1		802.]	
		1	
1	XAVIER BECERRA		
2	Attorney General of California JAMES M. LEDAKIS		
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General NICOLE R. TRAMA		
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 263607		
5	600 West Broadway, Suite 1800 San Diego, CA 92101		
6	P.O. Box 85266 San Diego, CA 92186-5266		
7	Telephone: (619) 738-9441 Facsimile: (619) 645-2061		
8	Attorneys for Complainant		
9	BEFORE THE		
10	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS FOR THE BUREAU OF AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR		
11	STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
12			
13			
14	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 77/18-6315	
15	STUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MARKS,		
16	PRESIDENT/SECRETARY/TREASURER 10831 Bloomfield Street, #B	ACCUSATION	
17	Los Alamitos, CA 90720		
18	Automotive Repair Dealer Registration No. ARD 276487		
19	Respondent.		
20			
21			
22	Complainant alleges:		
23	PARTIES	÷	
24	1. Patrick Dorais (Complainant) brings this Accusation	on solely in his official capacity as	
25	the Chief of the Bureau of Automotive Repair, Department of		
26	2. On or about May 2, 2014, the Bureau of Automotiv		
27	Repair Dealer Registration Number ARD 276487 to Stuttgart	Auto Werks, dba German Auto;	
28	///		
	(STUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERM	AN AUTO: GERALD LEROY MARKS	
	PRESIDENT/SECF	RETARY/TREASURER) ACCUSATION	

1	
1	with Gerald Leroy Marks as President/Secretary/Treasurer (Respondent). The Automotive Repair
2	Dealer Registration expired on May 31, 2018, and has not been renewed.
3	JURISDICTION
4	3. This Accusation is brought before the Director of the Department of Consumer
5	Affairs (Director) for the Bureau of Automotive Repair, under the authority of the following laws.
6	All section references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.
7	4. Section 118, subdivision (b), of the Code provides that the suspension, expiration,
8	surrender or cancellation of a license shall not deprive the Director of jurisdiction to proceed with
9	a disciplinary action during the period within which the license may be renewed, restored,
10	reissued or reinstated.
11	5. Section 477 of the Code provides, that "Board" includes "bureau," "commission,"
12	"committee," "department," "division," "examining committee," "program," and "agency."
13	"License" includes certificate, registration or other means to engage in a business or profession
14	regulated by the code.
15	6. Section 9884.13 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the expiration of a valid
16	registration shall not deprive the director or chief of jurisdiction to proceed with a disciplinary
17	proceeding against an automotive repair dealer or to render a decision invalidating a registration
18	temporarily or permanently.
19	7. Section 9884.22, subdivision (a), of the Code states:
20	(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the director may revoke,
21	suspend, or deny at any time any registration required by this article on any of the grounds for disciplinary action provided in this article. The proceedings under this
22	article shall be conducted in accordance with Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 11500) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code, and the director
23	shall have all the powers granted therein.
24	STATUTORY PROVISIONS
25	8. Section 9884.7 of the Code states:
26	(a) The director, where the automotive repair dealer cannot show there was a
27	bona fide error, may deny, suspend, revoke, or place on probation the registration of an automotive repair dealer for any of the following acts or omissions related to
28	the conduct of the business of the automotive repair dealer, which are done by the
	2
	(STUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MARKS, PRESIDENT/SECRETARY/TREASURER) ACCUSATION

1	
1	automotive repair dealer or any automotive technician, employee, partner, officer, or member of the automotive repair dealer.
2	(1) Making or authorizing in any manner or by any means whatever any
3	statement written or oral which is untrue or misleading, and which is known, or which by the exercise of reasonable care should be known, to be untrue or
4	misleading.
5	(2) Causing or allowing a customer to sign any work order that does not
6	state the repairs requested by the customer or the automobile's odometer reading at the time of repair.
7	(3) Failing or refusing to give to a customer a copy of any document
8	requiring his or her signature, as soon as the customer signs the document.
9	(4) Any other conduct which constitutes fraud.
10	(5) Conduct constituting gross negligence.
11	(6) Failure in any material respect to comply with the provisions of this
12	chapter or regulations adopted pursuant to it.
13	(7) Any willful departure from or disregard of accepted trade standards for good and workmanlike repair in any material respect, which is prejudicial to
14	another without consent of the owner or his or her duly authorized representative.
15	(8) Making false promises of a character likely to influence, persuade, or
16	induce a customer to authorize the repair, service, or maintenance of automobiles.
17	(9) Having repair work done by someone other than the dealer or his or her employees without the knowledge or consent of the customer unless the dealer can
18	demonstrate that the customer could not reasonably have been notified.
19	(10) Conviction of a violation of Section 551 of the Penal Code.
20	Upon denying of registration, the director shall notify the applicant thereof,
21	in writing, by personal service or mail addressed to the address of the applicant set forth in the application, and the applicant shall be given a hearing under Section
22	9884.12 if, within 30 days thereafter, he or she files with the bureau a written request for hearing, otherwise the denial is deemed affirmed.
23	
24	(b) Except as provided for in subdivision (c), if an automotive repair dealer operates more than one place of business in this state, the director pursuant to
25	subdivision (a) shall only suspend, revoke, or place on probation the registration of the specific place of business which has violated any of the provisions of this
26	chapter. This violation, or action by the director, shall not affect in any manner the
	right of the automotive repair dealer to operate his or her other places of business.
27	(c) Notwithstanding subdivision (b), the director may suspend, revoke, or place on probation the registration for all places of business operated in this state
28	3
	(STUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MA PRESIDENT/SECRETARY/TREASURER) ACCUSAT

by an automotive repair dealer upon a finding that the automotive repair dealer has, or is, engaged in a course of repeated and willful violations of this chapter, or regulations adopted pursuant to it.

9. Section 9884.8 of the Code states:

All work done by an automotive repair dealer, including all warranty work, shall be recorded on an invoice and shall describe all service work done and parts supplied. Service work and parts shall be listed separately on the invoice, which shall also state separately the subtotal prices for service work and for parts, not including sales tax, and shall state separately the sales tax, if any, applicable to each. If any used, rebuilt, or reconditioned parts are supplied, the invoice shall clearly state that fact. If a part of a component system is composed of new and used, rebuilt or reconditioned parts, that invoice shall clearly state that fact. The invoice shall include a statement indicating whether any crash parts are original equipment manufacturer crash parts or nonoriginal equipment manufacturer aftermarket crash parts. One copy of the invoice shall be given to the customer and one copy shall be retained by the automotive repair dealer.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10. Section 9884.9 of the Code states:

(a) The automotive repair dealer shall give to the customer a written estimated price for labor and parts necessary for a specific job. No work shall be done and no charges shall accrue before authorization to proceed is obtained from the customer. No charge shall be made for work done or parts supplied in excess of the estimated price without the oral or written consent of the customer that shall be obtained at some time after it is determined that the estimated price is insufficient and before the work not estimated is done or the parts not estimated are supplied. Written consent or authorization for an increase in the original estimated price may be provided by electronic mail or facsimile transmission from the customer. The bureau may specify in regulation the procedures to be followed by an automotive repair dealer if an authorization or consent for an increase in the original estimated price is provided by electronic mail or facsimile transmission. If that consent is oral, the dealer shall make a notation on the work order of the date, time, name of person authorizing the additional repairs and telephone number called, if any, together with a specification of the additional parts and labor and the total additional cost, and shall do either of the following:

(1) Make a notation on the invoice of the same facts set forth in the notation on the work order.

(2) Upon completion of the repairs, obtain the customer's signature or initials to an acknowledgment of notice and consent, if there is an oral consent of the customer to additional repairs, in the following language:

"I acknowledge notice and oral approval of an increase in the original estimated price.

(signature or initials)"

Nothing in this section shall be construed as requiring an automotive repair dealer to give a written estimated price if the dealer does not agree to perform the requested repair.

(b) The automotive repair dealer shall include with the written estimated 1 price a statement of any automotive repair service that, if required to be done, will be done by someone other than the dealer or his or her employees. No service shall 2 be done by other than the dealer or his or her employees without the consent of the customer, unless the customer cannot reasonably be notified. The dealer shall be 3 responsible, in any case, for any service in the same manner as if the dealer or his or her employees had done the service. 4 (c) In addition to subdivisions (a) and (b), an automotive repair dealer, when 5 doing auto body or collision repairs, shall provide an itemized written estimate for all parts and labor to the customer. The estimate shall describe labor and parts 6 separately and shall identify each part, indicating whether the replacement part is new, used, rebuilt, or reconditioned. Each crash part shall be identified on the 7 written estimate and the written estimate shall indicate whether the crash part is an original equipment manufacturer crash part or a nonoriginal equipment 8 manufacturer aftermarket crash part. 9 (d) A customer may designate another person to authorize work or parts supplied in excess of the estimated price, if the designation is made in writing at 10 the time that the initial authorization to proceed is signed by the customer. The bureau may specify in regulation the form and content of a designation and the 11 procedures to be followed by the automotive repair dealer in recording the designation. For the purposes of this section, a designee shall not be the 12 automotive repair dealer providing repair services or an insurer involved in a claim that includes the motor vehicle being repaired, or an employee or agent or a person 13 acting on behalf of the dealer or insurer. 14 11. Section 9884.11 of the Code states: 15 Each automotive repair dealer shall maintain any records that are required by regulations adopted to carry out this chapter. Those records shall be open for 16 reasonable inspection by the chief or other law enforcement officials. All of those records shall be maintained for at least three years. 17 12. Section 9889.50 of the Code states: 18 19 The Legislature finds the following: 20 (1) Thousands of California automobile owners each year require repair of their vehicles as a result of collision or other damage. 21 (2) California automobile owners are suffering direct and indirect harm 22 through unsafe, improper, incompetent, and fraudulent auto body repairs. 23 (3) There is a lack of proper training and equipment that auto body repair shops need to meet the demands of the highly evolved and sophisticated 24 automobile manufacturing industry. 25 (4) California has no minimum standards or requirements for auto body repair shops. 26 (5) Existing laws currently regulating the auto body industry could be 27 strengthened. 28 5 (STUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MARKS,

PRESIDENT/SECRETARY/TREASURER) ACCUSATION

1	
1	(6) There is a compelling need to increase competency and standards for the auto body repair industry.
2	
3	13. Section 9889.51 of the Code states:
4	"'Auto body repair shop' means a place of business operated by an automotive repair dealer where automotive collision repair or reconstruction of automobile or truck bodies is performed."
6	REGULATORY PROVISIONS
7	
	14. California Code of Regulations, title 16, (CCR) section 3353, ¹ states, in pertinent
8	part:
9 10	No work for compensation shall be commenced and no charges shall accrue without specific authorization from the customer in accordance with the following requirements:
11	(a) Estimate for Parts and Labor. Every dealer shall give to each customer a
12	written estimated price for labor and parts for a specific job.
13	(b) Estimate for Auto Body or Collision Repairs. Every dealer, when doing auto body or collision repairs, shall give to each customer a written estimated price
14	for parts and labor for a specific job. Parts and labor shall be described separately and each part shall be identified, indicating whether the replacement part is new, used, rebuilt or reconditioned. The estimate shall also describe replacement crash
15 16	parts as original equipment manufacturer (OEM) crash parts or non-OEM aftermarket crash parts.
17	(c) Additional Authorization. The dealer shall obtain the customer=s authorization before any additional work not estimated is done or parts not
18	estimated are supplied. This authorization shall be in written, oral, or electronic form, and shall describe additional repairs, parts, labor and the total additional cost.
19	
20	(1) If the authorization from the customer for additional repairs, parts, or labor in excess of the written estimated price is obtained orally, the dealer shall also make a notation on the work order and on the invoice of the date, time, name
21 22	of the person authorizing the additional repairs, and the telephone number called, if any, together with the specification of the additional repairs, parts, labor and the
	total additional costs.
23 24	(2) If the authorization from the customer for additional repairs, parts, or labor in excess of the written estimated price is obtained by facsimile transmission
25	(fax), the dealer shall also attach to the work order and the invoice, a faxed document that is signed and dated by the customer and shows the date and time of
26	transmission and describes the additional repairs, parts, labor and the total additional cost.
27 28	¹ The language as set forth in this Accusation, reflects the language that was in operation and effect at the time of the violations. Section 3353 was subsequently amended in 2018. 6
	(STUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MARKS, PRESIDENT/SECRETARY/TREASURER) ACCUSATION

(3) If the authorization from the customer for additional repairs, parts, or 1 labor in excess of the written estimated price is obtained by electronic mail (e-mail), the dealer shall print and attach to the work order and invoice. the e-mail 2 authorization which shows the date and time of transmission and describes the 3 additional repairs, parts, labor, and the total additional costs. 4 (4) The additional repairs, parts, labor, total additional cost, and a statement that the additional repairs were authorized either orally, or by fax, or by e-mail 5 shall be recorded on the final invoice to Section 9884.9 of the Business and Professions Code. All documentation must be retained pursuant to Section 6 9884.11 of the Business and Professions Code. 7 (d) Estimated Price to Tear Down, Inspect, Report and Reassemble. For purposes of this article, to "tear down" shall mean to disassemble, and "teardown" 8 shall mean the act of disassembly. If it is necessary to tear down a vehicle component in order to prepare a written estimated price for required repair, the 9 dealer shall first give the customer a written estimated price for the teardown. This price shall include the cost of reassembly of the component. The estimated price 10 shall also include the cost of parts and necessary labor to replace items such as gaskets, seals and O rings that are normally destroyed by teardown of the 11 component. If the act of teardown might prevent the restoration of the component to its former condition, the dealer shall write that information on the work order 12 containing the teardown estimate before the work order is signed by the customer. 13 The repair dealer shall notify the customer orally and conspicuously in writing on the teardown estimate the maximum time it will take the repair dealer to 14 reassemble the vehicle or the vehicle component in the event the customer elects not to proceed with the repair or maintenance of the vehicle and shall reassemble 15 the vehicle within that time period if the customer elects not to proceed with the repair or maintenance. The maximum time shall be counted from the date of authorization of teardown. 16 17 After the teardown has been performed, the dealer shall prepare a written estimated price for labor and parts necessary for the required repair. All parts 18 required for such repair shall be listed on the estimate. The dealer shall then obtain the customer's authorization for either repair or reassembly before any further 19 work is done. 20 (e) Revising an Itemized Work Order. If the customer has authorized repairs according to a work order on which parts and labor are itemized, the dealer shall 21 not change the method of repair or parts supplied without the written, oral, electronic authorization of the customer. The authorization shall be obtained from 22 the customer as provided in subsection (c) and Section 9884.9 of the Business and Professions Code. 23 24 (g) Definitions. As used in this section, "written " shall mean the communication of information or information in writing, other than by electronic 25 means; "oral" shall mean the oral communication of information either in person or telephonically; "electronic" shall mean the communication of information by 26 facsimile transmission (fax) or electronic mail (e-mail). 27 28 7 (STUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MARKS, PRESIDENT/SECRETARY/TREASURER) ACCUSATION

1	15. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 3358, ² states:
2 3	Each automotive repair dealer shall maintain legible copies of the following records for not less than three years:
4	(a) All invoices relating to automotive repair including invoices received from other sources for parts and/or labor.
5	(b) All written estimates pertaining to work performed.
6 7	(c) All work orders and/or contracts for repairs, parts and labor. All such records shall be open for reasonable inspection and/or reproduction by the bureau or other law enforcement officials during normal business hours.
8	
9	16. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 3371, ³ states:
10	No dealer shall publish, utter, or make or cause to be published, uttered, or
11	made any false or misleading statement or advertisement which is known to be false or misleading, or which by the exercise of reasonable care should be known
12	to be false or misleading. Advertisements and advertising signs shall clearly show the following:
13	(a) Firm Name and Address. The dealer's firm name and address as they
14	appear on the State registration certificate as an automotive repair dealer; and
15	(b) Telephone Number. If a telephone number appears in an advertisement or on an advertising sign, this number shall be the same number as that listed for the dealer's firm name and address in the telephone directory, or in the telephone
16 17	company records if such number is assigned to the dealer subsequent to the publication of such telephone directory.
18	17. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 3372.1 states:
19	An automotive repair dealer shall not advertise automotive service at a price
20	which is misleading. Price advertising is misleading in circumstances which include but are not limited to the following:
21	(a) The automotive repair dealer does not intend to sell the advertised service
22	at the advertised price but intends to entice the consumer into a more costly transaction; or
23	(b) The advertisement for service has the capacity to mislead the public as to
24	the extent that anticipated parts, labor or other services are included in the
25	advertised price; or
26 27	² The language as set forth in this Accusation, reflects the language that was in operation and effect at the time of the violations. Section 3358 was subsequently amended in 2018. ³ The language as set forth in this Accusation, reflects the language that was in operation
28	and effect at the time of the violations. Section 3371 was subsequently amended in 2018.
	(STUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MARKS, PRESIDENT/SECRETARY/TREASURER) ACCUSATION

PRESIDENT/SECRETARY/TREASURER) ACCUSATION

1	(c) The advertisement for service or repair has the capacity to mislead the
2	public as to the need for additional related parts, labor or other services; or
3	(d) The automotive repair dealer knows or should know that the advertised
4	service cannot usually be performed in a good and workmanlike manner without additional parts, services or labor; provided, however, that an advertisement which
5	clearly and conspicuously discloses that additional labor, parts or services are often needed will, to that extent, not be regarded as misleading. Any such
6	disclosure statement shall indicate that many instances of performance of the service involve extra cost and, if the automotive dealer reasonably expects that the
7	extra cost will be more than 25% of the advertised costs, that the extra cost may be
8	substantial. The type size of the disclosure statement shall be at least 1/2 the type size used in the advertised price and the statement shall either be shown near the
9	price or shall be prominently footnoted through use of an asterisk or similar reference.
10	
11	18. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 3373, states:
12	No automotive repair dealer or individual in charge shall, in filling out an
13	estimate, invoice, or work order, or record required to be maintained by section 3340.15(f) of this chapter, withhold therefrom or insert therein any statement or
14	information which will cause any such document to be false or misleading, or
15	where the tendency or effect thereby would be to mislead or deceive customers, prospective customers, or the public.
16	COST RECOVERY
17	19. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may request the
18	administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of
19	the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and
20	enforcement of the case, with failure of the licentiate to comply subjecting the license to not being
21	renewed or reinstated. If a case settles, recovery of investigation and enforcement costs may be
22	included in a stipulated settlement.
23	RESTITUTION
24	20. Section 11519, subdivision (d) of the Government Code provides, in pertinent part,
25	that the Director may require restitution of damages suffered as a condition of probation in the
26	event probation is ordered.
27	///
28	9
	(STUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MARKS, PRESIDENT/SECRETARY/TREASURER) ACCUSATION

FACTS

1 2 21. At all times alleged in this Accusation, any allegation of fraud refers to actual fraud. In the alternative, fraud refers to constructive fraud as defined in Civil Code sections 1571-1573. 3 4 22. At all times alleged in this Accusation, Gerald Leroy Marks (Marks) was acting within the course and scope of a technician, employee, partner, officer, owner, or member of 5 6 Respondent. Respondent advertised on the internet website, "Craigslist," numerous listings 23. 7 advertising low priced rebuilt Volkswagen engines, transmissions, and expertise in Volkswagen 8 repair. Respondent used low priced engine rebuilding advertisements to bait and switch 9 consumers into substantially higher cost transactions, never intending to complete the repairs. 10 Respondent intentionally mislead consumers into paying in advance of repairs, with the promise 11 of placement on a "build list" giving the consumer a false sense of hope that their Volkswagen 12 components would receive priority and be completed in a timely manner. The following nine 13 consumers were victims of Respondent's scheme:⁴ 14 15 **CONSUMER COMPLAINT #1 - J.H.** 24. J.H. found Respondent through an advertisement on Craigslist. In the advertisement, 16 17 Respondent offered a rebuilt Volkswagen engine for \$500.00. 25. On or about July 25, 2017, J.H. contacted Respondent and spoke with Marks. J.H. 18 19 asked about a rebuilt short block assembly (engine assembly without cylinders or cylinder heads) for his Volkswagen. J.H. was told that Respondent had one in stock for \$500.00 with J.H.'s 20 Volkswagen's old engine traded in as a core. 21 On or about July 26, 2017, J.H. delivered his old engine to Respondent for a rebuild. 26. 22 When he arrived, Marks was not at Respondent's shop, so he spoke to an employee, "Shawn." 23 Shawn told J.H. that he did not have a rebuilt engine available for exchange; however, he stated 24 that Respondent could rebuild the Volkswagen's engine for \$500.00. J.H. signed an estimate to 25 "inspect all parts dropped off, contact customer on inspection and options, assemble customer's 26 27 ⁴ Cumulatively, Respondent stole a total of \$21,704.76 from these nine consumers. That amount does not include the value of the engines, transmissions and ancillary parts that 28 Respondent failed to return. 10

short block" J.H.'s engine for \$503.00, and was charged and paid a \$200.00 deposit. J.H. expected Respondent to rebuild his Volkswagen's engine for \$500.00 as advertised and promised.

Approximately one week later, on or about August 3, 2017, Marks emailed J.H. a 27. 3 new estimate for \$1,529.28 to rebuild his engine. The new estimate also had a different 4 description of the work that included a "tear down." J.H. declined to pay this new estimate and 5 made multiple attempts to reach Marks by phone, however, Marks did not respond. Therefore, on 6 or about August 14, 2017, J.H. went to Respondent's station to retrieve his engine and \$200.00. 7 While J.H. was at Respondent's station, Marks showed J.H. an engine that was disassembled on a 8 workbench and told J.H. that the disassembled engine was J.H.'s Volkswagen's engine. The 9 10 engine had not been cleaned. J.H. requested his deposit back, but Marks refused. J.H. requested an itemized invoice of labor that was performed, but Marks refused. J.H. loaded his engine and 11 parts into his vehicle and left without his deposit. J.H. filed a consumer complaint against 12 Respondent with the Bureau of Automotive Repair (BAR). 13

28. On or about January 29, 2018, a BAR representative visited Respondent and
discussed J.H.'s complaint with Marks. Marks admitted that he did not refund any money to J.H.
Respondent also did not maintain a copy of the revised estimate dated August 3, 2017 in its
records.

18

1

2

CONSUMER COMPLAINT #2 – R.T.

29. R.T. found Respondent through an advertisement on the internet website, Craigslist.
20 In the advertisement, Respondent offered a rebuilt Volkswagen engine for \$1,395.00.

30. On or about March 9, 2017, R.T. delivered his Volkswagen to Respondent. Marks
provided R.T. with an estimate to rebuild the engine for \$1,420.92, which included removing the
engine from the Volkswagen, rebuilding the engine and installing the rebuilt engine. The
estimate did not document the maximum time it would take to reassemble R.T.'s engine should
R.T. elect not to proceed with the repair. R.T. expected that Respondent would rebuild his
Volkswagen's engine for \$1,420.00 in three months as promised. R.T. paid Respondent
\$1,420.00 when he dropped his vehicle off.

28

31. On or about March 17, 2017, Marks emailed R.T. with a list of performance parts
 available for the engine. R.T. reviewed the document, checked off the items he wanted to install
 and returned it to Respondent's station to discuss the upgraded items. The additional items
 totaled \$977.48, which R.T. paid to Respondent.

32. Approximately two weeks later, Marks emailed R.T. a revised estimate for \$2,398.40
dated March 24, 2017. R.T. authorized the revised estimate.

33. In June 2017, R.T. visited Respondent to check in on the work that was being
performed on his engine. R.T. discovered that Respondent had not performed any work yet.
Marks then attempted to charge R.T. an additional \$500.00 by offering a "Racers Rush," which
promised a completed engine in thirty days. R.T. declined the offer.

34. In August 2017, R.T. visited Respondent again to check in on the work that was being
performed. R.T. discovered that Respondent had not performed any work yet. At that point, R.T.
told Respondent that he wanted to pick up his engine. R.T. also requested a refund in the amount
of \$1,420.00. Marks agreed and told R.T. to come back in a week to pick up his engine.

35. Approximately one week later, on or about August 22, 2017, Marks messaged R.T.
stating that he could not cancel the contract. Marks requested an additional charge of \$408.83 for
R.T. to pick up his disassembled engine. Feeling pressured that he may lose his engine, R.T.
agreed to Marks' demand. R.T. attempted to contact Marks to retrieve his engine and \$1,420.00;
however, Respondent did not return either. R.T. sued Marks in small claims court, which resulted
in a judgment against Marks. R.T. also filed a complaint with BAR.

36. On or about January 29, 2018, a BAR representative visited Respondent and
discussed R.T.'s complaint with Marks. Marks admitted that the did not refund any money to
R.T., and did not return parts to R.T. Respondent also did not maintain a copy of the March 9,
2017 invoice and work order that were provided to R.T.

25

CONSUMER COMPLAINT #3 – J.M.

37. R.T. found Respondent through an advertisement on the internet website, Craigslist.
In the advertisement, Respondent offered a rebuilt Volkswagen engine for \$1,200.00.

38. On or about January 3, 2017, J.M. delivered his Volkswagen to Respondent, who
 provided him with an estimate to rebuild his Volkswagen's engine for \$1,541.87. J.M. expected
 and believed that Respondent would rebuild his Volkswagen's engine for \$1,541.87 as promised
 and thus, paid Respondent \$1,500.00 in cash when he dropped off the engine.

39. Shortly thereafter, on or about January 13, 2017, Marks emailed J.M. with a revised
estimate for \$2,193.49, which J.M. authorized. However, Respondent did not document the date,
time, telephone number, name of person authorizing work, the additional cost, and additional
work that was to be performed when Respondent raised the cost from \$1,541.87 to \$2,442.30 on
the work order.

40. For the next several months, J.M. attempted to contact Marks about his engine 10 11 rebuild; however, Marks avoided J.M.'s calls. In October 2017, J.M. visited Respondent's station to follow up on his rebuild. J.M. discovered that Respondent had not performed any work on his 12 engine in the past ten months. J.M. questioned Marks as to why no work had been performed on 13 his engine. Marks then provided J.M. with a new estimate showing a total amount of \$2,560.69. 14 J.M. declined the new estimate and asked Marks when his engine would be ready. Marks became 15 angry and told J.M. that it would be ready, "when I say it will be ready." At that point, J.M. 16 asked Marks to return his \$1,500.00 and return his engine. Marks refused to refund J.M.'s money 17 but told J.M. he could take his engine, but that it was disassembled. Thereafter, J.M. filed a 18 19 consumer complaint with BAR.

41. On January 29, 2018, a BAR representative met with Marks to discuss the complaint filed by J.M. against Respondent. Marks told the representative that J.M. wanted to cancel his contract in October because he had purchased a replacement engine from another source and that J.M. was told he could not cancel it because his engine was being assembled. Marks admitted that J.M.'s engine was not complete, that he refused to provide a refund to J.M. and that he did not return J.M.'s engine. Respondent also did not maintain the January 3, 2017 invoice, and failed to provide part invoices for the parts listed on the January 3, 2017 work order.

13

27

111

111

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

CONSUMER COMPLAINT #4 – R.H.

42. R.H. found Respondent through an advertisement on the internet website, Craigslist. In the advertisement, Respondent offered a rebuilt Volkswagen engine for \$799.00.

43. On or about July 8, 2017, R.H. delivered his Volkswagen to Respondent. Respondent provided R.H. with an estimate to rebuild his engine and provide a rebuilt manual transmission for \$2,157.92. R.H. expected that Respondent would rebuild his Volkswagen's engine and provide a rebuilt manual transmission for \$2,157.92 in four months, as promised. However, Respondent did not document the maximum time it would take to reassemble R.H.'s engine 8 9 should R.H. elect not to proceed with the repair on the work order.

After Respondent removed the engine and transmission from R.H.'s Volkswagen, 44. 10 Marks emailed R.H. a new estimate for \$2,823.25 to rebuild his engine and provide a rebuilt 11 manual transmission, which R.H. authorized. However, Respondent did not document the date, 12 time, telephone number, name of person authorizing work, the additional cost, and additional 13 work that was to be performed when Respondent raised the cost from \$2,157.92 to \$2,823.25 on 14 the work order. Respondent charged R.H. a deposit in the amount of \$1,000, which R.H. paid in 15 cash. Respondent subsequently charged R.H. the balance of \$1,823.25, which R.H. paid in cash. 16

For the next several months, R.H. attempted to contact Marks to no avail about the 45. 17 18 status of the work. Therefore, in December 2017, R.H. went to Respondent's station, where he discovered that no work had been performed on the engine. During this meeting, Marks provided 19 a manual transmission. R.H. questioned Marks as to when his engine would be complete but 20 Marks became argumentative. When R.H. asked for his money or his engine back, Respondent 21 refused. Thereafter, R.H. filed a complaint with BAR. 22

46. On January 29, 2018, a BAR representative met with Marks to discuss the complaint 23 that was filed by R.H. against Respondent. Marks told the BAR representative that R.H. was 24 25 happy to wait until his engine was complete, but then admitted that R.H.'s engine was not complete, he had not started repairs to the engine and he did not know when it would be 26 completed. The BAR representative informed Marks that R.H. wanted a refund and the return of 27 28 his engine. Marks refused to provide any refund and refused to return the engine.

1	CONSUMER COMPLAINT #5 – A.S1 ⁵	
2	47. A.S. found Respondent through an advertisement on the internet website, Craigslist.	
3	In the advertisement, Respondent offered rebuilt Volkswagen engines for low prices. A.S.	
4	contacted Respondent and spoke to Marks, who assured A.S. that Respondent could rebuild the	
5	engine and transmission for \$4,200.00.	
6	48. On or about July 16, 2017, A.S. delivered his Volkswagen to Respondent. On or	
7	about July 18, 2017, Marks provided A.S. with an estimate to rebuild the Volkswagen's engine	
8	and transmission for \$4,388.91, which included removing the engine and transmission from the	
9	vehicle, rebuilding the engine and transmission and installing the rebuilt engine and transmission.	
10	A.S. expected that Respondent would rebuild the engine and transmission for \$4,388.91 in two	
11	months, as promised. Thereafter, A.S. mailed Respondent at personal check on July 19, 2017 in	
12	the amount of \$2,200.00.	
13	49. Approximately two weeks later on or about July 31, 2017, Marks sent A.S. a revised	
14	estimate for \$5,759.71, which A.S. authorized. Respondent attempted to charge A.S. with an	
15	additional fee by offering a "Racers Rush," where Respondent would complete the work in 30	
16	days. A.S. declined that offer.	
17	50. Respondent continued to pressure A.S. into paying additional money or he would not	
18	begin the repairs to the engine. Therefore, on September 13, 2017, A.S. paid Respondent an	
19	additional \$2,000.00 by personal check.	
20	51. Over the next several months, Marks made numerous excuses to A.S. regarding the	
21	time to complete the repairs. Marks emailed A.S. another revised estimate for \$7,269.08, which	
22	A.S. declined.	
23	52. During December 2017 and January 2018, A.S. made numerous trips to Respondent's	
24	station to check on the status of his work. However, Marks was never present when A.S. visited	
25	and Marks did not return A.S. attempts to communicate. On January 31, 2018, after becoming	
26	frustrated by Marks' lack of communication, A.S. returned to Respondent's station to pick up his	
27		
28	⁵ There are two consumers with the initials A.S. To differentiate between the two, they will be referred to as A.S1 and A.S2.	
	15 (STUTICART AUTO WERKS, DRA GERMAN, AUTO, GERALD LEROV MARKS	
	(STUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MARKS, PRESIDENT/SECRETARY/TREASURER) ACCUSATION	

engine and obtain a refund. An employee at Respondent's station refused to return Marks engine
 and Marks refused to respond to A.S. contact. Thereafter, A.S. filed a complaint with BAR
 against Respondent.

4

5

6

7

CONSUMER COMPLAINT #6 – R.B.

53. R.B. found Respondent through an advertisement on the internet website, Craigslist. In the advertisement, Respondent offered rebuilt Volkswagen engines for low prices. Through text message exchanges, Marks assured R.B. that he could rebuild R.B.'s engine for \$1,628.92.

54. On or about July 18, 2017, Marks emailed R.B. an estimate to rebuild his engine for
\$1,628.92. R.B. signed the estimate and sent it back to Marks. Shortly thereafter, R.B. delivered
his engine to Respondent. R.B. expected that Respondent would rebuild his Volkswagen's
engine for \$1,628.92 as promised. Respondent charged R.B. a deposit in the amount of \$300.00,
which R.B. paid in cash.

55. Approximately two weeks later, on or about August 2, 2017, Marks emailed R.B. a
revised estimate for \$2,766.24, which R.B. authorized. Marks told R.B. that work could not be
performed until 80% of the total cost was paid. Marks convinced R.B. to pay an additional
\$1,000.00, which he paid in cash. Marks promised to complete R.B.'s engine in thirty days.

17 56. In February 2018, after becoming frustrated at Mark's lack of communication, R.B.
18 returned to Respondent's station to pick up his engine and \$2,300.00. Respondent's employee
19 told R.B. that no work had been performed on his engine. R.B. subsequently mailed Respondent
20 a letter demanding return of this money and his engine but Marks did not respond.

21

<u>CONSUMER COMPLAINT #7 – A.S.-2</u>

57. A.S. found Respondent through an advertisement on the internet website, Craigslist.
In the advertisement, Respondent advertised expertise in Volkswagen engine repairs for low
prices. On or about December 19, 2015, A.S. delivered his engine to Respondent. Marks
provided A.S. with an estimate to rebuild A.S.' engine for \$703.00. A.S. expected that
Respondent would rebuild his engine for \$703.00 as promised. Respondent charged a \$200.00
deposit, which A.S. paid.

28

58. On or about April 18, 2016, Marks invited A.S. to visit Respondent's station to view
 a collection of damaged parts. Marks claimed that the damaged parts were from A.S.' engine and
 then provided A.S. with a revised estimate of \$3,132.00 to rebuild his engine. During that
 meeting, A.S. paid Respondent \$400.00 using a debit card.

5

6

7

59. On or about May 4, 2016, A.S. visited Respondent to check the progress of his engine. Respondent had not performed any work; however, Marks convinced A.S. to pay an additional \$400.00 in cash to Respondent.

8 60. In March 16, 2017, A.S. returned to Respondent's station. During that visit, Marks
9 convinced A.S. to pay an additional \$400.00 in cash to Respondent.

10 61. In May 2017, A.S. visited Respondent's station to check the progress of his engine
11 and discovered that no work had been performed. When A.S. questioned Marks about the lack of
12 work, Marks responded by threatening him.

62. On or about October 30, 2017, A.S. contacted Marks about the status of his engine
and Marks replied that A.S.' engine would be on the staging table in the next week. On or about
November 29, 2017, A.S. contacted Marks again about the status of his engine. On or about
December 6, 2017, Marks responded to A.S. and told him that A.S.' engine would be complete by
the end of December 2017. A.S. never received his rebuilt engine. On or about February 27,
2018, Marks sent A.S. a message that he closed his shop. Thereafter, A.S. filed a complaint
against Respondent with BAR.

20

CONSUMER COMPLAINT #8 – N.C.

63. N.C. found Respondent through an advertisement on the internet website, Craigslist.
In the advertisement, Respondent advertised expertise in Volkswagen engine repairs for low
prices. On or about March 30, 2017, N.C. delivered his engine to Respondent. Marks provided
N.C. with an estimate to rebuild the engine for \$3,403.40 and insisted that N.C. pay the full
amount in cash before work could begin. N.C. paid Respondent \$3,403.40 by cashier's check.
N.C. expected that Respondent would rebuild his Volkswagen's engine for \$3,403.40 as
promised.

28

111

(STUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MARKS, PRESIDENT/SECRETARY/TREASURER) ACCUSATION 64. Over the next several months, N.C. made several attempts to contact Marks about
the status of his engine. Marks did not respond. On January 2, 2018, N.C. visited Respondent's
station to check the progress and discovered that no work had been performed yet. Marks told
N.C. that his engine was number 2 on his build list. In February 2018, N.C. continued to contact
Marks about the status of his engine. On February 27, 2018, N.C. returned to Respondent's
station to check on the progress and discovered that Respondent had closed. N.C. never received
a rebuilt engine and never received his \$3,403.40 back.

8

<u>CONSUMER COMPLAINT #9 – S.W.</u>

65. S.W. found Respondent through an advertisement on the internet website, Craigslist. 9 In the advertisement, Respondent advertised expertise in Volkswagen engine repairs for low 10 prices. On or about September 5, 2017, S.W. met with Marks to discuss an estimate to install a 11 fuel injection system. On September 6, 2017, S.W. delivered his Volkswagen to Respondent's 12 station. Marks provided S.W. with an estimate to install a fuel injection system for \$2,602.96 and 13 insisted that S.W. pay half in cash before work could begin. S.W. paid Respondent \$1,602.00 in 14 cash. S.W. expected Respondent to install a fuel injection system on his Volkswagen for 15 16 \$2,602.96 as promised.

17 66. Over the next several months, S.W. made multiple attempts to contact Marks about
18 the status of his install. Marks did not respond. In January 2018, S.W. visited Marks at
19 Respondent's station to check the progress on his Volkswagen. Marks told S.W. that he could not
20 locate a wiring harness necessary to complete the repair. A few days later, S.W. purchased the
21 wiring harness from an internet retailer and delivered it to Marks.

67. On or about February 27, 2018, S.W. received a text message from Marks indicating
that he closed Respondent's station. Marks did not respond to any subsequent contact attempts.
Respondent did not return S.W.'s Volkswagen or \$1,602.96.

68. From February 26, 2018 to March 1, 2018, a BAR representative made several
attempts to visit Respondent but found that the business was closed.

27 69. In addition, during the course of the investigation, the BAR representative also
28 discovered that Marks, doing business as Respondent, advertised on the internet-based website,

1	Craigslist, without properly showing Respondent's business name and address as it appears in
2	BAR's records.
3	FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE
4	(Untrue or Misleading Statements)
5	70. Complainant re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth above
6	in paragraphs 21-69.
7	71. Respondent's registration is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 9884.7,
8	subdivision (a)(1), in that Respondent made or authorized in any manner or by any means
9	whatever any statement written or oral which is untrue or misleading, and which is known, or
10	which by the exercise of reasonable care should be known, to be untrue or misleading.
11	SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE
12	(Fraud)
13	72. Complainant re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth above
14	in paragraphs 21-69.
15	73. Respondent's registration is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 9884.7,
16	subdivision (a)(4) for conduct that constitutes fraud.
17	THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE
18	(Failure to Comply with the Code)
19	74. Complainant re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth above
20	in paragraphs 21-69.
21	75. Respondent's Registration is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 9884.7,
22	subdivision (a)(6), in that Respondent failed to comply with the following sections of the Code, in
23	the following respect:
24	a) Section 9884.9(a) – Respondent failed to meet estimate and authorization
25	requirements as required by the Code with respect to R.T., J.M., and R.H.
26	b) Section 9884.11 – Respondent failed to maintain records and/or make records open
27	for reasonable inspection as it relates to his work for clients, J.H. and R.T.
28	///
	(STUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MARKS, PRESIDENT/SECRETARY/TREASURER) ACCUSATION

PRESIDENT/SECRETARY/TREASURER) ACCUSATION

1		FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE
2		(Failure to Comply with Regulations)
3	76.	Complainant re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth above
4	in paragrap	ohs 21-69.
5	77.	Respondent's Registration is subject to disciplinary action under section 9884.7,
6	subdivisior	n (a)(6), in that Respondent failed to comply with the following sections of the
7	California	Code of Regulations, title 16, in the following respect:
8	a)	Section 3353(c)(1) – Respondent failed to comply with additional authorization
9	requiremen	ts with respect to J.M. and R.H.
10	b)	Section 3353(d) – Respondent failed to comply with estimate to teardown, inspect,
11	report and	reassemble with respect to R.H.
12	c)	Section 3358(a) – Respondent failed to maintain legible copies of all invoices
13	relating to	automotive repair including invoices received from other sources for parts and/or labor
14	with respec	et to R.T.
15	d)	Section 3358(c) – Respondent failed to maintain all work orders and/or contracts for
16	repairs, par	ts and labor with respect to J. H. and R.T.
17	e)	Section 3371 – Respondent made an untrue or misleading statement or advertisement
18	with respec	et to J.H., R.T., J.M., R.H., A.S., R.B., A.S., N.C., and S.W.
19	f)	Section 3372.1 – Respondent advertised automotive services at a price which is
20	misleading	with respect to J.H., R.T., J.M., R.H., A.S., R.B., A.S., N.C., and S.W.
21	g)	Section 3373 – Respondent inserted a statement or information in an estimate which
22	caused the	document to be false or misleading with respect to J.H.
23		FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE
24		(False Promises)
25	78.	Complainant re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth above
26	in paragrap	ohs 21-69.
27	///	
28	///	
		(STUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MARKS, PRESIDENT/SECRETARY/TREASURER) ACCUSATION

I

1 79. Respondent's Registration is subject to disciplinary action under section 9884.7(a)(8) 2 in that Respondent made false promises of a character likely to influence, persuade, or induce a 3 customer to authorize the repair, service, or maintenance of automobiles. 4 OTHER MATTERS 5 80. Under Code section 9884.7, subdivision (c), the Director may invalidate temporarily 6 or permanently or refuse to validate, the registrations for all places of business operated in this 7 State by Respondent upon a finding that Respondent has engaged in a course of repeated and willful violations of the laws and regulations pertaining to an automotive repair dealer. 9 PRAYER 10 WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, 11 and that following the hearing, the Director of Consumer Affairs issue a decision: 12 1. Revoking or suspending Automotive Repair Dealer Registration Number ARD 13 276487, issued to Stuttgart Auto Werks, dba German Auto; Gerald Leroy Marks, 19 President/Secretary/Treasurer; 15 2. Ordering Gerald Leroy Marks to pay the Bureau of Automotive Repair the reasonable 10 costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions 10 DATED: </th <th>1</th> <th></th>	1		
2 in that Respondent made false promises of a character likely to influence, persuade, or induce a 3 customer to authorize the repair, service, or maintenance of automobiles. 4 OTHER MATTERS 5 80. Under Code section 9884.7, subdivision (c), the Director may invalidate temporarily 6 or permanently or refuse to validate, the registrations for all places of business operated in this 7 State by Respondent upon a finding that Respondent has engaged in a course of repeated and 8 willful violations of the laws and regulations pertaining to an automotive repair dealer. 9 PRAYER 10 WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, 11 and that following the hearing, the Director of Consumer Affairs issue a decision: 12 1. Revoking or suspending Automotive Repair Dealer Registration Number ARD 13 276487, issued to Stuttgart Auto Werks, dba German Auto; Gerald Leroy Marks, 14 President/Secretary/Treasurer; 15 2. Ordering Gerald Leroy Marks to pay the Bureau of Automotive Repair the reasonable 16 costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions 17 DATED: March 21, 2019 21 DATED: March 21, 2019	1	79. Respondent's Registration is subject to disciplinary action under section 9884.7(a)(8)	
4 OTHER MATTERS 5 80. Under Code section 9884.7, subdivision (c), the Director may invalidate temporarily 6 or permanently or refuse to validate, the registrations for all places of business operated in this 7 State by Respondent upon a finding that Respondent has engaged in a course of repeated and 8 willful violations of the laws and regulations pertaining to an automotive repair dealer. 9 PRAYER 10 WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, 11 and that following the hearing, the Director of Consumer Affairs issue a decision: 12 1. Revoking or suspending Automotive Repair Dealer Registration Number ARD 13 276487, issued to Stuttgart Auto Werks, dba German Auto; Gerald Leroy Marks, 14 President/Secretary/Treasurer; 15 2. Ordering Gerald Leroy Marks to pay the Bureau of Automotive Repair the reasonable 16 costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions 17 Code section 125.3; and, 18 DATED: March 24, 2019 PATED: March 24, 2019 PATERCK DORAIS Chief Bureau of Automotive Repair 18 DATED: March 24, 2019	2	in that Respondent made false promises of a character likely to influence, persuade, or induce a	
5 80. Under Code section 9884.7, subdivision (c), the Director may invalidate temporarily 6 or permanently or refuse to validate, the registrations for all places of business operated in this 7 State by Respondent upon a finding that Respondent has engaged in a course of repeated and 8 willful violations of the laws and regulations pertaining to an automotive repair dealer. 9 PRAYER 10 WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, 11 and that following the hearing, the Director of Consumer Affairs issue a decision: 12 1. Revoking or suspending Automotive Repair Dealer Registration Number ARD 13 276487, issued to Stuttgart Auto Werks, dba German Auto; Gerald Leroy Marks, 14 President/Secretary/Treasurer; 15 2. Ordering Gerald Leroy Marks to pay the Bureau of Automotive Repair the reasonable 16 costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions 17 Code section 125.3; and, 18 3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper. 19 PATEICK DORAIS 21 Chief 21 State of California 21 CSTUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MARKS, <td>3</td> <td>customer to authorize the repair, service, or maintenance of automobiles.</td>	3	customer to authorize the repair, service, or maintenance of automobiles.	
6 or permanently or refuse to validate, the registrations for all places of business operated in this 7 State by Respondent upon a finding that Respondent has engaged in a course of repeated and 8 willful violations of the laws and regulations pertaining to an automotive repair dealer. 9 PRAYER 10 WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, 11 and that following the hearing, the Director of Consumer Affairs issue a decision: 12 1. Revoking or suspending Automotive Repair Dealer Registration Number ARD 13 276487, issued to Stuttgart Auto Werks, dba German Auto; Gerald Leroy Marks, 14 President/Secretary/Treasurer; 15 2. Ordering Gerald Leroy Marks to pay the Bureau of Automotive Repair the reasonable 16 costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions 17 Code section 125.3; and, 18 3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper. 19 PATEICK DORAIS 21 State of California 26 21 21 (STUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MARKS,	4	OTHER MATTERS	
7 State by Respondent upon a finding that Respondent has engaged in a course of repeated and willful violations of the laws and regulations pertaining to an automotive repair dealer. 9 PRAYER 10 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: 11 and that following the hearing, the Director of Consumer Affairs issue a decision: 12 1. Revoking or suspending Automotive Repair Dealer Registration Number ARD 13 276487, issued to Stuttgart Auto Werks, dba German Auto; Gerald Leroy Marks, 14 President/Secretary/Treasurer; 15 2. Ordering Gerald Leroy Marks to pay the Bureau of Automotive Repair the reasonable 16 costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions 17 Code section 125.3; and, 18 3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper. 19 DATED: March 21, 2019 PATRICK DORAIS PATRICK DORAIS 21 SD2018701805 State of California 28 21 21 21 21 21	5	80. Under Code section 9884.7, subdivision (c), the Director may invalidate temporarily	
 willful violations of the laws and regulations pertaining to an automotive repair dealer. 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: Revoking or suspending Automotive Repair Dealer Registration Number ARD 276487, issued to Stuttgart Auto Werks, dba German Auto; Gerald Leroy Marks, President/Secretary/Treasurer; Ordering Gerald Leroy Marks 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; and, Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper. DATED: March 21, 2019 PATRICK DORAIS Chief Bureau of Automotive Repair Department of Consumer Affairs State of California Complainant 	6	or permanently or refuse to validate, the registrations for all places of business operated in this	
9 PRAYER 10 WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, 11 and that following the hearing, the Director of Consumer Affairs issue a decision: 12 1. Revoking or suspending Automotive Repair Dealer Registration Number ARD 13 276487, issued to Stuttgart Auto Werks, dba German Auto; Gerald Leroy Marks, 14 President/Secretary/Treasurer; 15 2. Ordering Gerald Leroy Marks to pay the Bureau of Automotive Repair the reasonable 16 costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions 17 Code section 125.3; and, 18 3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper. 19 PATED: 20 PATED: 21 DATED: 21 SD2018701805 21 CSTUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MARKS,	7	State by Respondent upon a finding that Respondent has engaged in a course of repeated and	
10 WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, 11 and that following the hearing, the Director of Consumer Affairs issue a decision: 12 1. Revoking or suspending Automotive Repair Dealer Registration Number ARD 13 276487, issued to Stuttgart Auto Werks, dba German Auto; Gerald Leroy Marks, 14 President/Secretary/Treasurer; 15 2. Ordering Gerald Leroy Marks to pay the Bureau of Automotive Repair the reasonable 16 costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions 17 Code section 125.3; and, 18 3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper. 19 PATED: March 21 2019 20 PATRICK DORAIS 21 Chief 22 SD2018701805 23 SD2018701805 24 21 25 21	8	willful violations of the laws and regulations pertaining to an automotive repair dealer.	
11 and that following the hearing, the Director of Consumer Affairs issue a decision: 12 1. Revoking or suspending Automotive Repair Dealer Registration Number ARD 13 276487, issued to Stuttgart Auto Werks, dba German Auto; Gerald Leroy Marks, 14 President/Secretary/Treasurer; 15 2. Ordering Gerald Leroy Marks to pay the Bureau of Automotive Repair the reasonable 16 costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions 17 Code section 125.3; and, 18 3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper. 19 DATED: 20 PATRICK DORAIS 21 DATED: 22 SD2018701805 23 SD2018701805 24 21 25 SD2018701805 26 21	9	PRAYER	
1 Revoking or suspending Automotive Repair Dealer Registration Number ARD 276487, issued to Stuttgart Auto Werks, dba German Auto; Gerald Leroy Marks, President/Secretary/Treasurer; 2. Ordering Gerald Leroy Marks 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; and, 3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper. DATED: March 21, 2019 PATRICK DORAIS Chief Bureau of Automotive Repair Dearted SD2018701805 71681118.docx	10	WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged,	
 276487, issued to Stuttgart Auto Werks, dba German Auto; Gerald Leroy Marks, President/Secretary/Treasurer; 2. Ordering Gerald Leroy Marks 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; and, 3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper. DATED: March 21, 2019 Patrick DorAIS Chief Bureau of Automotive Repair Department of Consumer Affairs State of California Complainant SD2018701805 71681118.docx 	11	and that following the hearing, the Director of Consumer Affairs issue a decision:	
 President/Secretary/Treasurer; Ordering Gerald Leroy Marks 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; and, Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper. DATED: Manch 21, 2019 PATRICK DORAIS Chief Bureau of Automotive Repair Department of Consumer Affairs State of California Complainant SD2018701805 71681118.doex 21 CSTUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MARKS, 	12	1. Revoking or suspending Automotive Repair Dealer Registration Number ARD	
 2. Ordering Gerald Leroy Marks 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; and, 3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper. DATED: March 21, 2019 DATED: March 21, 2019 PATRICK DORAIS Chief Bureau of Automotive Repair Department of Consumer Affairs State of California Complainant SD2018701805 71681118.docx 21 	13	276487, issued to Stuttgart Auto Werks, dba German Auto; Gerald Leroy Marks,	
 costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 125.3; and, Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper. DATED: Manch 21, 2019 PATRICK DORAIS Chief Bureau of Automotive Repair Department of Consumer Affairs State of California Complainant SD2018701805 71681118.docx SD2018701805 71681118.docx 	14	President/Secretary/Treasurer;	
 Code section 125.3; and, Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper. DATED: March 21, 2019 PATRICK DORAIS Chief Bureau of Automotive Repair Department of Consumer Affairs State of California Complainant SD2018701805 71681118.docx SD2018701805 71681118.docx 	15	2. Ordering Gerald Leroy Marks to pay the Bureau of Automotive Repair the reasonable	
 3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper. DATED: March 21, 2019 Patrick Dorais DATED: March 21, 2019 PATRICK DORAIS Chief Bureau of Automotive Repair Department of Consumer Affairs State of California Complainant SD2018701805 71681118.doex 21 (STUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MARKS, 	16	costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions	
19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 SD2018701805 71681118.doex 21	17	Code section 125.3; and,	
20 21 22 23 24 24 25 26 27 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	18	3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.	
21 DATED: March 21, 2019 Patick Doris 23 PATRICK DORAIS 24 Chief 25 Bureau of Automotive Repair 26 SD2018701805 27 SD2018701805 71681118.docx 21 (STUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MARKS,	19		
22 23 24 24 25 26 27 29 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	20		
 PATRICK DORAIS Chief Bureau of Automotive Repair Department of Consumer Affairs State of California <i>Complainant</i> SD2018701805 71681118.docx SD2018701805 21 (STUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MARKS, 	21	DATED: March 2/ 2019 Fatick toring	
 Bureau of Automotive Repair Department of Consumer Affairs State of California <i>Complainant</i> SD2018701805 71681118.docx SD2018701805 (STUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MARKS, 	22	PATRICK DORAIS	
 State of California Complainant SD2018701805 71681118.docx 28 21 (STUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MARKS, 	23	Bureau of Automotive Repair	
25 26 27 SD2018701805 71681118.docx 28 21 (STUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MARKS,	24	State of California	
27 28 21 (STUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MARKS,			
27 28 21 (STUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MARKS,		SD2018701805	
21 (STUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MARKS,			
(STUTTGART AUTO WERKS, DBA GERMAN AUTO; GERALD LEROY MARKS,	28	21	