3. On or about October 3, 2013, Respondent was served by Certified and First Class Mail copies of the Accusation No. 2014-20, Statement to Respondent, Notice of Defense, Request for Discovery, and Discovery Statutes (Government Code sections 11507.5, 11507.6, and 11507.7) at Respondent's address of record which, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 136, is required to be reported and maintained with the Board. Respondent's address of record was and is:

22479 Birds Eye Drive Diamond Bar, CA 91765.

- 4. Service of the Accusation was effective as a matter of law under the provisions of Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c) and/or Business & Professions Code section 124.
- 5. On or about October 11, 2013, the aforementioned documents were returned by the U.S. Postal Service marked "No Forwarding Address." The address on the documents was the same as the address on file with the Board. Respondent failed to maintain an updated address with the Board and the Board has made attempts to serve the Respondent at the address on file. Respondent has not made himself available for service and therefore, has not availed himself of his right to file a notice of defense and appear at hearing.
 - 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. Respondent failed to file a Notice of Defense within 15 days after service upon him of the Accusation, and therefore waived his right to a hearing on the merits of Accusation No. 2014-20.
 - 8. California 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.

 9. 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 relevant evidence contained in the Default Decision Evidence Packet in this matter, as well as taking official notice of all the investigatory reports, exhibits and statements contained therein on file at the Board's offices regarding the allegations contained in Accusation No. 2014-20 and finds that the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 2014-20, are separately and severally, found to be true and correct by clear and convincing evidence.

10. Taking official notice of its own internal records, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 125.3, it is hereby determined that the reasonable costs for Investigation and Enforcement is \$3195.00 as of November 10, 2013.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

- 1. Based on the foregoing findings of fact, Respondent Rodney J. Overstreet, Jr. has subjected his Applicator License No. RA 51309 to discipline.
 - 2. The agency has jurisdiction to adjudicate this case by default.
- 3. The Structural Pest Control Board is authorized to revoke Respondent's Applicator License based upon the following violations alleged in the Accusation which are supported by the evidence contained in the Default Decision Evidence Packet in this case.

a. FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Conviction of a Substantially Related Crime)

1. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under sections 8649 and 490, in conjunction with California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1937.1, in that Respondent has been convicted of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a licensed applicator. On or about June 11, 2013 in the criminal proceeding entitled *The People of the State of California v. Rodney Jerome Overstreet* (Super. Ct. Orange County, 2012, No. 12WM08835), Respondent was convicted on his plea of guilty to the following three counts: (1) one misdemeanor count of violating Penal Code section 496, subdivision (a) [receiving known stolen property]; (2) one misdemeanor count of violating Penal Code section 484, subdivision