reinspection fee shall also be charged. If the board's authorized
10 representative makes no determination or determines the property is in compliance, no
11 inspection fee shall be charged.

12 The notice sent to the registered company shall inform the registered company that if
13 it desires a hearing to contest the finding of noncompliance, the hearing shall be requested
14 by written notice to the board within 20 days of receipt of the notice of noncompliance from
15 the board. Where a hearing is not requested pursuant to this section, payment of any
16 assessment shall not constitute an admission of any noncompliance charged.

17 STATUTORY PROVISIONS

18 8. Code section 8516 states, in pertinent part:

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

26 Every property inspected pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 8516.1, or Section
27 8518, or subdivision (b) of this section shall be assessed a filing fee pursuant to Section
28 8674.

Failure of a registered company to report and file with the board the address of any
property inspected or work completed pursuant to Section 8516.1, Section 8518, or this
section are grounds for disciplinary action and shall subject the registered company to a fine
of not more than two thousand five hundred dollars (\$2,500).

A written inspection report conforming to this section and on 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,
filed 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.

1 Original inspection reports or copies thereof shall be submitted to the board upon request
2 within two business days. The following shall be set forth in the report:

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

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

14 (10) Recommendations for corrective measures.

15 9. Section 8518 of the Code states, in pertinent part:

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

21 The address of each property inspected or upon which work was completed shall be
22 reported on a form prescribed by the board and shall be filed with the board no later than 10
23 working days after completed work.

24 10. Code section 8638 states:

25 Failure on the part of a registered company to complete any operation or construction
26 repairs for the price stated in the contract for such operation or construction repairs or in
27 any modification of such contract is a ground for disciplinary action.

28 11. Code section 8639 states:

Aiding or abetting an unlicensed individual or unregistered company to evade the
provisions of this chapter or knowingly combining or conspiring with an unlicensed
individual or unregistered company, or allowing one's license or company registration to be
used by an unlicensed individual or unregistered company, or acting as agent or partner or
associate, or otherwise, of an unlicensed individual or unregistered company to evade the
provisions of this chapter is a ground for disciplinary action.

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

12. Code section 8641 states:

Failure to comply with the provisions of this chapter, or any rule or 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 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.

13. Code section 8642 states:

The commission of any grossly negligent or fraudulent act by the licensee as a pest control operator, field representative, or applicator or by a registered company is a ground for disciplinary action.

REGULATORY PROVISIONS

14. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1990, states, in pertinent part:

(a) All reports shall be completed as prescribed by the board. Copies filed 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:

(3) Infestations, infections or evidence thereof.

(4) Wood members found to be damaged by wood destroying pests or organisms.

(b) Conditions usually deemed likely to lead to infestation or infection include, but are not limited to:

(2) Inaccessible subareas or portions thereof and areas where there is less than 12 inches clear space between the bottom of the floor joists and the unimproved ground area.

(3) Excessive Cellulose Debris. This is defined as any cellulose debris of a size that can be raked or larger. Stumps and wood imbedded in footings in earth contact shall be reported.

(4) Earth-wood contacts.

(5) Commonly controllable moisture conditions which would foster the growth of a fungus infection materially damaging to woodwork.

(d) Even though the licensee may consider the following areas inaccessible for purposes of inspection, the licensee must state specifically which of these areas or any other areas were not inspected and why the inspection of these areas is not practical: furnished interiors; inaccessible attics or portions thereof; the interior of hollow walls; spaces between a floor or porch deck and the ceiling or soffit below; stall showers over finished ceilings; such structural segments as porte cocheres, enclosed bay windows, buttresses, and similar areas to which there is no access without defacing or tearing out lumber, masonry or finished work; built-in cabinet work; floors beneath coverings, areas where storage conditions or locks make inspection impracticable.

1 (f) The following language shall appear just prior to the first finding/recommendation on
2 each separated report:

3 "This is a separated report which is defined as Section I/Section II conditions evident on the
4 date of the inspection. Section I contains items where there is visible evidence of active
5 infestation, infection or conditions that have resulted in or from infestation of infection.
6 Section II items are conditions deemed likely to lead to infestation or infection but where
7 no visible evidence of such was found. Further inspection items are defined as
8 recommendations to inspect area(s) which during the original inspection did not allow the
9 inspector access to complete the inspection and cannot be defined as Section I or Section
10 II."

11 15. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1991, states, in pertinent
12 part:

13 (a) Recommendations for corrective measures for the conditions found shall be made as
14 required by paragraph 10 of subdivision (b) of Section 8516 of the code and shall also
15 conform with the provisions of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations and any other
16 applicable local building code, and shall accomplish the following:

17 (5) Structural members which appear to be structurally weakened by wood-destroying pests
18 to the point where they no longer serve their intended purpose shall be replaced or
19 reinforced. Structural members which are structurally weakened by fungus to the point
20 where they no longer serve their intended purpose shall be removed or, if feasible, may
21 remain in place if another structural member is installed adjacent to it to perform the same
22 function, if both members are dry (below 20% moisture content), and if the excessive
23 moisture condition responsible for the fungus damage is corrected. Structural members
24 which appear to have only surface fungus damage may be chemically treated and/or left as
25 is if, in the opinion of the inspector, the structural member will continue to perform its
26 originally intended function and if correcting the excessive moisture condition will stop the
27 further expansion of the fungus.

28 (8) Exterminate all reported wood-destroying pests. Such extermination shall not be
considered repair under section 8516(b)(12) of the code. If evidence indicates that wood-
destroying pests extend into an inaccessible area(s), recommendation shall be made to
either:

(A) enclose the structure for an all encompassing treatment utilizing materials listed in
Section 8505.1 of the code, or

(B) use another all encompassing method of treatment which exterminates the infestation
of the structure, or

(C) locally treat by any or all of the following:

1. exposing the infested area(s) for local treatment,

2. removing the infested wood,

3. using another method of treatment which exterminates the infestation. (If any
recommendation is made for local treatment, the report must contain the following
statement: "Local treatment is not intended to be an entire structure treatment method. If
infestations of wood-destroying pests extend or exist beyond the area(s) of local treatment,
they may not be exterminated.")

When a complete inspection is performed, a recommendation shall be made to remove or
cover all accessible pellets and frass of wood-destroying pests.

1 When a limited inspection is performed, the inspection report shall state that the inspection
2 is limited to the area(s) described and diagrammed. A recommendation shall be made to
3 remove or cover all accessible pellets and frass of wood-destroying pests in the limited
4 areas. The limited inspection report shall include a recommendation for further inspection
5 of the entire structure and that all accessible evidence of wood-destroying pests be removed
6 or covered.

7 (9) For the extermination of subterranean termite infestations, treat an infested area under
8 the structure when subterranean termite tubes are found connected to the ground or when
9 active infestations are found in the ground. Subterranean termite tubes shall be removed
10 where accessible, except where a licensee is using an above ground termite bait station that
11 requires the use of the termite tubes to be effective. Where a licensee is using an above
12 ground termite bait station that requires the use of termite tubes to be effective,
13 subterranean termite tubes can remain in place for the duration of the licensee's use of the
14 termite bait stations. At the conclusion of the treatment, the subterranean termite tubes shall
15 be removed.

16 (12) Repair a stall shower if it is found to leak when water tested for a minimum of
17 fifteen (15) minutes after the shower drain has been plugged and the base filled to within
18 one (1) inch of the top of the shower dam. Stall showers with no dam or less than two (2)
19 inches to the top of the dam are to be water tested by running water on the unplugged
20 shower base for a minimum of five (5) minutes./ showers over finished ceilings must be
21 inspected but need to be water tested. If water stains are evidence on the ceiling,
22 recommendations shall be made for further inspection and testing.

23 16. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1993, states, in pertinent
24 part:

25 All of the following reports must be in compliance with the requirements of Section 8516
26 of the code. All reports must be on the form prescribed by the board.

27 (d) A supplemental report is the report on the inspection performed on inaccessible areas
28 that have been made accessible as recommended on a previous report. Such report shall
indicate the absence or presence of wood-destroying pests or organisms or conditions
conducive thereto. This report can also be used to correct, add, or modify information in a
previous report. A licensed operator or field representative shall refer to the original report
in such a manner to identify it clearly.

17. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1937.14, states:

All work completed by licensees or registered companies shall be done within the specific
requirements of any plans or specifications and shall meet accepted trade standards for
good and workmanlike construction in any material respect, and shall comply with
provisions of Section 2516(c)(1), (2), (4) and (6) of Title 24, California Code of
Regulations.

COST RECOVERY/RESTITUTION

18. Code section 125.3 provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may request the
administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of

1 the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and
2 enforcement of the case.

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

6 LIEBER PROPERTY

7 20. On or about July 23, 2009, Respondent inspected the property located at 846 West
8 Hillcrest Blvd., in Monrovia, California, ("Lieber property"), for wood destroying pests and
9 organisms for escrow purposes, and on that same day issued Wood Destroying Pests and
10 Organisms Inspection Report No. 5527 ("Inspection Report No. 5527"). Inspection Report No.
11 5527 consisted of five findings and recommendations.

12 21. On or about August 17, 2009, Respondent issued a Standard Notice of Work
13 Completed and Not Completed ("Completion Notice"), certifying that all of the work
14 recommended in Inspection Report No. 5527, dated July 23, 2009, had been completed in
15 accordance with the Board's rules and regulations, and that the property was now free of evidence
16 of active infestation or infection in visibly accessible areas.

17 22. On or about August 29, 2009, escrow closed.

18 23. On or about October 2, 2009, Foss Termite Control, Inc. ("Foss") inspected the
19 Lieber property for wood destroying pests and organisms. Foss prepared an inspection report
20 consisting of four findings and recommendations.

21 24. On or about October 14, 2009, the Board received a complaint from the homeowner,
22 Elaine Lieber, due to Foss's findings of evidence of termites and termite damage to the structure.

23 25. On or about October 26, 2009, the Board notified Respondent of the homeowner's
24 complaint.

25 26. On or about November 10, 2009, Respondent notified the Board that he contacted and
26 met with the homeowner and is addressing the problems.

27 27. On or about December 14, 2009, a Board specialist performed a limited inspection of
28 the Lieber property and noted violations.

1 f. Respondent failed to report subterranean termite damage in the substructure on the
2 July 23, 2009, inspection report, as defined by California Code of Regulations, title 16, section
3 1990(a)(4).

4 g. Respondent failed to report evidence of an excessive moisture condition (water
5 stains) in the substructure on the July 23, 2009, inspection report, as defined by California Code
6 of Regulations, title 16, section 1990(a)(5).

7 h. Respondent failed to report inaccessible portions of the substructure, due to an
8 insulated sub-floor, on the July 23, 2009, and February 17, 2010, inspection reports, as defined by
9 California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1990(b)(2) and 1993(d).

10 i. Respondent failed to report decay fungi, decay fungi damage, and evidence of an
11 excessive moisture condition (water stains) at the framing below the side carriage porch on the
12 July 23, 2009, and February 17, 2010, inspection reports, as defined by California Code of
13 Regulations, title 16, section 1990(a)(3) and (4), and 1990(b)(5).

14 j. Respondent failed to report evidence of subterranean termites in the attic framing on
15 the July 23, 2009, and March 19, 2010, inspection reports, and the full extent of the evidence of
16 subterranean termites in the attic on the February 17, 2010, inspection report, as defined by
17 California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1990(a)(3).

18 k. Respondent failed to report the drywood termite damage at the wood deck framing on
19 the July 23, 2009, inspection report, and the full extent of the drywood termite damage at the
20 wood deck on the February 17, 2010, and March 19, 2010, inspection reports, as defined by
21 California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1990(a)(4).

22 l. Respondent failed to report subterranean termite damage at the wood deck framing on
23 the July 23, 2009, and March 19, 2010, inspection reports, and the full extent of the subterranean
24 termite damage at the wood deck on the February 17, 2010, inspection report, as defined by
25 California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1990(a)(4).

26 m. Respondent failed to report earth-to-wood contact at the wood deck load posts on the
27 July 23, 2009, inspection report, as defined by California Code of Regulations, title 16, section
28 1990(b)(4) and 1993(d).

1 n. Respondent failed to report decay fungi damage at the framing of the nook below the
2 wood deck on the July 23, 2009, and February 17, 2010, inspection reports, as defined by
3 California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1990(a)(4).

4 o. Respondent failed to report evidence of an excessive moisture condition (water
5 damage) and decay fungi damage at the storage area below the wood deck on the July 23, 2009,
6 and February 17, 2010, inspection reports, as defined by California Code of Regulations, title 16,
7 section 1990(a)(4) and 1990(b)(5).

8 p. Respondent failed to report portions of the attic that are inaccessible due to
9 construction on the July 23, 2009, and February 17, 2010, inspection reports, as defined by
10 California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1990(d).

11 q. Respondent failed to report water damage at the wood deck storage area on the
12 March 19, 2010, inspection report, as defined by California Code of Regulations, title 16, section
13 1990(b)(5).

14 r. Respondent failed to report decay fungi damage at the wood deck nook on the
15 March 19, 2010, inspection report, as defined by California Code of Regulations, title 16, section
16 1990(b)(4).

17 s. Respondent failed to report the full extent of the substandard repair work previously
18 completed at the wood deck on the March 19, 2010, inspection report.

19 t. Respondent failed to report substandard repair work previously completed at the
20 wood deck on the February 17, 2010, inspection report.

21 **Section 8516(b)(6) and (7) and (10):**

22 u. Respondent failed to make a proper finding and recommendation regarding the
23 reported fungus damage at the porch post on the July 23, 2009, inspection report; and at the
24 deck/patio on the February 17, 2010, inspection report. The findings failed to report the cause of
25 the infection, and the recommendations failed to include a recommendation to correct the
26 excessive moisture condition that caused the infection, as defined by California Code of
27 Regulations, title 16, section 1991(a)(5).

28 ///

1 v. Respondent failed to make a proper finding and recommendation regarding the
2 reported fungus damage at the wood deck storage area on the March 19, 2010, inspection report.
3 The findings failed to report the cause of the infection, and the recommendation failed to include
4 a recommendation to correct the excessive moisture condition that caused the infection, as
5 defined by California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1991(a)(5).

6 **Section 8516(b)(10):**

7 w. Respondent failed to make a proper recommendation regarding the reported evidence
8 of subterranean termites in the substructure on the July 23, 2009, and February 17, 2010,
9 inspection reports. The recommendations failed to include a recommendation to remove the
10 accessible evidence of infestation, as defined by California Code of Regulations, title 16, section
11 1991(a)(9).

12 x. Respondent failed to make a recommendation for the water stains reported in the
13 substructure, the evidence of drywood termites reported at the decks/patios, and the water stains
14 reported at the decks/patios on the February 17, 2010, inspection reports, as defined by California
15 Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1990(g).

16 y. Respondent failed to make a proper recommendation regarding the water stains in the
17 substructure reported on the February 17, 2010, and March 19, 2010, inspection reports. A
18 recommendation was not made to have the proper tradesmen determine the source of the water
19 stains, and to make repairs if needed, as defined by California Code of Regulations, title 16,
20 section 1990(b)(5).

21 z. Respondent failed to make a proper recommendation regarding the inaccessible
22 portion of the substructure, reported on the March 19, 2010, inspection report. The
23 recommendation failed to include a recommendation for further inspection of the inaccessible
24 substructure, and the issuance of a "supplemental" inspection report, as defined by California
25 Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1993(d).

26 aa. Respondent failed to make a proper recommendation regarding the reported evidence
27 of drywood termites at the decks/patios on the March 19, 2010, inspection report. The
28

1 recommendation failed to include a recommendation to cover or remove the accessible evidence
2 of infestation, as defined by California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1991(a)(8).

3 bb. Respondent failed to make a proper recommendation regarding the drywood termite
4 damage at the decks/patios reported on the March 19, 2010, inspection report. A
5 recommendation was made to just patch the damage, when the damage needs to be replaced, as
6 defined by California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1991(a)(5).

7 **THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

8 **(Workmanship)**

9 36. Respondent's registration and operator's license are subject to discipline under
10 Code section 8641, in that on the Lieber property, he failed to complete all work to meet accepted
11 trade standards for good and workmanlike construction in any material respect, as defined by
12 California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1937.14, in the following respects:

13 **Inspection Report No. 5527, dated July 23, 2009:**

14 a. Respondent failed to properly repair the fungus damage at the side porch post, in that
15 instead of replacing the entire board, only a section was cut out and replaced, and the replaced
16 section was loose.

17 b. Respondent failed to properly repair the damage at the wood deck framing, in that the
18 replacements are not properly cut, nailed, or installed; some of the replacements are split; some of
19 the damage was sloppily patched, when it should have been replaced; some of the damage was
20 sloppily patched and not sanded; and the downspout was not properly installed.

21 **Inspection Report No. 5527A, dated February 17, 2010:**

22 c. Respondent failed to properly repair the reinforcements at the subterranean termite
23 damage in the substructure, in that a cleat was not used to support the reinforcements; the
24 reinforcements were either toe-nailed into the floor joist, or nailed through the floor joist into the
25 reinforcements.

26 d. Respondent failed to properly repair the decay fungi damage and excessive moisture
27 condition (water stains) at the framing below the side carriage porch, in that scrap lumber was
28

1 randomly installed under the porch, serving little or no purpose at all, and the boards that
2 appeared to have a purpose were not properly nailed.

3 e. Respondent failed to properly repair the damage at the earth-to-wood contact at the
4 wood deck load posts, in that instead of leveling the soil beneath the wood deck, a stretch was
5 created around the load posts, which has already started to allow the earth to re-accumulate
6 against the wood in the trenches.

7 f. Respondent failed to properly repair the decay fungi damage at the framing of the nook
8 below the wood deck, in that it is not properly installed or nailed.

9 g. Respondent failed to properly repair the decay fungi damage at the framing of the
10 storage area below the wood deck, in that the repair work is not properly installed.

11 **FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

12 **(Violation of Contract)**

13 37. Respondent's registration and operator's license are subject to discipline under Code
14 section 8638, in that, concerning the Lieber property, Respondent failed to complete the
15 following work, as set forth in the Completion Notice dated February 19, 2010:

- 16 a. Respondent failed to remove the cellulose debris in the substructure.
- 17 b. Respondent failed to repair the subterranean termite damage in the substructure.
- 18 c. Respondent failed to remove the evidence of subterranean termites in the attic.
- 19 d. Respondent failed to repair the drywood termite damage at the wood deck framing.

20 **FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

21 **(Failed to Comply with Report of Findings)**

22 38. Respondent's registration and operator's license are subject to discipline under Code
23 section 8641, in that he failed to comply with Code section 8622, by failing to correct the items
24 described in the Report of Findings within thirty (30) calendar days of receipt of the Notice,
25 bringing the Lieber property into compliance with the Board's Notice and Report of Findings,
26 dated January 5, 2010.

27 ///

28 ///

1 SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

2 (Aiding and Abetting)

3 39. Respondent's registration and operator's license are subject to discipline under
4 Code section 8639, in that on or about March 19, 2010, on the Lieber property, Respondent aided
5 or abetted an unlicensed individual or knowingly combined or conspired with an unlicensed
6 individual, Ruben Salas, to evade the provisions of the Structural Pest Control Act, in that Ruben
7 Salas performed an inspection of the attic space over the garage.

8 SEVENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

9 (Grossly Negligent or Fraud Act)

10 40. Respondent's registration and operator's license are subject to discipline under
11 Code section 8642, in that, on or about July 23, 2009, concerning the Lieber property,
12 Respondent committed a grossly negligent or fraudulent act by failing to indicate on Inspection
13 Report No. 5527, what type of report he was issuing.

14 PRIOR DISCIPLINE/MATTERS IN AGGRAVATION

15 41. In a Decision and Order effective December 3, 2008, *In the Matter of the*
16 *Accusation Against Zappen Exterminating; Joseph W. Zappen*, Case No. 2008-14, Respondent's
17 Company Registration Certificate No. PR 3982 and Operator's License No. OPR 10234, in
18 Branch 3, were revoked. The revocations were stayed and Respondent was placed on three (3)
19 years probation under certain terms and conditions. In addition, Respondent was suspended from
20 practicing for ten (10) business days. A true and correct copy of the Decision and Order,
21 Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order, and Accusation in Case No. 2008-14, are attached
22 hereto as **Exhibit A**, and incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth.

23 42. In a Decision and Order effective June 25, 2010, *In the Matter of the Accusation*
24 *Against Zappen Exterminating; Joseph W. Zappen*, Case No. 2009-37, Respondent's Company
25 Registration Certificate No. PR 3982 and Operator's License No. OPR 10234, in Branch 3, were
26 revoked. The revocations were stayed and Respondent was placed on an additional two (2) years
27 probation beyond the three (3) year term of probation set forth in the Decision and Order in
28 Accusation No. 2008-14, which was to expire on December 30, 2011. A true and correct copy of

1 the Decision and Order, Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order, and Accusation in Case
2 No. 2009-37, are attached hereto as **Exhibit B**, and incorporated herein by reference as though
3 fully set forth.

4 **Company Registration No. PR 3982**

5 43. On or about November 29, 2005, the company registration paid a fine in the
6 amount of \$50 levied by the Los Angeles County Agricultural Commissioner for violating Code
7 section 8505.17.

8 44. On or about July 2, 2008, the company registration paid a fine in the amount of \$50
9 levied by the Los Angeles County Agricultural Commissioner for violating Code section 8505.17.

10 45. On or about December 14, 2009, the company registration paid a fine in the amount
11 of \$50 levied by the Los Angeles County Agricultural Commissioner for violating Code section
12 8505.17.

13 **Operator License No. OPR 10234**

14 46. On or about December 14, 2009, the company registration paid a fine in the amount
15 of \$50 levied by the Los Angeles County Agricultural Commissioner for violating Code section
16 8505.17.

17 **OTHER MATTERS**

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

24 48. Pursuant to Code section 8624, if Operator's License No. OPR 10234, issued to
25 Joseph W. Zappen, is suspended or revoked, the Board may suspend or revoke Company
26 Registration No. PR 3982, issued to Zappen Exterminating.

27 49. Pursuant to Code section 8624, the causes for discipline established as to Zappen
28 Exterminating, likewise constitutes causes for discipline against Joseph W. Zappen, regardless of

1 whether he had knowledge of or participated in the acts or omissions which constitute causes for
2 discipline against Zappen Exterminating.

3 50. Pursuant to Code section 8654, if discipline is imposed on Operator's License No.
4 OPR 10234, issued to Joseph W. Zappen, then Joseph W. Zappen shall be prohibited from
5 serving as an officer, director, associate, partner, qualifying manager, or responsible managing
6 employee for any registered company during the time the discipline is imposed, and any
7 registered company which employs, elects, or associates Joseph W. Zappen, shall be subject to
8 disciplinary action.

9 **PRAYER**

10 **WHEREFORE**, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged,
11 and that following the hearing, the Structural Pest Control Board issue a decision:

12 1. Revoking or suspending Company Registration Certificate Number PR 3982, issued
13 to Zappen Exterminating;

14 2. Revoking or suspending Operator's License Number OPR 10234, issued to Joseph
15 W. Zappen;

16 3. Revoking or suspending any other license for which Joseph W. Zappen is furnishing
17 the qualifying experience or appearance;

18 4. Ordering restitution of all damages according to proof suffered by Elaine Lieber as a
19 condition of probation in the event probation is ordered;

20 5. Prohibiting Joseph W. Zappen from serving as an officer, director, associate, partner,
21 qualifying manager or responsible managing employee of any registered company during the
22 period that discipline is imposed on Company Registration Certificate Number PR 3982, issued to
23 Zappen Exterminating;

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 6. Ordering Joseph W. Zappen to pay the Structural Pest Control Board the reasonable
2 costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions
3 Code section 125.3; and,

4 7. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

5 DATED: 10/11/10



KELLI OKUMA
Registrar/Executive Officer
Structural Pest Control Board
Department of Pesticide Regulation
State of California
Complainant

10 LA2010503622
11 10614370.doc

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