, 18

///

3. On or about February 16, 2012, Respondent was served by Certified and First Class Mail copies of the Petition to Revoke Probation No. 2011-24, 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 business address of record which, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 136, is required to be reported and maintained with the Board. Respondent's business address of record was and is:

## 15314 Devonshire Street, Suite C Mission Hills, CA 91345

- 4. On or about March 12, 2012, the aforementioned documents were returned by the U.S. Postal Service marked "Not At This Address" and "Attempted-Not Known-Return to Sender."
- 5. On or about March 13, 2012, Respondent was served by Certified and First Class Mail copies of the Petition to Revoke Probation No. 2011-24, 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 residential address of record which, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 136, is required to be reported and maintained with the Board. Respondent's residential address of record was and is:

## 3890 Santa Cruz Ct. Simi Valley, CA 93063.

6. The addresses on the documents are the same as the addresses 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 addresses 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.

22.

///

- 7. Service of the Petition to Revoke Probation was effective as a matter of law under the provisions of Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c) and/or Business & Professions

  Code section 124.
  - 8. 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.
- 9. Respondent failed to file a Notice of Defense within 15 days after service upon him of the Petition to Revoke Probation, and therefore waived his right to a hearing on the merits of Petition to Revoke Probation No. 2011-24.
  - 10. 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.
- 11. 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 Petition to Revoke Probation No. 2011-24 finds that the charges and allegations in Petition to Revoke Probation No. 2011-24, are separately and severally, found to be true and correct by clear and convincing evidence.
- 12. 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 \$4,915.00 (\$2,900.00 investigation costs and \$2,015.00 prosecution costs) as of April 6, 2012.

## **DETERMINATION OF ISSUES**

- 1. Based on the foregoing findings of fact, Respondent Cesar Ruiz Alvarado has subjected his Applicator License No. RA 51605 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 Petition to Revoke Probation which are supported by the evidence contained in the Default Decision Evidence Packet in this case:
- a. Condition 1 of the terms and conditions of probation contained in the decision in Case No. 2011-24 provides that Respondent shall obey all laws and rules relating to the practice of structural pest control.
- b. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to comply with Probation Condition No. 1, referenced above. The facts and circumstances regarding this violation are that Respondent failed to obey all laws and rules relating to the practice of structural pest control in that he failed to comply with Business and Professions Code section 8567 and California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1911 in that Respondent failed to notify on a form prescribed by the Board his change of employment and address of record. Further, Respondent failed to comply with California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1937.12 (a)(1) in that Respondent failed to file quarterly reports as indicated in paragraph 11 below which is incorporated herein.
- c. Probation Condition No. 3 of the terms and conditions of probation contained in the decision in Case No. 2011-24 provides that Respondent shall file quarterly reports with the Board during the period of probation. Respondent Sampson's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to file Quarterly Reports for the probation period beginning December 21, 2010 to November 21, 2011.

///

## ORDER

IT IS SO ORDERED that Applicator License No. RA 51605, heretofore issued to Respondent Cesar Ruiz Alvarado, 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 July 20, 2012

It is so ORDERED June 20, 2012

FOR THE STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL

BOARD

DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION

51091757.DOC DOJ Matter ID:LA2012506170

Attachment:

Exhibit A: Petition to Revoke Probation