

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
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
FOR THE BUREAU OF AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

**YORBA LINDA TEST ONLY SMOG CHECK
KYEONG SOOK KIM, OWNER
17071 Imperial Highway Suite A9
Yorba Linda, California 92886**

**Automotive Repair Dealer Registration No.
ARD 226705**

**Smog Check-Test Only Station License No. TC
226705**

Respondents.

Case No. 79/13-55

DEFAULT DECISION AND ORDER

[Gov. Code, §11520]

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. On February 26, 2013, Complainant John Wallauch, in his official capacity as the Chief of the Bureau of Automotive Repair (Bureau), Department of Consumer Affairs, filed Accusation No. 79/13-55 against Respondent Kyeong Sook Kim, owner of Yorba Linda Test Only Smog Check before the Director of Consumer Affairs. (Accusation attached as Exhibit A.)
2. On March 28, 2003, the Bureau issued Automotive Repair Dealer Registration No. ARD 226705 (registration) to Respondent. The registration was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought in Accusation No. 79/13-55 and will expire on March 31, 2014, unless renewed.

1 3. On April 15, 2003, the Bureau issued Smog Check-Test Only Station License No. TC
2 226705 (license) to Respondent. The license was in full force and effect at all times relevant to
3 the charges brought in Accusation No. 79/13-55 and will expire on March 31, 2014, unless
4 renewed.

5 4. On February 26, 2013, Respondent was served by Certified and First Class Mail
6 copies of the Accusation No. 79/13-55, Statement to Respondent, Notice of Defense, Request for
7 Discovery, and Discovery Statutes (Government Code sections 11507.5, 11507.6, and 11507.7) at
8 Respondent's address of record which, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 136, is
9 required to be reported and maintained with the Bureau. Respondent's address of record was and
10 is 17071 Imperial Highway Suite A9, Yorba Linda, California 92886.

11 5. Service of the Accusation was effective as a matter of law under the provisions of
12 Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c) and/or Business & Professions Code section
13 124.

14 6. On March 1, 2013, the aforementioned documents were signed for on respondent's
15 behalf

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

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

22 8. Respondent failed to file a Notice of Defense within 15 days after service upon her of
23 the Accusation, and therefore waived her right to a hearing on the merits of Accusation No.
24 79/13-55.

25 9. California Government Code section 11520 states, in pertinent part:

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

 10. Pursuant to its authority under Government Code section 11520, the Director after
having reviewed the proof of service dated February 26, 2013, and USPS certified mail and

1 tracking receipts finds Respondent is in default. The Director will take action without further
2 hearing and, based on Accusation, No. 79/13-55, proof of service and on the Affidavit of Bureau
3 Representative Steven R. Miller, finds that the allegations in Accusation are true.

4 11. Taking official notice of its own internal records, pursuant to Business and
5 Professions Code section 125.3, it is hereby determined that the reasonable costs for Investigation
6 and Enforcement are \$8,220.69 as of March 18, 2013.

7 DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

8 1. Based on the foregoing findings of fact, Respondent Kyeong Sook Kim, owner of
9 Yorba Linda Test Only Smog Check has subjected her Automotive Repair Dealer Registration
10 No. ARD 226705 and Smog Check-Test Only Station License No. TC 226705 to discipline.

11 2. The agency has jurisdiction to adjudicate this case by default.

12 3. The Director of Consumer Affairs is authorized to revoke Respondent's Automotive
13 Repair Dealer Registration and Smog Check-Test Only Station License based upon the following
14 violations alleged in the Accusation which are supported by the evidence contained in the
15 affidavit of Bureau Representative Steven R. Miller in this case.

16 a. Respondent has subjected her registration to discipline under Code section
17 9884.7, subdivision (a)(1), in that on April 24, 2012, she made statements which she knew or
18 which by exercise of reasonable care she should have known were untrue or misleading when
19 she issued electronic Certificate of Compliance No. [REDACTED] for a 1984 Ford F-250 Truck,
20 certifying that the vehicle was in compliance with applicable laws and regulations when, in fact,
21 the vehicle had a modified carburetor and disconnected evaporative emission control system
22 hoses and was not in compliance with those laws and regulations.

23 b. Respondent has subjected her registration to discipline under Code section
24 9884.7, subdivision (a)(4), in that on April 24, 2012, she committed acts which constitute fraud
25 by issuing electronic Certificate of Compliance No. [REDACTED] for a 1984 Ford F-250 Truck
26 without performing a bona fide visual inspection of the carburetor and evaporative emission
27 control system hoses on the vehicle.

1 c. Respondent has subjected her station license to discipline under H & S Code
2 section 44072.2, subdivision (a), in that on April 24, 2012, regarding a 1984 Ford F-250 Truck,
3 she violated the following sections of that Code:

4 i. **Section 44012, subdivision (f):** Respondent failed to perform emission
5 control tests on the vehicle in accordance with procedures prescribed by the department.

6 ii. **Section 44015, subdivision (b):** Respondent issued electronic Certificate
7 of Compliance No. [REDACTED] without properly testing and inspecting the vehicle to determine if
8 it was in compliance with section 44012 of that Code.

9 iii. **Section 44059:** Respondent willfully made false entries for electronic
10 Certificate of Compliance No. [REDACTED] by certifying that the vehicle had been inspected as
11 required when, in fact, it had not.

12 d. Respondent has subjected her station license to discipline under H & S Code
13 section 44072.2, subdivision (c), in that on April 24, 2012, regarding a 1984 Ford F-250 Truck,
14 she violated the following sections of the Regulations:

15 i. **Section 3340.24, subdivision (c):** Respondent falsely or fraudulently
16 issued electronic Certificate of Compliance No. [REDACTED] without performing a bona fide
17 inspection of the carburetor and evaporative emission control system hoses on the vehicle as
18 required by H & S Code section 44012.

19 ii. **Section 3340.35, subdivision (c):** Respondent issued electronic
20 Certificate of Compliance No. [REDACTED] even though the vehicle had not been inspected in
21 accordance with H & S Code section 3340.42.

22 iii. **Section 3340.42:** Respondent failed to conduct the required smog tests
23 and inspections on the vehicle in accordance with the Bureau's specifications.

24 e. Respondent has subjected her station license to discipline under H & S Code
25 section 44072.2, subdivision (d), in that on April 24, 2012, regarding a 1984 Ford F-250 Truck,
26 she committed acts involving dishonesty, fraud or deceit whereby another was injured by issuing
27 electronic Certificate of Compliance No. [REDACTED] for that vehicle without performing a bona
28

1 fide inspection of the emission control devices and systems on the vehicle, thereby depriving the
2 citizens of the State of California the benefits of the Motor Vehicle Inspection Program.

3 **ORDER**

4 IT IS SO ORDERED that Automotive Repair Dealer Registration No. ARD 226705, and
5 Smog Check-Test Only Station License No. TC 226705, heretofore issued to Respondent Kyeong
6 Sook Kim, owner of Yorba Linda Test Only Smog Check, are revoked.

7 Pursuant to Government Code section 11520, subdivision (c), Respondent may serve a
8 written motion requesting that the Decision be vacated and stating the grounds relied on within
9 seven days after service of the Decision on Respondent. The motion should be sent to the Bureau
10 of Automotive Repair, ATTN: William D. Thomas, 10949 North Mather Blvd., Rancho
11 Cordova, CA 95670. The agency in its discretion may vacate the Decision and grant a hearing
12 on a showing of good cause, as defined in the statute.

13 This Decision shall become effective on 4/19/13.

14 It is so ORDERED March 29, 2013

15
16 
17 _____
18 DONALD CHANG
19 Assistant Chief Counsel
20 Department of Consumer Affairs
21
22
23

24 Attachments:
25 Exhibit A: Accusation
26 Exhibit B: USPS Certified Mail Receipt & Tracking Record

27 70700442.DOC
28 DOJ Matter ID:SD2012703917

1 KAMALA D. HARRIS
Attorney General of California
2 LINDA K. SCHNEIDER
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
3 G. MICHAEL GERMAN
Deputy Attorney General
4 State Bar No. 103312
110 West "A" Street, Suite 1100
5 San Diego, CA 92101
P.O. Box 85266
6 San Diego, CA 92186-5266
Telephone: (619) 645-2617
7 Facsimile: (619) 645-2061
Attorneys for Complainant

8 **BEFORE THE**
9 **DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS**
10 **FOR THE BUREAU OF AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR**
11 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

11 In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 79/13-55
12 YORBA LINDA TEST ONLY SMOG CHECK	ACCUSATION
13 KYEONG SOOK KIM, OWNER	SMOG CHECK
14 17071 Imperial Highway, Suite A9 Yorba Linda, California 92886	
15 Automotive Repair Dealer Registration No. ARD 226705	
16 Smog Check-Test Only Station License No. TC 226705	
17 Respondent.	

18
19 Complainant alleges:

20 **PARTIES**

21 1. Complainant John Wallauch brings this Accusation solely in his official capacity
22 as the Chief of the Bureau of Automotive Repair (Bureau), Department of Consumer Affairs.

23 **Automotive Repair Dealer Registration**

24 2. On March 28, 2003, the Bureau of Automotive Repair issued Automotive Repair
25 Dealer (ARD) Registration Number 226705 to Respondent Kyeong Sook Kim, Owner of Yorba
26 Linda Test Only Smog Check. Respondent's ARD registration was in full force and effect at all
27 times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on March 31, 2013, unless renewed.

28

1 9. Code section 9884.7 states, in pertinent part:

2 (a) The director, where the automotive repair dealer cannot show there
3 was a bona fide error, may deny, suspend, revoke, or place on probation the
4 registration of an automotive repair dealer for any of the following acts or
5 omissions related to the conduct of the business of the automotive repair dealer,
6 which are done by the automotive repair dealer or any automotive technician,
7 employee, partner, officer, or member of the automotive repair dealer.

8 (1) Making or authorizing in any manner or by any means
9 whatever any statement written or oral which is untrue or misleading, and which
10 is known, or which by the exercise of reasonable care should be known, to be
11 untrue or misleading.

12
13 (4) Any other conduct that constitutes fraud.

14
15 (6) Failure in any material respect to comply with the provisions
16 of this chapter or regulations adopted pursuant to it.

17
18 (b) Except as provided for in subdivision (c), if an automotive repair
19 dealer operates more than one place of business in this state, the director pursuant
20 to subdivision (a) shall only suspend, revoke, or place on probation the
21 registration of the specific place of business which has violated any of the
22 provisions of this chapter. This violation, or action by the director, shall not
23 affect in any manner the right of the automotive repair dealer to operate her or her
24 other places of business.

25 (c) Notwithstanding subdivision (b), the director may suspend, revoke,
26 or place on probation the registration for all places of business operated in this
27 state by an automotive repair dealer upon a finding that the automotive repair
28 dealer has, or is, engaged in a course of repeated and willful violations of this
chapter, or regulations adopted pursuant to it.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

10. H & S Code section 44012 states:

21 The test at the smog check stations shall be performed in accordance with
22 procedures prescribed by the department and may require loaded mode
23 dynamometer testing in enhanced areas, two-speed idle testing, testing utilizing a
24 vehicle's onboard diagnostic system, or other appropriate test procedures as
25 determined by the department in consultation with the state board. The
26 department shall implement testing using onboard diagnostic systems, in lieu of
27 loaded mode dynamometer or two-speed idle testing, on model year 2000 and
28 newer vehicles only, beginning no earlier than January 1, 2013. However, the
department, in consultation with the state board, may prescribe alternative test
procedures that include loaded mode dynamometer or two-speed idle testing for
vehicles with onboard diagnostic systems that the department and the state board
determine exhibit operational problems. The department shall ensure, as
appropriate to the test method, the following:

1 (a) Emission control systems required by state and federal law are
2 reducing excess emissions in accordance with the standards adopted pursuant to
3 subdivisions (a) and (c) of Section 44013.

4 (f) A visual or functional check is made of emission control devices
5 specified by the department, including the catalytic converter in those instances in
6 which the department determines it to be necessary to meet the findings of
7 Section 44001. The visual or functional check shall be performed in accordance
8 with procedures prescribed by the department.

9 11. H & S Code section 44015 states, in pertinent part:

10 (b) If a vehicle meets the requirements of Section 44012, a smog check
11 station licensed to issue certificates shall issue a certificate of compliance or a
12 certificate of noncompliance.

13 12. H & S Code section 44059 states:

14 *The willful making of any false statement or entry with regard to a*
15 *material matter in any oath, affidavit, certificate of compliance or noncompliance,*
16 *or application form which is required by this chapter or Chapter 20.3*
17 *(commencing with Section 9880) of Division 3 of the Business and Professions*
18 *Code, constitutes perjury and is punishable as provided in the Penal Code.*

19 13. H & S Code section 44072.2 states, in pertinent part:

20 The director may suspend, revoke, or take other disciplinary action against
21 a license as provided in this article if the licensee, or any partner, officer, or
22 director thereof, does any of the following:

23 (a) Violates any section of this chapter [the Motor Vehicle Inspection
24 Program (H & S Code § 44000, et seq.)] and the regulations adopted pursuant to
25 it, which related to the licensed activities.

26 (c) Violates any of the regulations adopted by the director pursuant to this
27 chapter.

28 (d) Commits any act involving dishonesty, fraud, or deceit whereby
another is injured.

14. H & S Code section 44072.8 states:

When a license has been revoked or suspended following a hearing under
this article, any additional license issued under this chapter in the name of the
licensee may be likewise revoked or suspended by the director.

1 **REGULATORY PROVISIONS**

2 15. California Code of Regulations, title 16 (Regulations), section 3340.24 states, in
3 pertinent part:

4
5 (c) The bureau may suspend or revoke the license of or pursue other legal
6 action against a licensee, if the licensee falsely or fraudulently issues or obtains a
7 certificate of compliance or a certificate of noncompliance.

8 16. Section 3340.35, subdivision (c) of the Regulations states:

9 A licensed station shall issue a certificate of compliance or noncompliance
10 to the owner or operator of any vehicle that has been inspected in accordance with
11 the procedures specified in section 3340.42 of this article and has all the required
12 emission control equipment and devices installed and functioning correctly. The
13 following conditions shall apply:

14 (1) Customers shall be charged the same price for certificates as that paid
15 by the licensed station; and

16 (2) Sales tax shall not be assessed on the price of certificates.

17 17. Section 3340.42 of the Regulations states:

18 With the exception of diesel-powered vehicles addressed in subsection (f)
19 of this section, the following emissions test methods and standards apply to all
20 vehicles:

21
22 (e) In addition to the test methods prescribed in this section, the following
23 tests shall apply to all vehicles, except diesel-powered vehicles, during the Smog
24 Check inspection:

25 (1) A visual inspection of the vehicle's emissions control systems. During
26 the visual inspection, the technician shall verify that the following emission
27 control devices, as applicable, are properly installed on the vehicle:

28 (A) air injection systems,

(B) computer(s) and related sensors and switches,

(C) crankcase emissions controls, including positive crankcase ventilation,

(D) exhaust gas after treatment systems, including catalytic converters,

(E) exhaust gas recirculation (EGR) systems,

(F) fuel evaporative emission controls,

(G) fuel metering systems, including carburetors and fuel injection,

(H) ignition spark controls, and

1 (I) any emissions control systems that are not otherwise prompted by the
2 Emissions Inspection System, but listed as a requirement by the vehicle
3 manufacturer.

4

5 (f) On or after January 1, 2010, all 1998 model year and newer diesel-
6 powered vehicles, with a gross vehicle weight rating of 14,000 or less pounds, are
7 subject to the Smog Check Program. The following required inspections apply to
8 all diesel-powered vehicles:

9 (1) A visual inspection of the vehicle's emissions control systems. During
10 the visual inspection, the technician shall verify that the following emission
11 control devices, as applicable, are properly installed on the vehicle:

12 (A) computer(s) and related sensors and switches,

13 (B) crankcase emissions controls,

14 (C) exhaust gas after treatment systems, including catalytic converters and
15 particulate filters,

16 (D) exhaust gas recirculation (EGR) systems,

17 (E) fuel metering systems, including fuel injection, and

18 (F) any emissions control systems that are not otherwise prompted by the
19 Emissions Inspection System, but listed as a requirement by the vehicle
20 manufacturer.

21

22 COST RECOVERY

23 18. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may request
24 the administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or
25 violations of the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation
26 and enforcement of the case, with failure of the licentiate to comply subjecting the license to not
27 being renewed or reinstated. If a case settles, recovery of investigation and enforcement costs
28 may be included in a stipulated settlement.

29 UNDERCOVER OPERATION: 1984 FORD F-250 TRUCK

30 19. On April 5, 2012, in preparation for an undercover operation at Respondent's
31 smog testing station, Yorba Linda Test Only Smog Check, the Bureau prepared one of its
32 vehicles, a 1984 Ford F-250 Truck, to fail a proper smog inspection due to a modified carburetor
33 and disconnected evaporative emission control system hoses. On that same date, the Bureau
34 performed a post-modification smog check on the vehicle, including an Acceleration Simulation

1 Mode (ASM) test. The vehicle failed the visual portion of the inspection due to a modified
2 carburetor and disconnected evaporative emission control system hoses, as confirmed by the
3 Vehicle Inspection Report (VIR) for the tested vehicle, and as it was modified to do.

4 20. On April 24, 2012, a Bureau undercover operator took the vehicle to
5 Respondent's smog station and requested a smog check inspection using the assumed name of
6 Jack Schmidt. The operator signed a work order and received an estimate copy from an
7 employee of Respondent's smog station. After the vehicle was tested, the operator paid the
8 employee \$68.00 and received a copy of invoice number [REDACTED] showing a breakdown of the
9 \$68.00 charged. The operator also received a VIR from the employee indicating that the vehicle
10 passed the visual inspection, functional check, and emissions test conducted by Respondent
11 Alejandro Nunez, Advanced Emission Specialist Technician License Number EA 631311. The
12 VIR indicated that Smog Check Certificate Number [REDACTED] had been electronically
13 transmitted to the Department of Motor Vehicles from station number TC 226705, which
14 corresponds to the station license number issued to Respondent. The operator then returned the
15 vehicle to Bureau custody.

16 21. Later that same day, Bureau personnel re-inspected the vehicle after the smog test
17 at Respondent's smog station. The condition of the vehicle as modified before testing at
18 Respondent's smog station had not changed; the previously modified carburetor had not been
19 replaced and the evaporative emission control system hoses remained disconnected.

20 **FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

21 **(Misleading Statements)**

22 22. Respondent has subjected her registration to discipline under Code section
23 9884.7, subdivision (a)(1), in that on April 24, 2012, she made statements which she knew or
24 which by exercise of reasonable care she should have known were untrue or misleading when
25 she issued electronic Certificate of Compliance No. [REDACTED] for the 1984 Ford F-250 Truck,
26 certifying that the vehicle was in compliance with applicable laws and regulations when, in fact,
27 the vehicle had a modified carburetor and disconnected evaporative emission control system
28 hoses and was not in compliance with those laws and regulations.

1 inspection of the carburetor and evaporative emission control system hoses on the vehicle as
2 required by H & S Code section 44012.

3 b. Section 3340.35, subdivision (c): Respondent issued electronic
4 Certificate of Compliance No. [REDACTED] even though the vehicle had not been inspected in
5 accordance with H & S Code section 3340.42.

6 c. Section 3340.42: Respondent failed to conduct the required smog tests
7 and inspections on the vehicle in accordance with the Bureau's specifications.

8 FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

9 (Dishonesty, Fraud or Deceit)

10 26. Respondent has subjected her station license to discipline under H & S Code
11 section 44072.2, subdivision (d), in that on April 24, 2012, regarding the 1984 Ford F-250 Truck,
12 she committed acts involving dishonesty, fraud or deceit whereby another was injured by issuing
13 electronic Certificate of Compliance No. [REDACTED] for that vehicle without performing a bona
14 fide inspection of the emission control devices and systems on the vehicle, thereby depriving the
15 citizens of the State of California the benefits of the Motor Vehicle Inspection Program.

16 MATTERS IN AGGRAVATION

17 27. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent,
18 Complainant alleges as follows:

19 a. On June 26, 2003, the Bureau issued Citation No. C03-1301 to
20 Respondent, for violations of H & S Code section 44012, subdivision (f) (failure to perform a
21 visual and functional check of emission control devices according to procedures prescribed by
22 the department); and Regulations, section 3340.35, subdivision (c) (issuing a certificate of
23 compliance to a vehicle that was improperly tested). On July 9, 2003, a citation conference was
24 held. The Bureau assessed civil penalties totaling \$500.00 against Respondent for the violations.
25 Respondent paid the fine on July 25, 2003.

26 b. On March 25, 2009, the Bureau issued Citation No. C09-1096 against
27 Respondent, for violations of H & S Code section 44012, subdivision (f) (failure to perform a
28 visual and functional check of emission control devices according to procedures prescribed by

1 the department); and Regulations, section 3340.35, subdivision (c) (issuing a certificate of
2 compliance to a vehicle that was improperly tested). On April 9, 2009, a citation conference was
3 held. The Bureau assessed civil penalties totaling \$500.00 against Respondent for the violations.
4 Respondent paid the fine on April 13, 2009.

5 c. On September 1, 2009, the Bureau issued Citation No. C2010-0167
6 against Respondent, for violations of H & S Code section 44012, subdivision (f) (failure to
7 determine that emission control devices and systems required by state and federal law are
8 installed and functioning correctly in accordance with test procedures); and Regulations, section
9 3340.35, subdivision (c) (issuing a certificate of compliance to a vehicle that was improperly
10 tested). On September 25, 2009, a citation conference was held. The Bureau assessed civil
11 penalties totaling \$1,000.00 against Respondent for the violations. Respondent paid the fine on
12 October 21, 2009.

13 c. On June 7, 2011, the Bureau issued Citation No. C2011-1457 against Respondent,
14 for violations of H & S Code section 44012, subdivision (f) (failure to determine that emission
15 control devices and systems required by state and federal law are installed and functioning
16 correctly in accordance with test procedures). On June 23, 2011, a citation conference was held.
17 The Bureau assessed civil penalties totaling \$1,500.00 against Respondent for the violation.
18 Respondent paid the fine on July 19, 2011.

19 OTHER MATTERS

20 28. Pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code section 9884.7, subdivision (c), the Director may
21 suspend, revoke, or place on probation the registration for all places of business operated in this
22 state by Respondent Kyeong Sook Kim, owner of Yorba Linda Test Only Smog Check, upon a
23 finding that Respondent has, or is, engaged in a course of repeated and willful violations of the
24 laws and regulations pertaining to an automotive repair dealer.

25 29. Pursuant to Health & Saf. Code section 44072.8, if Smog Check, Test Only,
26 Station License Number TC 226705, issued to Respondent Kyeong Sook Kim, owner of Yorba
27 Linda Test Only Smog Check, is revoked or suspended, any additional license issued under this
28 chapter in the name of said licensee may be likewise revoked or suspended by the director.

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

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the Director of Consumer Affairs issue a decision:

1. Revoking or suspending Automotive Repair Dealer Registration Number 226705, issued to Respondent Kyeong Sook Kim, owner of Yorba Linda Test Only Smog Check;

2. Revoking or suspending any other automotive repair dealer registration issued to Kyeong Sook Kim;

3. Revoking or suspending Smog Check-Test Only Station License Number TC 226705, issued to Kyeong Sook Kim, owner of Yorba Linda Test Only Smog Check;

4. Revoking or suspending any additional license issued under Chapter 5 of the Health and Safety Code in the name of Kyeong Sook Kim;

5. Ordering Kyeong Sook Kim to pay the Bureau of Automotive Repair the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 125.3;

6. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

DATED: 2/26/13

John Wallauch by [Signature]
JOHN WALLAUCH
Chief
Bureau of Automotive Repair
Department of Consumer Affairs
State of California
Complainant

SD2012703917
70687022.doc