

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:

**VALLEY SMOG & REPAIR  
JAGDEV SINGH, OWNER  
1506 N. Blackstone  
Fresno, CA 93703**

**Automotive Repair Dealer Reg. No. ARD  
248173  
Smog Check Station License No. RC 248173**

and

**GURPREET SINGH CHAUHAN  
1506 N. Blackstone  
Fresno, CA 93703**

**Smog Check Inspector License No. EO  
147842  
Smog Check Repair Technician License No.  
EI 147842 (formerly Advanced Emission  
Specialist Technician License No. EA  
147842)**

Respondents.

Case No. 79/14-19

OAH No. 2013110704

**DEFAULT DECISION AND ORDER**

[Gov. Code, §11520]

///  
///

FINDINGS OF FACT

1  
2           1.    On or about August 30, 2013, Complainant Patrick Dorais, in his official capacity as  
3 the Acting Chief of the Bureau of Automotive Repair, Department of Consumer Affairs, filed  
4 Accusation No. 79/14-19 against Valley Smog & Repair; Jagdev Singh, Owner (Respondent  
5 Singh) and Gurpreet Singh Chauhan (Respondent Chauhan) before the Director of Consumer  
6 Affairs. (Accusation attached as Exhibit A.)

7           2.    On or about December 4, 2006, the Bureau of Automotive Repair (Bureau) issued  
8 Automotive Repair Dealer Registration No. ARD 248173 to Respondent Singh, owner of Valley  
9 Smog & Repair. The Automotive Repair Dealer Registration was in full force and effect at all  
10 times relevant to the charges brought in Accusation No. 79/14-19 and will expire on November  
11 30, 2014, unless renewed.

12           3.    On or about December 7, 2006, the Bureau of Automotive Repair issued Smog Check  
13 Station License No. RC 248173 to Respondent Singh. The Smog Check Station License was in  
14 full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought in Accusation No. 79/14-19 and  
15 will expire on November 30, 2014, unless renewed.

16           4.    In or about 2003, the Director issued Automotive Repair Dealer Registration Number  
17 ARD 227381 ("registration") to Respondent Chauhan. On September 24, 2007, Respondent  
18 Chauhan's registration was revoked.

19           5.    On or about September 9, 2003, the Director issued Smog Check Station License  
20 Number RC 227381 to Respondent Chauhan. On September 24, 2007, Respondent Chauhan's  
21 smog check station license was revoked.

22           6.    In or about 2005, the Director issued Advanced Emission Specialist Technician  
23 License Number EA 147842 to Respondent Chauhan. On September 24, 2007, Respondent  
24 Chauhan's advanced emission specialist technician license was revoked; however, the revocation  
25 was stayed and Respondent was placed on probation for three (3) years on terms and conditions.  
26 The license was also suspended for 30 days effective September 24, 2007. Respondent  
27 Chauhan's advanced emission specialist technician license was due to expire on January 31,  
28 2013. Pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 3340.28, subdivision (e), the

1 subdivision (e), the license was renewed, pursuant to Respondent Chauhan's election, as Smog  
2 Check Inspector License Number EO 147842 and Smog Check Repair Technician License  
3 Number EI 147842 ("technician licenses"), effective January 31, 2013. Respondent Chauhan's  
4 technician licenses will expire on January 31, 2015, unless renewed.

5 7. On or about September 12, 2013, Respondents were served by Certified and First  
6 Class Mail copies of Accusation No. 79/14-19, Statement to Respondent, Notice of Defense,  
7 Request for Discovery, and Discovery Statutes (Government Code sections 11507.5, 11507.6,  
8 and 11507.7) at Respondents' address of record which, pursuant to Business and Professions  
9 Code section 136, is required to be reported and maintained with the Bureau. Respondents'  
10 address of record was and is:

11 1506 N. Blackstone  
12 Fresno, CA 93703.

13 8. Service of the Accusation was effective as a matter of law under the provisions of  
14 Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c) and/or Business & Professions Code section  
15 124.

16 9. On or about October 1, 2013, Respondents signed and returned Notices of Defense,  
17 requesting a hearing in this matter. A Notice of Hearing was served by mail at Respondents'  
18 address of record and it informed them that an administrative hearing in this matter was scheduled  
19 for September 8, 2014. Respondent Chauhan failed to appear at that hearing.

20 10. Government Code section 11506 states, in pertinent part:

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

26 11. California Government Code section 11520 states, in pertinent part:

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

///



1           ii. Respondent Chauhan represented to the undercover operator that the Bureau's  
2 2000 Toyota needed a pressure switch. In fact, the pressure switch was in good serviceable  
3 condition, was free from damage, and was not in need of replacement at the time the vehicle was  
4 taken to Respondent Singh's facility.

5           iii. Respondent Chauhan obtained payment from a Bureau undercover operator for  
6 adding Freon to the A/C system on the Bureau's 2000 Toyota as part of the A/C service. In fact,  
7 Chauhan had no basis for selling Freon to the undercover operator or adding Freon to the A/C  
8 system in that the refrigerant in use on the vehicle had not been identified and checked for  
9 contamination by the facility as required by California Code of Regulations, title 16, section  
10 3366, subdivision (a)(12). Further, the A/C system had been recharged with refrigerant prior to  
11 the time the vehicle was taken to Respondent Singh's facility, the refrigerant in use on the vehicle  
12 was not contaminated, and the vehicle was not in need of any refrigerant or a refrigerant service.

13           iv. Respondent Chauhan made a false or misleading representation to the  
14 undercover operator regarding the A/C system on the Bureau's 2000 Toyota, as set forth in  
15 paragraph 3(a)(iii) above, in order to induce the operator to purchase an unnecessary repair on the  
16 vehicle, then sold the operator the unnecessary repair—the replacement of the pressure switch.

17           v. On or about September 18, 2012, Respondent Chauhan represented to the  
18 undercover operator that the A/C service on the Bureau's 2000 Chevrolet would be \$19.99 plus  
19 \$35 for Freon, and that Freon was needed on the vehicle since it was "the stuff" that made the  
20 A/C "blow cold air." In fact, Chauhan had no basis for recommending or selling Freon to the  
21 undercover operator or adding Freon to the A/C system in that the refrigerant in use on the  
22 vehicle had not been identified and checked for contamination by the facility as required by  
23 California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 3366, subdivision (a)(12). Further, the A/C  
24 system had been evacuated and charged with refrigerant prior to the time the vehicle was taken to  
25 Respondent Singh's facility, the refrigerant in use on the vehicle was not contaminated, and the  
26 vehicle was not in need of any refrigerant or a refrigerant service. In addition, the only repair  
27 needed on the A/C system was the replacement of the defective magnetic clutch relay.

28 ///

1           vi. On or between November 7-13, 2012, Respondent Chauhan, represented to a  
2 Bureau undercover operator that the Bureau's 1995 Chevrolet needed a tune-up and fuel injection  
3 service and that the repairs or services were needed for the vehicle to pass the smog inspection.  
4 In fact, the only repair(s) needed on the vehicle was the adjustment of the number five cylinder  
5 spark plug gap to specifications or the replacement of the spark plug, and replacement of the  
6 oxygen sensor. Further, the spark plug wires, distributor cap, and ignition rotor were new and  
7 were not in need of replacement, and the fuel injectors were not in need of servicing or repair at  
8 the time the vehicle was taken to Respondent Singh's facility.

9           vii. Respondent Chauhan made false or misleading representations to the  
10 undercover operator regarding the Bureau's 1995 Chevrolet, as set forth in paragraph 3(a)(vi)  
11 above, in order to induce the operator to purchase unnecessary repairs on the vehicle, sold the  
12 operator the unnecessary repairs, including the replacement of the spark plug wires, four sparks  
13 plugs, the distributor cap, the ignition rotor, and the fuel injection service, and failed to make  
14 necessary repairs, including replacement of the oxygen sensor.

15 ///

16 ///

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

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

ORDER

IT IS SO ORDERED that Smog Check Inspector (EO) License and Smog Check Repair Technician (EI) License No. 147842, heretofore issued to Respondent Gurpreet Singh Chauhan, is revoked.

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

This Decision shall become effective on February 24, 2015  
It is so ORDERED January 5, 2015

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
TAMARA COLSON  
Assistant Chief Counsel  
Department of Consumer Affairs

11484187.DOC  
SA2013110979

Attachment:  
Exhibit A: Accusation

---

# Exhibit A

Accusation

1 KAMALA D. HARRIS  
Attorney General of California  
2 KENT D. HARRIS  
Supervising Deputy Attorney General  
3 PHILLIP L. ARTHUR  
Deputy Attorney General  
4 State Bar No. 238339  
1300 I Street, Suite 125  
5 P.O. Box 944255  
Sacramento, CA 94244-2550  
6 Telephone: (916) 322-0032  
Facsimile: (916) 327-8643  
7 *Attorneys for Complainant*

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

12 In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

Case No. 79/14-19

13 **VALLEY SMOG & REPAIR**  
14 **JAGDEV SINGH, OWNER**  
1506 N. Blackstone  
Fresno, CA 93703

**ACCUSATION**

(Smog Check)

15 **Automotive Repair Dealer Reg. No. ARD 248173**  
16 **Smog Check Station License No. RC 248173**

17 and

18 **GURPREET SINGH CHAUHAN**  
1506 N. Blackstone  
Fresno, CA 93703

19 **Smog Check Inspector License No. EO 147842**  
20 **Smog Check Repair Technician License No. EI**  
21 **147842 (formerly Advanced Emission Specialist**  
**Technician License No. EA 147842)**

22 Respondents.

23  
24 Complainant alleges:

25 **PARTIES/LICENSE INFORMATION**

26 1. Patrick Dorais ("Complainant") brings this Accusation solely in his official capacity  
27 as the Acting Chief of the Bureau of Automotive Repair ("Bureau"), Department of Consumer  
28 Affairs.

1           **Valley Smog & Repair; Jagdev Singh, Owner**

2           2.     On or about December 4, 2006, the Director of Consumer Affairs ("Director") issued  
3     Automotive Repair Dealer Registration Number ARD 248173 ("registration") to Jagdev Singh  
4     ("Respondent Singh"), owner of Valley Smog & Repair. Respondent Singh's registration was in  
5     full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on or about  
6     November 30, 2013, unless renewed.

7           3.     On or about December 7, 2006, the Director issued Smog Check Station License  
8     Number RC 248173 to Respondent Singh. Respondent Singh's smog check station license was in  
9     full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on  
10    November 30, 2013, unless renewed.

11           **Gurpreet Singh Chauhan**

12          4.     On or about June 25, 2003, the Director issued Automotive Repair Dealer  
13    Registration Number ARD 227381 ("registration") to Gurpreet Singh Chauhan ("Respondent  
14    Chauhan"). On September 24, 2007, Respondent Chauhan's registration was revoked, as set forth  
15    in subparagraph 59 (b) below.

16          5.     On or about September 9, 2003, the Director issued Smog Check Station License  
17    Number RC 227381 to Respondent Chauhan. On September 24, 2007, Respondent Chauhan's  
18    smog check station license was revoked, as set forth in subparagraph 59 (b) below.

19          6.     On or about February 17, 2005, the Director issued Advanced Emission Specialist  
20    Technician License Number EA 147842 to Respondent Chauhan. On September 24, 2007,  
21    Respondent Chauhan's advanced emission specialist technician license was revoked; however, the  
22    revocation was stayed and Respondent was placed on probation for three (3) years on terms and  
23    conditions, as set forth in subparagraph 59 (b) below. The license was also suspended for 30 days  
24    effective September 24, 2007. Respondent Chauhan's advanced emission specialist technician  
25    license was due to expire on January 31, 2013. Pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title  
26    16, section 3340.28, subdivision (e), the license was renewed, pursuant to Respondent Chauhan's  
27    election, as Smog Check Inspector License Number EO 147842 and Smog Check Repair  
28

1 Technician License Number EI 147842 ("technician licenses"), effective January 31, 2013.<sup>1</sup>  
2 Respondent Chauhan's technician licenses will expire on January 31, 2015, unless renewed.

3 **JURISDICTION**

4 7. Business and Professions Code ("Bus. & Prof. Code") section 9884.7 provides that  
5 the Director may revoke an automotive repair dealer registration.

6 8. Bus. & Prof. Code section 9884.13 provides, in pertinent part, that the expiration of a  
7 valid registration shall not deprive the Director of jurisdiction to proceed with a disciplinary  
8 proceeding against an automotive repair dealer or to render a decision temporarily or permanently  
9 invalidating (suspending or revoking) a registration

10 9. Health and Safety Code ("Health & Saf. Code") section 44002 provides, in pertinent  
11 part, that the Director has all the powers and authority granted under the Automotive Repair Act  
12 for enforcing the Motor Vehicle Inspection Program.

13 10. Health & Saf. Code section 44072.6 provides, in pertinent part, that the expiration or  
14 suspension of a license by operation of law, or by order or decision of the Director of Consumer  
15 Affairs, or a court of law, or the voluntary surrender of the license shall not deprive the Director  
16 of jurisdiction to proceed with disciplinary action.

17 11. Health & Saf. Code section 44072.8 states that when a license has been revoked or  
18 suspended following a hearing under this article, any additional license issued under this chapter  
19 in the name of the licensee may be likewise revoked or suspended by the director.

20 12. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 3340.28, subdivision (e), states that  
21 "[u]pon renewal of an unexpired Basic Area Technician license or an Advanced Emission  
22 Specialist Technician license issued prior to the effective date of this regulation, the licensee may  
23 apply to renew as a Smog Check Inspector, Smog Check Repair Technician, or both.

24 ///

25 ///

26 <sup>1</sup> Effective August 1, 2012, California Code of Regulations, title 16, sections 3340.28,  
27 3340.29, and 3340.30 were amended to implement a license restructure from the Advanced  
28 Emission Specialist Technician (EA) license and Basic Area (EB) Technician license to Smog  
Check Inspector (EO) license and/or Smog Check Repair Technician (EI) license.



1 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 . . .

2 15. Bus. & Prof. Code section 22, subdivision (a), states:

3 "Board" as used in any provision of this Code, refers to the board in  
4 which the administration of the provision is vested, and unless otherwise expressly  
5 provided, shall include "bureau," "commission," "committee," "department,"  
"division," "examining committee," "program," and "agency."

6 16. Bus. & Prof. Code section 477, subdivision (b), states, in pertinent part, that a  
7 "license" includes "registration" and "certificate."

8 17. Health & Saf. Code section 44072.2 states, in pertinent part:

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

11 . . . . .  
12 (c) Violates any of the regulations adopted by the director pursuant to this  
13 chapter.

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

15 18. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section ("Regulation") 3340.15, subdivision  
16 (i), states, in pertinent part, that "[a] licensed smog check station shall not sublet inspections or  
17 repairs required as part of the Smog Check Program . . ."

18 19. Regulation 3356 states, in pertinent part:

19 (a) All invoices for service and repair work performed, and parts  
20 supplied, as provided for in Section 9884.8 of the Business and Professions Code,  
shall comply with the following:

21 . . . . .  
22 (2) The invoice shall separately list, describe and identify all of the  
23 following:

24 (B) Each part supplied, in such a manner that the customer can  
25 understand what was purchased . . .

26 20. Regulation section 3366 states:

27 (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, any automotive  
28 repair dealer that advertises or performs, directly or through a sublet contractor,  
automotive air conditioning work and uses the words service, inspection, diagnosis,

1 top off, performance check or any expression or term of like meaning in any form of  
2 advertising or on a written estimate or invoice shall include and perform all of the  
3 following procedures as part of that air conditioning work:

4 (1) Exposed hoses, tubing and connections are examined for damage or  
5 leaks;

6 (2) The compressor and clutch, when accessible, are examined for  
7 damage, missing bolts, missing hardware, broken housing and leaks;

8 (3) The compressor is rotated to determine if it is seized or locked up;

9 (4) Service ports are examined for missing caps, damaged threads and  
10 conformance with labeling;

11 (5) The condenser coil is examined for damage, restrictions or leaks;

12 (6) The expansion device, if accessible, is examined for physical damage  
13 or leaks;

14 (7) The accumulator receiver dryer and in-line filter have been checked  
15 for damage, missing or loose hardware or leaks;

16 (8) The drive belt system has been checked for damaged or missing  
17 pulleys or tensioners and for proper belt routing, tension, alignment, excessive wear  
18 or cracking;

19 (9) The fan clutch has been examined for leakage, bearing wear and  
20 proper operation;

21 (10) The cooling fan has been checked for bent or missing blades;

22 (11) Accessible electrical connections have been examined for loose,  
23 burnt, broken or corroded parts;

24 (12) The refrigerant in use has been identified and checked for  
25 contamination;

26 (13) The system has been checked for leakage at a minimum of 50-PSI  
27 system pressure;

28 (14) The compressor clutch, blower motor and air control doors have  
been checked for proper operation;

(15) High and low side system operating pressures, as applicable, have  
been measured and recorded on the final invoice; and,

(16) The center air distribution outlet temperature has been measured and  
recorded on the final invoice.

(b) Whenever the automotive air conditioning work being advertised or  
performed does not involve opening the refrigerant portion of the air conditioning  
system, refrigerant evacuation, or full or partial refrigerant recharge, the procedures  
specified in subsection (a) need be performed only to the extent required by accepted  
trade standards.

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

21. Regulation section 3371 states, in pertinent part:

No dealer shall publish, utter, or make or cause to be published, uttered, or 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 to be false or misleading . . .

22. Regulation section 3372 states:

In determining whether any advertisement, statement, or representation is false or misleading, it shall be considered in its entirety as it would be read or heard by persons to whom it is designed to appeal. An advertisement, statement, or representation shall be considered to be false or misleading if it tends to deceive the public or impose upon credulous or ignorant persons.

23. Regulation section 3372.1 states, in pertinent part:

An automotive repair dealer shall not advertise automotive service at a price which is misleading. Price advertising is misleading in circumstances which include but are not limited to the following:

(a) The automotive repair dealer does not intend to sell the advertised service at the advertised price but intends to entice the consumer into a more costly transaction . . .

24. Regulation section 3373 states:

No automotive repair dealer or individual in charge shall, in filling out an 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 information which will cause any such document to be false or misleading, or where the tendency or effect thereby would be to mislead or deceive customers, prospective customers, or the public.

COST RECOVERY

25. Bus. & Prof. Code section 125.3 provides, in pertinent part, that a Board may request the administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case.

///  
///  
///  
///  
///

1 UNDERCOVER OPERATION #1: 1997 CHEVROLET

2 26. On August 17, 2012, an undercover operator with the Bureau ("operator") took the  
3 Bureau's 1997 Chevrolet to Respondent Singh's facility. The air conditioning ("A/C") system on  
4 the Bureau-documented vehicle was performing at manufacturer's specifications and was not in  
5 need of servicing or repair. The operator met with Respondent Chauhan ("Chauhan") and told  
6 him that she needed to get the A/C checked. Chauhan had the operator sign a written estimate,  
7 but did not give her a copy. The estimate indicated that an A/C service would be performed on  
8 the vehicle for \$19.99 and that the service included the addition of Freon (refrigerant) at a cost of  
9 \$35 (for a total of \$54.99). The operator left the Respondent Singh's facility.

10 27. At approximately 3:35 p.m. that same day, the operator returned to the facility and  
11 met with Chauhan. Chauhan gave the operator a copy of the above estimate and an invoice, and  
12 told her that he put \$70 worth of Freon in the vehicle. The operator paid Chauhan \$95.91 for the  
13 A/C services, then left Respondent Singh's facility.

14 28. On August 20, 2012, the Bureau inspected the vehicle using the invoice for  
15 comparison. The Bureau found that the facility had charged the operator for two pounds of Freon  
16 when, in fact, the A/C system had been recharged with refrigerant prior to the time the vehicle  
17 was taken to the facility.

18 FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

19 (Untrue or Misleading Statements)

20 29. Respondent Singh's registration is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Bus. &  
21 Prof. Code section 9884.7, subdivision (a)(1), in that Respondent made or authorized a statement  
22 which he knew or in the exercise of reasonable care should have known to be untrue or  
23 misleading, as follows: Respondent represented on the written estimate that Freon would be  
24 added to the A/C system on the Bureau's 1997 Chevrolet as part of the A/C service. In fact,  
25 Respondent had no basis for recommending or selling Freon to the undercover operator or adding  
26 refrigerant to the A/C system in that the refrigerant in use on the vehicle had not been identified  
27 and checked for contamination by the facility as required by Regulation section 3366, subdivision  
28 (a)(12). Further, the A/C system had been recharged with refrigerant prior to the time the vehicle

1 was taken to Respondent Singh's facility and the vehicle was not in need of any refrigerant or a  
2 refrigerant service.

3 **SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

4 **(Failure to Provide Customer with Copy of Signed Document)**

5 30. Respondent Singh's registration is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Bus. &  
6 Prof. Code section 9884.7, subdivision (a)(3), in that Respondent Singh's technician, Respondent  
7 Chauhan, failed to provide the undercover operator with a copy of the written estimate as soon as  
8 she signed the document.

9 **THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

10 **(Fraud)**

11 31. Respondent Singh's registration is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Bus. &  
12 Prof. Code section 9884.7, subdivision (a)(4), in that Respondent committed acts constituting  
13 fraud, as follows: Respondent obtained payment from the undercover operator for adding Freon  
14 to the A/C system on the Bureau's 1997 Chevrolet as part of the A/C service. In fact, Respondent  
15 had no basis for selling Freon to the undercover operator or adding Freon to the A/C system in  
16 that the refrigerant in use on the vehicle had not been identified and checked for contamination by  
17 the facility as required by Regulation section 3366, subdivision (a)(12). Further, the A/C system  
18 had been recharged with refrigerant prior to the time the vehicle was taken to Respondent's  
19 facility, and the vehicle was not in need of any refrigerant or a refrigerant service.

20 **FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

21 **(Violations of the Bus. & Prof. Code)**

22 32. Respondent Singh's registration is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Bus. &  
23 Prof. Code section 9884.7, subdivision (a)(6), in that Respondent failed to comply with section  
24 9884.9, subdivision (a), of that Code in the following material respects:

25 a. Respondent Singh's technician, Respondent Chauhan, exceeded the estimate price of  
26 \$54.99 for the A/C service and the addition of Freon on the Bureau's 1997 Chevrolet without the  
27 operator's oral or written consent.

28 ///

1 b. Respondent Singh's technician, Respondent Chauhan, failed to provide the operator  
2 with the written estimate before performing the A/C service on the Bureau's 1997 Chevrolet.

3 **FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

4 **(Dishonesty, Fraud or Deceit)**

5 33. Respondent Singh's smog check station license is subject to disciplinary action  
6 pursuant to Health & Saf. Code section 44072.2, subdivision (d), in that Respondent committed  
7 dishonest, fraudulent, or deceitful acts whereby another was injured, as set forth in paragraphs 29  
8 and 31 above.

9 **UNDERCOVER OPERATION #2: 2000 TOYOTA**

10 34. On September 18, 2012, an undercover operator with the Bureau ("operator") took  
11 the Bureau's 2000 Toyota to Respondent Singh's facility. Respondent had a banner or  
12 advertisement posted at the facility, offering an "A/C service" for \$19.99. The operator met with  
13 Respondent Chauhan in the office and told him that the A/C in the vehicle was not blowing cold  
14 air and that she wanted it checked at the advertised price of \$19.99. A defective magnetic clutch  
15 relay had been installed in the Bureau-documented vehicle, preventing the A/C compressor from  
16 operating. Chauhan told the operator that the A/C service would be \$19.99 plus \$35 for Freon,  
17 and that Freon "is the stuff" that makes the A/C "blow cold air". The operator gave Chauhan the  
18 keys to the vehicle. Chauhan drove the vehicle into the shop area and began performing the A/C  
19 service. Chauhan did not provide the operator with a written estimate. The operator left  
20 Respondent Singh's facility, but returned later. Chauhan told the operator that he had tried the  
21 Freon, but the A/C was still not blowing cold air, that the problem "was something electrical,"  
22 and that he would only charge her \$20 for the A/C service. The operator paid Chauhan \$20, then  
23 left the vehicle at Respondent Singh's facility for repair.

24 35. At approximately 3:45 p.m. that same day, Chauhan called the operator and informed  
25 her that the total repair costs on the vehicle would be \$165. The operator told Chauhan that she  
26 would need to check with her husband and would call him back. The operator called Chauhan  
27 later and told him that her husband wanted to know "what he was paying for." Chauhan indicated  
28 that the vehicle would need 1½ pounds of Freon at a cost of \$52 and a pressure sensor at a cost of

1 \$30, and that the labor charges would be \$90. The operator told Chauhan that she would call him  
2 back after speaking with her husband. The operator called Chauhan later and authorized the  
3 repairs.

4 36. On September 19, 2012, the operator returned to Respondent Singh's facility to  
5 retrieve the vehicle, paid Chauhan \$160 (for total payments on the repairs of \$180), and received  
6 a copy of Invoice No. [REDACTED]

7 37. On September 20, 2012, the Bureau inspected the vehicle using the invoice for  
8 comparison. The Bureau found that Respondent Singh's facility had not repaired the vehicle as  
9 invoiced, had performed unnecessary repairs, and had failed to properly repair the A/C system,  
10 constituting gross negligence, as set forth below.

11 **SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

12 **(Untrue or Misleading Statements)**

13 38. Respondent Singh's registration is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Bus. &  
14 Prof. Code section 9884.7, subdivision (a)(1), in that Respondent made or authorized statements  
15 which he knew or in the exercise of reasonable care should have known to be untrue or  
16 misleading, as follows:

17 a. Respondent Singh's technician, Respondent Chauhan, represented to the undercover  
18 operator that Freon would be added to the A/C system on the Bureau's 2000 Toyota as part of the  
19 A/C service. In fact, Chauhan had no basis for recommending or selling Freon to the undercover  
20 operator or adding Freon to the A/C system in that the refrigerant in use on the vehicle had not  
21 been identified and checked for contamination by the facility as required by Regulation section  
22 3366, subdivision (a)(12). Further, the A/C system had been recharged with refrigerant prior to  
23 the time the vehicle was taken to Respondent Singh's facility, the refrigerant in use on the vehicle  
24 was not contaminated, and the vehicle was not in need of any refrigerant or a refrigerant service.

25 b. Respondent Singh's technician, Respondent Chauhan, represented to the undercover  
26 operator that the Bureau's 2000 Toyota needed a pressure switch. In fact, the pressure switch was  
27 in good serviceable condition, was free from damage, and was not in need of replacement at the  
28 time the vehicle was taken to Respondent Singh's facility.

1 c. Respondent Singh represented on the invoice that the pressure switch on the Bureau's  
2 2000 Toyota was replaced. In fact, that part was not replaced on the vehicle as invoiced.

3 **SEVENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

4 **(Fraud)**

5 39. Respondent Singh's registration is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Bus. &  
6 Prof. Code section 9884.7, subdivision (a)(4), in that Respondent committed acts constituting  
7 fraud, as follows:

8 a. Respondent Singh obtained payment from the undercover operator for adding Freon  
9 to the A/C system on the Bureau's 2000 Toyota as part of the A/C service. In fact, Respondent  
10 had no basis for selling Freon to the undercover operator or adding Freon to the A/C system in  
11 that the refrigerant in use on the vehicle had not been identified and checked for contamination by  
12 the facility as required by Regulation section 3366, subdivision (a)(12). Further, the A/C system  
13 had been recharged with refrigerant prior to the time the vehicle was taken to Respondent's  
14 facility, the refrigerant in use on the vehicle was not contaminated, and the vehicle was not in  
15 need of any refrigerant or a refrigerant service.

16 b. Respondent Singh's technician, Respondent Chauhan, made a false or misleading  
17 representation to the undercover operator regarding the A/C system on the Bureau's 2000 Toyota,  
18 as set forth in subparagraph 38(b) above, in order to induce the operator to purchase an  
19 unnecessary repair on the vehicle, then sold the operator the unnecessary repair—the replacement  
20 of the pressure switch.

21 c. Respondent Singh obtained payment from the undercover operator for replacing the  
22 pressure switch on the Bureau's 2000 Toyota. In fact, that part was not replaced on the vehicle as  
23 invoiced.

24 **EIGHTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

25 **(Gross Negligence)**

26 40. Respondent Singh's registration is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Bus. &  
27 Prof. Code section 9884.7, subdivision (a)(5), in that Respondent committed acts constituting  
28 gross negligence, as follows: Respondent removed the defective magnetic clutch relay on the

1 Bureau's 2000 Toyota and switched it with one of the existing engine cooling fan relays, i.e.,  
2 switched the positions of the two relays. As a result, the engine cooling fans are not operating  
3 properly or to manufacturer specifications, exposing the engine to potential damage from  
4 overheating.

5 **NINTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

6 **(Departure from Trade Standards)**

7 41. Respondent Singh's registration is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Bus. &  
8 Prof. Code section 9884.7, subdivision (a)(7), in that Respondent willfully departed from or  
9 disregarded accepted trade standards for good and workmanlike repair without the consent of the  
10 owner or the owner's duly authorized representative, in a material respect, as follows:  
11 Respondent failed to record on the invoice the center air distribution outlet temperature of the AC  
12 system on the Bureau's 2000 Toyota, as required by Regulation section 3366, subdivision (a)(16).

13 **TENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

14 **(Violations of the Bus. & Prof. Code)**

15 42. Respondent Singh's registration is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Bus. &  
16 Prof. Code section 9884.7, subdivision (a)(6), in that Respondent failed to comply with section  
17 9884.9, subdivision (a), of that Code in a material respect, as follows: Respondent Singh's  
18 technician, Respondent Chauhan, failed to provide the undercover operator with a written  
19 estimate for the A/C service on the Bureau's 2000 Toyota.

20 **ELEVENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

21 **(Misleading Price Advertising)**

22 43. Respondent Singh's registration is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Bus. &  
23 Prof. Code section 9884.7, subdivision (a)(6), in that Respondent Singh failed to comply with  
24 Regulation section 3372.1 by advertising the A/C service at a price which was misleading, as  
25 follows: Respondent Singh represented on the banner/advertisement, described in paragraph 32  
26 above, that the A/C service would be \$19.99. In fact, Respondent Singh did not intend to sell the  
27 advertised service for \$19.99, but intended to entice the consumer into a more costly transaction,  
28 as follows: Respondent Singh's technician, Respondent Chauhan, represented to the undercover

1 operator that the A/C service on the Bureau's 2000 Chevrolet would be \$19.99 plus \$35 for  
2 Freon, and that Freon was needed on the vehicle since it was "the stuff" that made the A/C "blow  
3 cold air". In fact, Respondent Chauhan had no basis for recommending or selling Freon to the  
4 undercover operator or adding Freon to the A/C system in that the refrigerant in use on the  
5 vehicle had not been identified and checked for contamination by the facility as required by  
6 Regulation section 3366, subdivision (a)(12). Further, the A/C system had been evacuated and  
7 charged with refrigerant prior to the time the vehicle was taken to Respondent Singh's facility,  
8 the refrigerant in use on the vehicle was not contaminated, and the vehicle was not in need of any  
9 refrigerant or a refrigerant service. In addition, the only repair needed on the A/C system was the  
10 replacement of the defective magnetic clutch relay.

11 **TWELFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

12 **(Dishonesty, Fraud or Deceit)**

13 44. Respondent Singh's smog check station license is subject to disciplinary action  
14 pursuant to Health & Saf. Code section 44072.2, subdivision (d), in that Respondent committed  
15 dishonest, fraudulent, or deceitful acts whereby another was injured, as set forth in paragraphs 38,  
16 39, and 43 above.

17 **THIRTEENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

18 **(Dishonesty, Fraud or Deceit)**

19 45. Respondent Chauhan's technician licenses are subject to disciplinary action pursuant  
20 to Health & Saf. Code section 44072.2, subdivision (d), in that Respondent committed dishonest,  
21 fraudulent, or deceitful acts whereby another was injured, as set forth in paragraphs 38(a) and (b),  
22 39(b), and 43 above.

23 **UNDERCOVER OPERATION #3: 1995 CHEVROLET**

24 46. On November 7, 2012, an undercover operator with the Bureau ("operator") took the  
25 Bureau's 1995 Chevrolet to Respondent Singh's facility. The spark plug gap on the number five  
26 cylinder spark plug on the Bureau-documented vehicle had been set to zero, causing the engine to  
27 misfire and the vehicle to fail a smog test due to excessive tailpipe emissions. The operator met  
28 with Respondent Chauhan and requested a smog inspection. Chauhan told the operator that he

1 would perform the inspection after he was done with another customer's vehicle. Chauhan had  
2 the operator sign a blank repair order. Approximately one and a half hours later, Chauhan came  
3 into the office and informed the operator that her vehicle failed the inspection. The operator paid  
4 Chauhan \$49.75, but was not given any documentation on the vehicle. Chauhan told the operator  
5 that he could repair the vehicle, but would have to diagnose it first. Chauhan also stated that he  
6 would not be able to perform the work until the following day. The operator left the vehicle at  
7 Respondent Singh's facility for the diagnosis.

8 47. On November 8, 2012, Respondent Chauhan called the operator and told her that he  
9 was finished with the diagnosis and that the vehicle needed multiple repairs, including a tune-up  
10 and a fuel injection service, at a total estimated cost of \$345. The operator asked Chauhan if the  
11 vehicle needed all of these services in order to pass the smog test. Chauhan said "Yes." The  
12 operator told Chauhan that she would check with her husband and call him back. That same day,  
13 the operator called Respondent Singh's facility and authorized the repairs.

14 48. On November 9, 2012, the operator called Respondent Singh's facility to check on  
15 the status of the vehicle. Respondent Chauhan told the operator that he was still working on the  
16 vehicle, but it should be ready the following day. The operator asked Chauhan if the vehicle  
17 would be "smogged" as well. Chauhan said "Yes."

18 49. On November 13, 2012, the operator returned to Respondent Singh's facility to  
19 retrieve the vehicle and paid Respondent Chauhan \$380 in cash for the repairs. Chauhan gave the  
20 operator a vehicle inspection report ("VIR") dated November 12, 2012. The VIR showed that the  
21 vehicle had passed the smog inspection and that the inspection had been performed by Smog  
22 Doctor, a test only facility located in Fresno.<sup>2</sup> The operator requested the VIR for the first (failed)

23 <sup>2</sup> Test only facilities are licensed smog check stations, that by law, are only allowed to test  
24 vehicles; they cannot repair them. Any needed repairs must be performed at either a smog check  
25 station designated as a test and repair facility or a STAR-certified Test and Repair station. Test-  
26 and-repair stations are licensed by the state to provide smog check tests and repairs to most  
27 vehicles. Under current law, test-and-repair stations are prohibited from certifying repaired  
28 "gross polluters" or vehicles that have been directed to test-only stations for inspection. Only  
test-only stations and STAR-certified Test and Repair station are able to certify repaired gross  
polluter vehicles. Pursuant to Health & Saf. Code section 39032.5, "gross polluter" means a  
vehicle with excess hydrocarbon, carbon monoxide, or oxides of nitrogen (NOX) emissions as  
established by the department in consultation with the state board.

1 inspection as well as an invoice. Chauhan gave the operator the repair order she had signed on  
2 November 7, 2012. The operator noticed that there was only one charge on the repair order, and  
3 asked Chauhan to write down all of the repairs he had performed on the vehicle. Chauhan made  
4 various notations on the repair order, then gave the operator the invoice copy, Invoice No. [REDACTED]  
5 and a VIR dated November 7, 2012. The VIR indicated that the vehicle had failed the smog  
6 inspection as a gross polluter.

7 50. On November 16, 2012, the Bureau inspected the vehicle using the invoice for  
8 comparison and found that Respondent Singh's facility had properly repaired the malfunction in  
9 the ignition system by replacing the number five cylinder spark plug. The Bureau also found that  
10 Respondent Singh's facility performed unnecessary repairs, failed to repair the vehicle as  
11 invoiced, and departed from accepted trade standards in a material respect, as set forth below.

#### 12 FOURTEENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

##### 13 (Untrue or Misleading Statements)

14 51. Respondent Singh's registration is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Bus. &  
15 Prof. Code section 9884.7, subdivision (a)(1), in that Respondent made or authorized statements  
16 which he knew or in the exercise of reasonable care should have known to be untrue or  
17 misleading, as follows:

18 a. Respondent Singh's technician, Respondent Chauhan, represented to the undercover  
19 operator that the Bureau's 1995 Chevrolet needed a tune-up and a fuel injection service and that  
20 the repairs or services were needed for the vehicle to pass the smog inspection. In fact, the only  
21 repair(s) needed on the vehicle was the adjustment of the number five cylinder spark plug gap to  
22 specifications or the replacement of the spark plug, and replacement of the oxygen sensor.  
23 Further, the spark plug wires, distributor cap, and ignition rotor were new and were not in need of  
24 replacement, and the fuel injectors were not in need of servicing or repair at the time the vehicle  
25 was taken to Respondent Singh's facility.

26 b. Respondent Singh represented on the invoice that the ignition rotor on the Bureau's  
27 1995 Chevrolet was replaced. In fact, that part was not replaced on the vehicle as invoiced.

28 ///

1. c. Respondent Singh represented on the invoice that only one spark plug was replaced  
2 on the Bureau's 1995 Chevrolet. In fact, five spark plugs were replaced on the vehicle, including  
3 the number five cylinder spark plug.

4 **FIFTEENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

5 (Fraud)

6 52. Respondent Singh's registration is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Bus. &  
7 Prof. Code section 9884.7, subdivision (a)(4), in that Respondent committed acts constituting  
8 fraud, as follows:

9 a. Respondent Singh's technician, Respondent Chauhan, made false or misleading  
10 representations to the undercover operator regarding the Bureau's 1995 Chevrolet, as set forth in  
11 subparagraph 51(a) above, in order to induce the operator to purchase unnecessary repairs on the  
12 vehicle, sold the operator the unnecessary repairs, including the replacement of the spark plug  
13 wires, four sparks plugs, the distributor cap, the ignition rotor, and the fuel injection service, and  
14 failed to make necessary repairs, including replacement of the oxygen sensor.

15 b. Respondent Singh obtained payment from the undercover operator for replacing the  
16 ignition rotor on the Bureau's 1995 Chevrolet. In fact, that part was not replaced on the vehicle  
17 as invoiced.

18 **SIXTEENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

19 (Departure from Trade Standards)

20 53. Respondent Singh's registration is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Bus. &  
21 Prof. Code section 9884.7, subdivision (a)(7), in that Respondent willfully departed from or  
22 disregarded accepted trade standards for good and workmanlike repair without the consent of the  
23 owner or the owner's duly authorized representative, in a material respect, as follows:

24 Respondent failed to reinstall one of the two wing nuts in the air cleaner housing cover on the  
25 Bureau's 1995 Chevrolet.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 SEVENTEENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

2 (Violations of the Bus. & Prof. Code)

3 54. Respondent Singh's registration is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Bus. &  
4 Prof. Code section 9884.7, subdivision (a)(6), in that Respondent failed to comply with section  
5 9884.9, subdivision (a), of that Code in a material respect, as follows: Respondent Singh's  
6 technician, Respondent Chauhan, failed to provide the undercover operator with a written  
7 estimate for the smog inspection on the Bureau's 1995 Chevrolet.

8 EIGHTEENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

9 (Violations of the Bus. & Prof. Code)

10 55. Respondent Singh's registration is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Bus. &  
11 Prof. Code section 9884.7, subdivision (a)(6), in that Respondent failed to comply with  
12 Regulation section 3356, subdivision (a)(2)(B), in a material respect, as follows: Respondent  
13 stated on Invoice No. [REDACTED] that only one spark plug was replaced on the Bureau's 1995  
14 Chevrolet when, in fact, a total of five spark plugs were replaced on the vehicle.

15 NINETEENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

16 (Failure to Comply with Regulations Pursuant to the Motor Vehicle Inspection Program)

17 56. Respondent Singh's smog check station license is subject to disciplinary action  
18 pursuant to Health & Saf. Code section 44072.2, subdivision (c), in that Respondent failed to  
19 comply with Regulation 3340.15, subdivision (i), as follows: Respondent sublet the second smog  
20 inspection on the Bureau's 1995 Chevrolet to Smog Doctor, as set forth in paragraph 49 above.

21 TWENTIETH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

22 (Dishonesty, Fraud or Deceit)

23 57. Respondent Singh's smog check station license is subject to disciplinary action  
24 pursuant to Health & Saf. Code section 44072.2, subdivision (d), in that Respondent committed  
25 dishonest, fraudulent, or deceitful acts whereby another was injured, as set forth in paragraphs 51  
26 and 52 above.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **TWENTY-FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

2 **(Dishonesty, Fraud or Deceit)**

3 58. Respondent Chauhan's technician licenses are subject to disciplinary action pursuant  
4 to Health & Saf. Code section 44072.2, subdivision (d), in that Respondent committed dishonest,  
5 fraudulent, or deceitful acts whereby another was injured, as set forth in subparagraphs 51(a) and  
6 52(a) above.

7 **MATTERS IN AGGRAVATION**

8 59. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondents Singh  
9 and Chauhan, Complainant alleges as follows:

10 **Respondent Singh**

11 a. On or about July 2, 2012, the Bureau issued Citation No. C2013-0002 against  
12 Respondent Singh for violating Health & Saf. Code section 44012, subdivision (f) (failure to  
13 perform a visual/functional check of emission control devices according to procedures prescribed  
14 by the department). On or about May 22, 2012, Respondent Singh had issued a certificate of  
15 compliance to a Bureau undercover vehicle with a missing PCV system. The Bureau assessed a  
16 civil penalty of \$1,000 against Respondent Singh for the violation. Respondent Singh paid the  
17 fine on August 23, 2012.

18 **Respondent Chauhan**

19 b. On September 24, 2007, pursuant to the Proposed Decision of the Administrative  
20 Law Judge adopted by the Director as the Decision in the disciplinary action entitled "In the  
21 Matter of the Accusation Against: Valley Smog, Gurpreet Singh Chauhan, Owner", et al., Case  
22 Number 79/07-20, the Director permanently invalidated (revoked) Automotive Repair Dealer  
23 Registration Number ARD 227381, and revoked Smog Check Station License Number RC  
24 227381 and Advanced Emission Specialist Technician License Number EA 147842 ("technician  
25 license") issued to Respondent Chauhan. The revocation as to Respondent Chauhan's technician  
26 license was stayed and Chauhan was placed on probation for three (3) years on terms and  
27 conditions. Respondent Chauhan's technician license was also suspended for 30 days effective  
28 September 24, 2007.

1 c. On or about July 2, 2012, the Bureau issued Citation No. M2013-0003 against  
2 Respondent Chauhan's technician license for violating Health & Saf. Code section 44032  
3 (qualified technicians shall perform tests of emission control systems and devices in accordance  
4 with Health & Saf. Code section 44012). On or about May 22, 2012, Respondent Chauhan had  
5 issued a certificate of compliance to a Bureau undercover vehicle with a missing PCV system.  
6 Respondent Chauhan was directed to complete an 8 hour training course and to submit proof of  
7 completion to the Bureau within 30 days from receipt of the citation. Respondent Chauhan  
8 completed the training on August 26, 2012.

9 **OTHER MATTERS**

10 60. Pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code section 9884.7, subdivision (c), the Director may  
11 suspend, revoke or place on probation the registration for all places of business operated in this  
12 state by Respondent Jagdev Singh, owner of Valley Smog & Repair, upon a finding that  
13 Respondent has, or is, engaged in a course of repeated and willful violations of the laws and  
14 regulations pertaining to an automotive repair dealer.

15 61. Pursuant to Health & Saf. Code section 44072.8, if Smog Check Station License  
16 Number RC 248173, issued to Respondent Jagdev Singh, owner of Valley Smog & Repair, is  
17 revoked or suspended, any additional license issued under this chapter in the name of said  
18 licensee may be likewise revoked or suspended by the Director.

19 62. Pursuant to Health & Saf. Code section 44072.8, if Smog Check Inspector License  
20 Number EO 147842 and Smog Check Repair Technician License No. EI 147842, issued to  
21 Respondent Gurpreet Singh Chauhan, are revoked or suspended, any additional license issued  
22 under this chapter in the name of said licensee may be likewise revoked or suspended by the  
23 Director.

24 **PRAYER**

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

27 1. Revoking or suspending Automotive Repair Dealer Registration Number ARD  
28 248173, issued to Jagdev Singh, owner of Valley Smog & Repair;

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

2. Revoking or suspending any other automotive repair dealer registration issued to Jagdev Singh;

3. Revoking or suspending Smog Check Station License Number RC 248173, issued to Jagdev Singh, owner of Valley Smog & Repair;

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

5. Revoking or suspending Smog Check Inspector License Number EO 147842 and Smog Check Repair Technician License No. EI 147842 issued to Gurpreet Singh Chauhan;

6. Revoking or suspending any additional license issued under Chapter 5 of the Health and Safety Code in the name of Gurpreet Singh Chauhan;

7. Ordering Jagdev Singh, owner of Valley Smog & Repair, and Gurpreet Singh Chauhan to pay the Director of Consumer Affairs the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 125.3;

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

DATED: August 30, 2013

*Patrick Dorais*

PATRICK DORAIS  
Acting Chief  
Bureau of Automotive Repair  
Department of Consumer Affairs  
State of California  
*Complainant*

SA2013110979

1 KAMALA D. HARRIS  
Attorney General of California  
2 KENT D. HARRIS  
Supervising Deputy Attorney General  
3 PHILLIP L. ARTHUR  
Deputy Attorney General  
4 State Bar No. 238339  
1300 I Street, Suite 125  
5 P.O. Box 944255  
Sacramento, CA 94244-2550  
6 Telephone: (916) 322-0032  
Facsimile: (916) 327-8643  
7 E-mail: Phillip.Arthur@doj.ca.gov  
*Attorneys for Complainant*  
8

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

11 In the Matter of the Accusation Against:  
12 **VALLEY SMOG & REPAIR**  
13 **JAGDEV SINGH, OWNER**  
14 **1506 N. Blackstone**  
**Fresno, CA 93703**  
15 **Automotive Repair Dealer Reg. No. ARD**  
**248173**  
16 **Smog Check Station License No. RC 248173**  
17 **and**  
18 **GURPREET SINGH CHAUHAN**  
19 **1506 N. Blackstone**  
**Fresno, CA 93703**  
20 **Smog Check Inspector License No. EO**  
**147842**  
21 **Smog Check Repair Technician License No.**  
22 **EI 147842 (formerly Advanced Emission**  
**Specialist Technician License No. EA**  
23 **147842)**  
24 Respondents.

Case No. 79/14-19  
OAH No. 2013110704  
**NOTICE OF HEARING**  
[Gov. Code, § 11509.]  
Hearing: Monday, September 8, 2014

25 ///  
26 ///  
27 ///  
28 ///

1 YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that a hearing in this matter will commence on **Monday,**  
2 **September 8, 2014,** at **1:30 p.m.** and will continue on a day-to-day basis, as necessary through  
3 **Tuesday, September 9, 2014,** before an Administrative Law Judge at the address listed below.

4 **Bureau of Automotive Repair - Fresno**  
5 **7130 North Marks**  
6 **Fresno, CA 93711**

7 The hearing will be conducted before the Director of Consumer Affairs, Bureau of  
8 Automotive Repair by an Administrative Law Judge of the Office of Administrative Hearings,  
9 upon the charges made in the Accusation served upon you.

10 If you object to the place of hearing, you must notify the presiding officer within ten (10)  
11 days after this notice is served on you. Failure to notify the presiding officer within ten (10) days  
12 will deprive you of a change in the place of hearing.

13 You may be present at the hearing. You have the right to be represented by an attorney at  
14 your own expense. You are not entitled to the appointment of an attorney to represent you at  
15 public expense. You are entitled to represent yourself without legal counsel. You may present  
16 any relevant evidence, and will be given full opportunity to cross-examine all witnesses testifying  
17 against you. You are entitled to the issuance of subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses  
18 and the production of books, documents, or other things by applying to the Office of  
19 Administrative Hearings, Attn: General Jurisdiction, 2349 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 200,  
20 Sacramento, CA 95833-4231, telephone: (916) 263-0550.

21 **INTERPRETER:** Pursuant to section 11435.20 of the Government Code, the hearing shall  
22 be conducted in the English language. If a party or a party's witness does not proficiently speak  
23 or understand the English language and before commencement of the hearing requests language  
24 assistance, an agency subject to the language assistance requirement in section 11435.15 of the  
25 Government Code shall provide a certified interpreter or an interpreter approved by the  
26 administrative law judge conducting the proceedings. The cost of providing the interpreter shall  
27 be paid by the agency having jurisdiction over the matter if the administrative law judge or  
28 hearing officer so directs, otherwise by the party for whom the interpreter is provided. If you or a

1 witness requires the assistance of an interpreter, ample advance notice of this fact should be given  
2 to the Office of Administrative Hearings so that appropriate arrangements can be made.


3 CONTINUANCES: Under section 11524 of the Government Code, the agency may grant a  
4 continuance, but when an administrative law judge of the Office of Administrative Hearings has  
5 been assigned to the hearing, no continuance may be granted except by him or her or by the  
6 presiding Administrative Law Judge for good cause. When seeking a continuance, a party shall  
7 apply for the continuance within ten (10) working days following the time the party discovered or  
8 reasonably should have discovered the event or occurrence which establishes good cause for the  
9 continuance. A continuance may be granted for good cause after the ten (10) working days have  
10 lapsed only if the party seeking the continuance is not responsible for and has made a good faith  
11 effort to prevent the condition or event establishing the good cause.

12 Continuances are not favored. If you need a continuance, immediately write or call the  
13 Office of Administrative Hearings: Attn: General Jurisdiction, 2349 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite  
14 200, Sacramento, CA 95833-4231 telephone: (916) 263-0550.

15 Dated: December 5, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

16 KAMALA D. HARRIS  
17 Attorney General of California  
18 KENT D. HARRIS  
19 Supervising Deputy Attorney General

20   
21 PHILLIP L. ARTHUR  
22 Deputy Attorney General  
23 *Attorneys for Complainant*

24 SA2013110979  
25 11230634.doc