3. On or about April 28, 2010, Juana Mejia, an employee of the Department of Justice, served by Certified and First Class Mail a copy of the Accusation No. 2010-75, 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:

12930 Court Street, #4 Garden Grove, CA 92841.

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

- 4. Service of the Accusation was effective as a matter of law under the provisions of Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c).
- 5. On or about May 24, 2010, the aforementioned documents sent via Certified Mail were returned by the U.S. Postal Service marked "Unclaimed." The aforementioned documents sent via First Class Mail were not returned by the U.S. Postal Service.
 - 6. Government Code section 11506 states, in pertinent part:
 - (c) The respondent shall be entitled to a hearing on the merits if the respondent files a notice of defense, and the notice shall be deemed a specific denial of all parts of the accusation not expressly admitted. Failure to file a notice of defense shall constitute a waiver of respondent's right to a hearing, but the agency in its discretion may nevertheless grant a hearing.
 - 7. Government Code section 11520 states, in pertinent part:
 - (a) If the respondent either fails to file a notice of defense or to appear at the hearing, the agency may take action based upon the respondent's express admissions or upon other evidence and affidavits may be used as evidence without any notice to respondent.
- 8. Pursuant to its authority under Government Code section 11520, the Board finds Respondent is in default. The Board will take action without further hearing and, based on the evidence on file herein, finds that the allegations in Accusation No. 2010-75 are true.
- 9. The total cost for investigation and enforcement in connection with the Accusation are One Thousand Eight Hundred and Forty-Five dollars (\$1,845.00) as of May 28, 2010.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

1. Based on the foregoing findings of fact, Respondent Carlos M. Rueda aka Carlos Morales has subjected his Registered Applicator's License No. RA 48491 to discipline.

- 2. A copy of the Accusation is attached.
- 3. The agency has jurisdiction to adjudicate this case by default.
- 4. The Structural Pest Control Board is authorized to revoke Respondent's Registered Applicator's License based upon the following violations alleged in the Accusation. On or about February 11, 2010, Respondent was convicted of a crime, aggravated assault with a deadly weapon and instrument, golf club, as defined in Penal Code section 245(a)(1), which is substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a structural pest control applicator. Respondent's Registration is subject to disciplinary action under Business and Professions Code sections 490 and 8649.

ORDER

IT IS SO ORDERED that Registered Applicator's License No. RA 48491, heretofore issued to Respondent Carlos M. Rueda aka Carlos Morales, is revoked.

Pursuant to Government Code section 11520, subdivision (c), Respondent may serve a written motion requesting that the Decision be vacated and stating the grounds relied on within seven (7) days after service of the Decision on Respondent. The agency in its discretion may vacate the Decision and grant a hearing on a showing of good cause, as defined in the statute.

This Decision shall become effective on ____ August 22, 2010

It is so ORDERED July 23, 2010

FOR THE STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION

80465388.DOC DOJ docket number;SD2010800486

Exhibit A: Accusation No. 2010-75

Exhibit A Accusation No. 2010-75

1 2	EDMUND G. BROWN JR. Attorney General of California LINDA K. SCHNEIDER	
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General NICOLE R. COOK Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 263607 Helli Chuma	
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 263607	_
5	110 West "A" Street, Suite 1100 San Diego, CA 92101	
6	P.O. Box 85266 San Diego, CA 92186-5266	
7	Telephone: (619) 645-2143 Facsimile: (619) 645-2061	
8	Attorneys for Complainant	
9	BEFORE THE STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD	
	DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
10	STATE OF CADIFORNIA	
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against: Case No. 2010-75	
12	, and the same of	
13	CARLOS M. RUEDA a.k.a. CARLOS MORALES ACCUSATION	ļ
14	12930 Court Street, #4 Garden Grove, CA 92841	
15		
16	Registered Applicator's License No. RA 48491	
17	Respondent.	
18		
19		
20	Complainant alleges:	ľ
21	PARTIES	
22	1. Kelli Okuma (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity as	
23	the Executive Officer of the Structural Pest Control Board, Department of Pesticide Regulation.	
24	2. On or about February 11, 2008, the Structural Pest Control Board issued Registered	
25	Applicator's License Number RA 48491 to Carlos M. Rueda also known as Carlos Morales	
26	(Respondent). The Registered Applicator's License was in full force and effect at all times	
27	relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on February 11, 2011, unless renewed.	
28		
	1	

Accusation

JURISDICTION

- 3. This Accusation is brought before the Structural Pest Control Board (Board),
 Department of Pesticide Regulation, under the authority of the following laws. All section
 references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.
- 4. Section 8620 of the Business and Professions Code (Code) provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may suspend or revoke a license when it finds that the holder, while a licensee or applicant, has committed any acts or omissions constituting cause for disciplinary action or in lieu of a suspension may assess a civil penalty.
 - 5. Section 8625 of the Code states:

The lapsing or suspension of a license or company registration by 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 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 such license or registration.

6. Section 8649 of the Code states:

Conviction of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a structural pest control operator, field representative, applicator, or registered company is a ground for disciplinary action. The certified record of conviction shall be conclusive evidence thereof.

7. Section 118(b), of the Code provides that the suspension, expiration, surrender, or cancellation of a license shall not deprive the Board of jurisdiction to proceed with a disciplinary action during the period within which the license may be renewed, restored, reissued or reinstated.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

8. Section 482 of the Code states:

Each board under the provisions of this code shall develop criteria to evaluate the rehabilitation of a person when:

- (a) Considering the denial of a license by the board under Section 480; or
- (b) Considering suspension or revocation of a license under Section 490.

Each board shall take into account all competent evidence of rehabilitation furnished by the applicant or licensee.

- 9. Section 490 of the Code states, in pertinent part, that the Board may suspend or revoke a license when it finds that the licensee has been convicted of a crime.
 - 10. Section 493 of the Code states:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in a proceeding conducted by a board within the department pursuant to law to deny an application for a license or to suspend or revoke a license or otherwise take disciplinary action against a person who holds a license, upon the ground that the applicant or the licensee has been convicted of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of the licensee in question, the record of conviction of the crime shall be conclusive evidence of the fact that the conviction occurred, but only of that fact, and the board may inquire into the circumstances surrounding the commission of the crime in order to fix the degree of discipline or to determine if the conviction is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of the licensee in question.

As used in this section, "license" includes "certificate," "permit," "authority," and "registration."

REGULATORY PROVISIONS

11. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1937.1 states:

For the purposes of denial, suspension or revocation of a license or company registration pursuant to Division 1.5 (commencing with Section 475) of the code, a crime or act shall be considered to be substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a licensee or registered company under Chapter 14 of Division 3 of the code if to a substantial degree it evidences present or potential unfitness of such licensee or registered company to perform the functions authorized by the license or company registration in a manner consistent with the public health, safety, or welfare. Such crimes or acts shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- (a) Any violation of the provisions of Chapter 14 of Division 3 of the code.
- (b) Commission of any of the following in connection with the practice of structural pest control:
 - (1) Fiscal dishonesty
 - (2) Fraud
 - (3) Theft

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

2122

2324

25

26 . 27

28

crime that is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a structural pest control field representative.

- The circumstances which led to the conviction are that on or about August 17, a. 2009, an officer from the Orange County Sheriff's Department responded to a radio dispatch concerning a "road rage" incident in the City of Stanton. The officer located the victim at the scene, who indicated that he was driving on Acacia Street when a vehicle behind him began honking at him as if he was driving too slowly. The driver of that vehicle was later identified as Respondent. Respondent then pulled his vehicle alongside the victim's vehicle and started cursing at the victim and the victim's passenger. The victim then "flipped off" Respondent. Respondent then sped past the victim, approached the intersection and pulled his vehicle in a perpendicular position blocking the victim's vehicle so that it could not pass through. Respondent then exited the vehicle with a golf club, and broke the victim's windshield with the club sending glass fragments inside the interior of the victim's vehicle. The victim believed that glass had flown into his eyes. As Respondent smashed the windshield, the victim feared that the golf club would break through the window and strike him. Fearing for his life, the victim then quickly exited his vehicle, which was not geared in the "park" position. The victim's vehicle then lunged forward and struck the Respondent's vehicle. Respondent got back into his vehicle and drove off.
 - b. The officer performed a records check of the vehicle driven by Respondent and then went to the registered owner's location. Because Respondent was not at the residence, the officer asked Respondent's wife to telephone him and request that he come home. Respondent appeared a short time later and indicated that he knew why the officers were looking for him. Respondent admitted that after he smashed the windshield, he became scared and dropped the vehicle off at a friend's house. Respondent admitted that the incident started when he honked his horn at the vehicle. Respondent also stated that he got so angry that he "blacked-out" momentarily, that he drove after the victim's vehicle, cut-off the vehicle and then stopped in front of it. Respondent admitted that he hit the windshield with the golf club while the victim and the victim's passenger were in the vehicle. He also stated that he had an anger problem and often hits

Accusation