

1 XAVIER BECERRA
Attorney General of California
2 ARMANDO ZAMBRANO
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
3 WILLIAM D. GARDNER
Deputy Attorney General
4 State Bar No. 244817
300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702
5 Los Angeles, CA 90013
Telephone: (213) 897-2114
6 Facsimile: (213) 897-2804
Attorneys for Complainant
7

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. 77/17-16353

13 **CESAR ORTIZ, dba**
14 **ABC SPEEDEE LUBE**
15 **4551 E. Gage Avenue**
16 **Bell, CA 90201**

A C C U S A T I O N

17 **Mailing Address:**
18 **3875 E. 3rd Street**
19 **Los Angeles, CA 90063**

20 **Automotive Repair Dealer Registration No.**
21 **ARD 252076**
22 **Brake Station License No. BS 252076,**
23 **Class C**
24 **Lamp Station License No. LS 252076,**
25 **Class A**

26 and

27 **FRANCISCO J. BRAMBILA**
28 **13143 Foxley Drive**
Whittier, CA 90602

Smog Check Inspector No. EO 33342
Smog Check Repair Technician License No.
EI 33342
Brake Adjuster License No. BA 33342,
Class C
Lamp Adjuster License No. LA 33342,
Class A,

Respondents.

1 Complainant alleges:

2 PARTIES

3 1.e Patrick Dorais (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in his official capacity as
4 the Chief of the Bureau of Automotive Repair, Department of Consumer Affairs.

5 2.e In 2007, the Bureau of Automotive Repair issued Automotive Repair Dealere
6 Registration Number ARD 252076 to Cesar Ortiz, dba ABC Speedee Lube. The Automotive
7 Repair Dealer Registration was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought
8 herein and will expire on September 30, 2019, unless renewed.

9 3.e On March 6, 2008, the Bureau of Automotive Repair issued Brake Station Licensee
10 Number BS 252076, class C, and Lamp Station Number LS 252076, class A, to Cesar Ortiz, dba
11 ABC Speedee Lube. The Brake Station License and Lamp Station License were in full force and
12 effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on September 30, 2019,
13 unless renewed.

14 4.e Respondent Francisco J. Brambila previously held Advanced Emission Specialiste
15 Technician EA 33342, which was scheduled to expire in December 2012. Pursuant to California
16 Code of Regulations, title 16, section 3340.28, subdivision (e), upon Respondent's election, said
17 license was renewed by the Bureau of Automotive Repair on November 13, 2012, as Smog Check
18 Inspector License Number EO 33342 and Smog Check Repair Technician License Number EI
19 33342. The Smog Check Inspector License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the
20 charges brought herein and will expire on December 31, 2019, unless renewed. The Smog Check
21 Repair Technician License expired on December 31, 2014, and has not been renewed.

22 5.e In 2007, the Bureau of Automotive Repair issued Brake Adjuster License Numbere
23 BA 33342, class C, to Francisco J. Brambila. The Brake Adjuster License was in full force and
24 effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on December 31, 2019,
25 unless renewed.

26 6.e In 2007, the Bureau of Automotive Repair issued Lamp Adjuster License Number LAe
27 33342, class A, to Francisco J. Brambila. The Brake Adjuster License was in full force and effect

28 ///

1 at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on December 31, 2019, unless
2 renewed.

3 JURISDICTION

4 7.e Business and Professions Code (BPC) section 9884.13 provides, in pertinent part, that
5 the expiration of a valid registration shall not deprive the Director of jurisdiction to proceed with
6 a disciplinary proceeding against an automotive repair dealer or to render a decision temporarily
7 or permanently invalidating (suspending or revoking) a registration.

8 8.e BPC section 9889.7 provides, in pertinent part, that the expiration or suspension of a
9 license by operation of law or by order or decision of the Director or a court of law, or the
10 voluntary surrender of a license shall not deprive the Director of jurisdiction to proceed with any
11 disciplinary proceedings.

12 STATUTES AND REGULATIONS

13 9. BPC section 9884.7 states, in pertinent part:

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

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

23

24 (4) Any other conduct that constitutes fraud.

25

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

28

10. BPC section 9889.3 states, in pertinent part:

The director may suspend, revoke, or take other disciplinary action
against a license as provided in this article [Article 7 (commencing with section
9889.1) of the Automotive Repair Act] if the licensee or any partner, officer, or
director thereof:

1 (a)e Violates any section of the Business and Professions Code which
relates to his or her licensed activities.

2 . . .

3 (c)e Violates any of the regulations promulgated by the director pursuant
4 to this chapter.

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

6

7 (h)e Violates or attempts to violate the provisions of this chapter relating
8 to the particular activity for which he or she is licensed . . .

9 10.e BPC section 9884.9, subdivision (a), requires an automotive repair dealer to provide a
10 written estimate to a customer before commencing work on a job.

11 11.e BPC section 9889.16 states:e

12 Whenever a licensed adjuster in a licensed station upon an inspection or
13 after an adjustment, made in conformity with the instructions of the bureau,
determines that the lamps or the brakes upon any vehicle conform with the
14 requirements of the Vehicle Code, he shall, when requested by the owner or driver of
the vehicle, issue a certificate of adjustment on a form prescribed by the director,
15 which certificate shall contain the date of issuance, the make and registration number
of the vehicle, the name of the owner of the vehicle, and the official license of the
16 station.

17 12.e BPC section 9889.22 states:e

18 The willful making of any false statement or entry with regard to a
material matter in any oath, affidavit, certificate of compliance or noncompliance, or
19 application form which is required by this chapter [the Automotive Repair Act] or
Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 44000) of Part 5 of Division 26 of the Health
20 and Safety Code constitutes perjury and is punishable as provided in the Penal Code.

21 13.e Section 44072.2 of the Health and Safety Code states, in pertinent part:e

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

25 . . .

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

1 14.e California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 3316, subdivision (d), provides ine
2 pertinent part:

3 “Effective April 1, 1999, licensed stations shall purchase certificates of adjustment from the
4 bureau for a fee of three dollars and fifty cents (\$3.50) each and shall not purchase or otherwise
5 obtain such certificates from any other source. Full payment is required at the time certificates are
6 ordered. Certificates are not exchangeable following delivery. A licensed station shall not sell or
7 otherwise transfer unused certificates of adjustment. Issuance of a lamp adjustment certificate
8 shall be in accordance with the following provisions:

9 . . .

10 “(2) Where all of the lamps, lighting equipment, and related electrical systems on a vehicle
11 have been inspected and found to be in compliance with all requirements of the Vehicle Code and
12 bureau regulations, the certificate shall certify that the entire system meets all of those
13 requirements.

14

15 15.e California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 3321, subdivision (2), providese
16 in pertinent part:

17 “Effective April 1, 1999, licensed stations shall purchase certificates of adjustment from the
18 bureau for a fee of three dollars and fifty cents (\$3.50) and shall not purchase or otherwise obtain
19 such certificates from any other source. A licensed station shall not sell or otherwise transfer
20 unused certificates of adjustment. Full payment is required at the time certificates are ordered.
21 Certificates are not exchangeable following delivery. Issuance of a brake adjustment certificate
22 shall be in accordance with the following provisions:

23 . . .

24 “(2) Where the entire brake system on any vehicle has been inspected or tested and found to
25 be in compliance with all requirements of the Vehicle Code and bureau regulations, and the
26 vehicle has been road-tested, the certificate shall certify that the entire system meets all such
27 requirements.

28

1 16.e California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 3505, subdivision (a), states:

2 "All adjusting, inspecting, servicing, and repairing of brake systems and lamp systems for
3 the purpose of issuing any certificate of compliance or adjustment shall be performed in official
4 stations, by official adjusters, in accordance with the following, in descending order of
5 precedence, as applicable:

6 (1) Vehicle Manufacturers' current standards, specifications and recommended procedures,
7 as published in the manufacturers' vehicle service and repair manuals.

8 (2) Current standards, specifications, procedures, directives, manuals, bulletins and
9 instructions issued by vehicle and equipment or device manufacturers.

10 (3) Standards, specifications and recommended procedures found in current industry-
11 standard reference manuals and periodicals published by nationally recognized repair information
12 providers.

13 (4) The bureau's *Handbook for Brake Adjusters and Stations*, May 2015, which is hereby
14 incorporated by reference.

15 (5) The bureau's *Handbook for Lamp Adjusters and Stations*, May 2015, which is hereby
16 incorporated by reference."

17 **COST RECOVERY**

18 17.e BPC section 125.3 provides, in pertinent part, that a Board may request the
19 administrative law judge to direct a licensee found to have committed a violation or violations of
20 the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and
21 enforcement of the case.

22 **UNDERCOVER OPERATION #1: 1998 CHEVROLET**

23 18.e On November 8, 2017, an undercover operator of the Bureau ("operator") took the
24 Bureau's 1998 Chevrolet to the ABC Speedee Lube station and requested brake and lamp
25 inspections. At that time, the vehicle's left front brake rotor was undersized and not within
26 manufacturer specifications, while its right rear brake drum was oversized and also not within
27 manufacturer specifications. In addition, both of the vehicle's headlamps had been misadjusted
28 such that they were not within allowable specification for proper illumination. Due to these

1 conditions, the Bureau-documented vehicle was incapable of passing a brake or lamp inspection
2 without appropriate adjustments and/or repairs.

3 19.e While working as an employee of Respondent Cesar Ortiz, dba ABC Speedee Lubee
4 (Respondent Ortiz), Respondent Francisco J. Brambila (Respondent Brambila) agreed to perform
5 brake and lamp inspections on the 1998 Chevrolet, but no written estimate was provided. The
6 Bureau operator was in a position to visually observe the vehicle while Respondent Brambila
7 performed the inspections. At no time did Respondent Brambila use any equipment to determine
8 whether the aim of the headlights was within the allowable range, and at no time did Respondent
9 Brambila perform a proper brake inspection by measuring the thickness of the brake rotors and
10 drums or performing a brake road test as required by state law. Despite the fact that he failed to
11 perform legitimate brake and lamp inspections in compliance with state law, Respondent
12 Brambila charged for and received payment for performing those inspections. In addition,
13 Respondent Brambila issued Brake Certificate No. [REDACTED] and Lamp Certificate No. LA
14 [REDACTED] fraudulently certifying under penalty of perjury that proper brake and lamp inspections
15 had been performed and that the vehicle had passed both inspections. After Respondent issued
16 brake and lamp certificates for the 1998 Chevrolet, a Bureau program representative re-examined
17 the vehicle and documented that Respondent had failed to measure the brake drums and rotors or
18 make any adjustments to the headlamps. Accordingly, the Bureau program representative
19 confirmed that the vehicle should not have passed Respondent's brake and lamp inspections.

20 **UNDERCOVER OPERATION #2: 1996 Chevrolet**

21 20.e On February 13, 2018, an undercover Bureau operator took the Bureau's 1996e
22 Chevrolet to Respondent Ortiz's station and requested brake and lamp inspections. At that time,
23 the vehicle's right front brake rotor was undersized and not within manufacturer specifications,
24 while its left rear brake drum was oversized and also not within manufacturer specifications. In
25 addition, both of the vehicle's headlamps had been misadjusted such that they were not within
26 allowable specification for proper illumination. Due to these conditions, the Bureau-documented
27 vehicle was incapable of passing a brake or lamp inspection without appropriate adjustments
28 and/or repairs.

1 21.a While working as an employee of Respondent Ortiz, Respondent Brambila performed a
2 brake and lamp inspections on the 1996 Chevrolet. A written estimate was not provided to the
3 Bureau operator. The Bureau operator was in a position to visually observe the vehicle while
4 Respondent Brambila performed the inspections. At no time did Respondent Brambila use any
5 equipment to determine whether the aim of the headlights was within the allowable range, and at
6 no time did Respondent Brambila perform a proper brake inspection by measuring the thickness
7 of the brake rotors and drums or performing a brake road test as required by state law. Despite
8 the fact that Respondent Brambila failed to perform legitimate brake and lamp inspections in
9 compliance with state law, the Bureau operator was charged for the performance those
10 inspections. In addition, Respondent Brambila issued Brake Certificate No. [REDACTED] and
11 Lamp Certificate No. [REDACTED] fraudulently certifying under penalty of perjury that proper
12 brake and lamp inspections had been performed and that the vehicle had passed both inspections.
13 After Respondent issued brake and lamp certificates for the 1996 Chevrolet, a Bureau program
14 representative re-examined the vehicle and documented that Respondent had failed to measure
15 the brake drums and rotors or make any adjustments to the headlamps. Accordingly, the Bureau
16 program representative confirmed that the vehicle should not have passed Respondent's brake
17 and lamp inspections.

18 **UNDERCOVER OPERATION #3: 2002 Toyota**

19 22.a On April 27, 2018, an undercover Bureau operator took the Bureau's 2002 Toyota to
20 the Respondent Ortiz's station and requested brake and lamp inspections. At that time, the
21 vehicle's right front brake rotor was undersized and not within manufacturer specifications, while
22 its left rear brake rotor was also undersized and not within manufacturer specifications. In
23 addition, the vehicle's right headlamp had been misadjusted such that it was not within allowable
24 specification for proper illumination. Due to these conditions, the Bureau-documented vehicle
25 was incapable of passing a brake or lamp inspection without appropriate adjustments and/or
26 repairs.

27 23.a While working as an employee of Respondent Ortiz, Respondent Brambila agreed to
28 perform brake and lamp inspections on the 2002 Toyota, but no written estimate was provided.

1 The Bureau operator was in a position to visually observe the vehicle while Respondent Brambila
2 performed the inspections. At no time did Respondent Brambila use any equipment to determine
3 whether the aim of the headlights was within the allowable range, and at no time did Respondent
4 Brambila perform a proper brake inspection by measuring the thickness of the brake rotors and
5 drums or performing a brake road test as required by state law. Despite the fact that he failed to
6 perform legitimate brake and lamp inspections in compliance with state law, Respondent
7 Brambila charged for and received payment for performing those inspections. In addition,
8 Respondent Brambila issued Brake Certificate No. [REDACTED] and Lamp Certificate No. [REDACTED]
9 [REDACTED], fraudulently certifying under penalty of perjury that proper brake and lamp inspections
10 had been performed and that the vehicle had passed both inspections. After Respondent issued
11 brake and lamp certificates for the 2002 Toyota, a Bureau program representative re-examined
12 the vehicle and documented that Respondent had failed to measure the brake drums and rotors or
13 make any adjustments to the headlamps. Accordingly, the Bureau program representative
14 confirmed that the vehicle should not have passed Respondent's brake and lamp inspections.

15 **FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

16 **(Untrue or Misleading Statements)**

17 24.e Respondent Ortiz's registration is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to BPCe
18 section 9884.7, subdivision (a)(1), in that Respondent's employee made statements that he knew
19 or in the exercise of reasonable care should have known to be untrue or misleading, as follows:

20 a.e Respondent's employee represented that he had performed proper brake and lamp
21 inspections on the Bureau's 1998 Chevrolet, 1996 Chevrolet and 2002 Toyota in compliance with
22 Bureau Regulations and pertinent provisions of the Vehicle Code when, in fact, he had not.

23 b.e Respondent's employee represented to the undercover operators that the Bureau's
24 1998 Chevrolet, 1996 Chevrolet and 2002 Toyota had passed their respective brake and lamp
25 inspections when, in fact, those vehicles were not capable of passing brake or lamp inspections.

26 c.e Respondent issued, and signed under penalty of perjury, brake certificates and lamp
27 certificates for the Bureau's 1998 Chevrolet, 1996 Chevrolet and 2002 Toyota when, in fact,
28 those vehicles were not capable of passing brake or lamp inspections.

1 Complainant refers to, and by this reference incorporates, the allegations set forth above in
2 paragraphs 18 through 23, inclusive, as though set forth fully herein.

3 **SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

4 **(Fraud)**

5 25.e Respondent Ortiz's registration is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to BPCe
6 section 9884.7, subdivision (a)(4), in that Respondent's employee committed acts that constitute
7 fraud by obtaining payment from Bureau operators for the performance of proper brake and lamp
8 inspections on the Bureau's 1998 Chevrolet, 1996 Chevrolet and 2002 Toyota when, in fact, he
9 failed to perform those inspections in compliance with Bureau Regulations and pertinent
10 provisions of the Vehicle Code. Complainant refers to, and by this reference incorporates, the
11 allegations set forth above in paragraphs 18 through 23, inclusive, as though set forth fully herein.

12 **THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

13 **(Failure to Comply with the Bus. & Prof. Code)**

14 26.e Respondent Ortiz's registration is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to BPCe
15 section 9884.7, subdivision (a)(6), in that Respondent's employee failed to comply with
16 provisions of that Code in the following material respects:

17 a.e **Section 9889.16:** Respondent's employee issued, and signed under penalty of
18 perjury, brake and lamp certificates for the Bureau's 1998 Chevrolet, 1996 Chevrolet and 2002
19 Toyota when, in fact, the vehicles were not in compliance with applicable state law.

20 c. **Section 9889.22:** Respondent's employee willfully made false statements or entriese
21 on the brake certificates and lamp certificates he issued for the Bureau's 1998 Chevrolet, 1996
22 Chevrolet and 2002 Toyota, as set forth in paragraphs 18 through 23, above.

23 **FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

24 **(Violations of Regulations)**

25 27.e Respondent Ortiz's registration is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to BPCe
26 section 9884.7, subdivision (a)(6), in that Respondent's employee failed to comply with
27 provisions of California Code of Regulations, title 16, in the following material respects:

28 ///

1 a.e **Section 3305, subdivision (a):** Respondent's employee failed to perform the
2 inspections of the brake systems and inspection and adjustment of the lamp systems on the
3 Bureau's 1998 Chevrolet, 1996 Chevrolet and 2002 Toyota in accordance with the specifications,
4 instructions, and directives issued by the Bureau and the vehicle manufacturer, as set forth in
5 paragraphs 18 through 23, above.

6 b.e **Section 3316, subdivision (d)(2):** Respondent's employee issued lamp certificates to
7 the Bureau's 1998 Chevrolet, 1996 Chevrolet and 2002 Toyota when all of the lamps, lighting
8 equipment, and/or related electrical systems on those vehicles were not in compliance with
9 Bureau regulations, as set forth in paragraphs 18 through 23, above.

10 c.e **Section 3321, subdivision (c)(2):** Respondent's employee issued brake certificates
11 for Bureau's 1998 Chevrolet, 1996 Chevrolet and 2002 Toyota when the brake systems on those
12 vehicles had not been completely tested or inspected, as set forth in paragraphs 18 through 23,
13 above.

14 **FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

15 **(Failure to Comply with the Bus. & Prof. Code)**

16 28.e Respondent's brake and lamp station licenses are subject to disciplinary actions
17 pursuant to BPC section 9889.3, subdivisions (a) and (h), in that Respondent violated the
18 provisions of BPC sections 9884.9, subdivision (a), 9889.16, relating to Respondent's licensed
19 activities. Complainant refers to, and by this reference incorporates, the allegations set forth
20 above in paragraphs 18 through 23, inclusive, as though set forth fully herein.

21 **SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

22 **(Failure to Comply with Regulations)**

23 29.e Respondent's brake and lamp station licenses are subject to disciplinary actions
24 pursuant to BPC section 9889.3, subdivision (c), in that Respondent failed to comply with the
25 provisions of California Code of Regulations, title 16, sections 3305, subdivision (a), 3316,
26 subdivision (d)(2), and 3321, subdivision (c)(2). Complainant refers to, and by this reference
27 incorporates, the allegations set forth above in paragraphs 18 through 23, inclusive, as though set
28 forth fully herein.

1 **SEVENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

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

3 30.s Respondent Brambila's brake and lamp adjuster licenses are subject to disciplinarys
4 action pursuant to BPC section 9889.3, subdivision (d), in that he committed acts involving
5 dishonesty, fraud, or deceit. Complainant refers to, and by this reference incorporates, the
6 allegations set forth above in paragraphs 18 through 23, inclusive, as though set forth fully herein.

7 **EIGHTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

8 **(Failure to Comply with the Bus. & Prof. Code)**

9 31.s Respondent Brambila's brake and lamp adjuster licenses are subject to disciplinarys
10 action pursuant to BPC section 9889.3, subdivisions (a) and (h), in that he violated the provisions
11 of Bus. & Prof. Code sections 9884.9, subdivision (a), 9889.16, and 9889.22 relating to his
12 licensed activities. Complainant refers to, and by this reference incorporates, the allegations set
13 forth above in paragraphs 18 through 23, inclusive, as though set forth fully herein.

14 **NINTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

15 **(Violations of Regulations)**

16 32.s Respondent Brambila's brake and lamp adjuster licenses are subject to disciplinary actions
17 pursuant to BPC section 9889.3, subdivision (c), in that he failed to comply with the provisions of
18 California Code of Regulations, title 16, sections 3305, subdivision (a), 3316, subdivision (d)(2),
19 and 3321, subdivision (c)(2). Complainant refers to, and by this reference incorporates, the
20 allegations set forth above in paragraphs 18 through 23, inclusive, as though set forth fully herein.

21 **TENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

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

23 33.s Respondent Brambila's smog check inspector license and smog check repairs
24 technician license are subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Health and Safety Code section
25 44072.2, subdivision (d), in that Respondent Brambila's committed acts involving dishonesty,
26 fraud, or deceit whereby another was injured. Complainant refers to, and by this reference
27 incorporates, the allegations set forth above in paragraphs 18 through 23, inclusive, as though set
28 forth fully herein.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

35.e Section 9889.9 of the BPC states that “[w]hen any license has been revoked ore suspended following a hearing under the provisions of this article [Article 7 (commencing with section 9889.1) of the Automotive Repair Act], any additional license issued under Articles 5 and 6 of this chapter in the name of the licensee may be likewise revoked or suspended by the director.”

PRAYER

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

- 1.e Revoking or suspending Automotive Repair Dealer Registration Number ARDe 252076, issued to Cesar Ortiz, dba ABC Speedee Lube;
- 2.e Revoking or suspending Brake Station License Number BS 252076, class C, issued to Cesar Ortiz, dba ABC Speedee Lube;
- 3.e Revoking or suspending Lamp Station License Number LS 252076, class A, issued to Cesar Ortiz, dba ABC Speedee Lube;
4. Revoking or suspending Brake Adjuster License Number BA 33342, class C, issued to Francisco J. Brambila;
- 5.e Revoking or suspending Lamp Adjuster License Number LA 33342, class A, issued to Francisco J. Brambila33342, class C, to Francisco J. Brambila;

1 6. Revoking or suspending Smog Check Inspector License Number EO 33342, issued to
2 Francisco J. Brambila;

3 7. Revoking or suspending any additional Automotive Repair Dealer Registrations
4 issued to Cesar Ortiz, pursuant to section 9884.7, subdivision (c), of the BPC;

5 8. Revoking or suspending any additional licenses issued under Articles 5 and 6 of the
6 Automotive Repair Act in the names of Cesar Ortiz or Francisco J. Brambila, pursuant to section
7 9889.9 of the BPC;

8 9. Revoking or suspending any additional license issued under Chapter 5 of the Health
9 and Safety Code in the name of Francisco J. Brambila, pursuant to section 44072.8 of the Health
10 and Safety Code;

11 10. Ordering Cesar Ortiz and Francisco J. Brambila to pay the Bureau of Automotive
12 Repair the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to
13 Business and Professions Code section 125.3;

14 11. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

15
16
17 DATED: March 21, 2019

18 
19 PATRICK DORAIS
20 Chief
21 Bureau of Automotive Repair
22 Department of Consumer Affairs
23 State of California
24 Complainant

25
26
27
28
LA2017604676
63136497.docx