

1 KAMALA D. HARRIS
Attorney General of California
2 JANICE K. LACHMAN
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
3 JEFFREY M. PHILLIPS
Deputy Attorney General
4 State Bar No. 154990
1300 I Street, Suite 125
5 P.O. Box 944255
Sacramento, CA 94244-2550
6 Telephone: (916) 324-6292
Facsimile: (916) 327-8643
7 *Attorneys for Complainant*

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

11 In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

Case No. 79/15-3

12 **AUTOMOTIVE CENTER**
13 **RUMALDO MIKE CARRILLO, OWNER**
14 **1818 East El Monte Way, Unit #1**
Dinuba, CA 93618-9317

A C C U S A T I O N

(Smog Check)

15 **Automotive Repair Dealer Reg. No. ARD 179642,**

16 **SELMA SMOG**
17 **PAUL SINGH PANNU, OWNER**
18 **2373 West Front Street**
Selma, CA 93662

19 **Automotive Repair Dealer Reg. No. ARD 222686**
Smog Check, Test Only, Station License No. TC 222686,

20 **PAUL SINGH PANNU**
21 **8652 East Nebraska**
Selma, CA 93662

22 **2205 First Street**
23 **Selma, CA 93662**

24 **Smog Check Inspector License No. EO 631488 and**
Smog Check Repair Technician License No. EI 631488
25 **(formerly Advanced Emission Specialist Technician**
License No. EA 631488)

26 **and**

27 **//**

28 **//**

1 **PAWANPAL SINGH RANDHAWA**
2 **5906 N. La Ventana**
3 **Fresno, CA 93723**

4 **Smog Check Inspector License No. EO 632778**
5 **Smog Check Repair Technician License**
6 **No. EI 632778 (formerly Advanced Emission Specialist**
7 **Technician License No. EA 632778)**

8 Respondents.

9 Complainant alleges:

10 **PARTIES**

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

13 **Automotive Center; Rumaldo Mike Carrillo, Owner**

14 2. On or about 1994, the Director of Consumer Affairs ("Director") issued Automotive
15 Repair Dealer Registration Number ARD 179642 ("registration") to Rumaldo Mike Carrillo
16 ("Respondent Carrillo"), owner of Automotive Center. Respondent's registration was in full
17 force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on August 31,
18 2014, unless renewed.

19 **Selma Smog; Paul Singh Pannu, Owner**

20 3. On or about February 25, 2010, the Director issued Automotive Repair Dealer
21 Registration Number ARD 222686 ("registration") to Paul Singh Pannu ("Respondent Pannu"),
22 owner of Selma Smog. Respondent's registration was in full force and effect at all times relevant
23 to the charges brought herein and will expire on February 28, 2015, unless renewed.

24 4. On or about March 4, 2010, the Director issued Smog Check, Test Only, Station
25 License Number TC 222686 ("smog check station license") to Respondent Pannu. Respondent's
26 smog check station license was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought
27 herein and will expire on February 28, 2015, unless renewed.

28 **Paul Singh Pannu**

5. On or about November 9, 2009, the Director issued Advanced Emission Specialist
Technician License Number EA 631488 to Paul Singh Pannu (Respondent Pannu). Pannu's

1 advanced emission specialist technician license was due to expire on March 31, 2014. Pursuant to
2 California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 3340.28, subdivision (e), the license was
3 renewed, pursuant to Pannu's election, as Smog Check Inspector License Number EO 631488
4 and Smog Check Repair Technician License Number EI 631488 ("smog technician licenses"),
5 effective March 27, 2014. Respondent's smog technician licenses will expire on March 31, 2016,
6 unless renewed.¹

7 **Pawanpal Singh Randhawa**

8 6. On or about December 27, 2010, the Director issued Advanced Emission Specialist
9 Technician License Number EA 632778 to Pawanpal Singh Randhawa ("Respondent
10 Randhawa"). Respondent's advanced emission specialist technician license was due to expire on
11 September 30, 2012. Pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 3340.28,
12 subdivision (e), the license was renewed, pursuant to Respondent's election, as Smog Check
13 Inspector License No. EO 632778 and Smog Check Repair Technician License No. EI 632778
14 ("smog technician licenses"), effective August 15, 2012. Respondent's smog technician licenses
15 will expire on September 30, 2014, unless renewed.

16 **JURISDICTION**

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

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

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

26 ¹ 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 engaged in a course of repeated and willful violations of this chapter, or regulations
2 adopted pursuant to it.

3 14. Bus. & Prof. Code section 22, subdivision (a), states:

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

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

10 16. Health & Saf. Code section 44072.2 states, in pertinent part:

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

14 (a) Violates any section of this chapter [the Motor Vehicle Inspection
15 Program (Health and Saf. Code § 44000, et seq.)] and the regulations adopted
16 pursuant to it, which related to the licensed activities.

17

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

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

22 17. Health & Saf. Code section 44072.10 states, in pertinent part:

23

24 (c) The department shall revoke the license of any smog check technician
25 or station licensee who fraudulently certifies vehicles or participates in the fraudulent
26 inspection of vehicles. A fraudulent inspection includes, but is not limited to, all of
27 the following:

28 (1) Clean piping, as defined by the department . . .

29 18. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 3340 states, in pertinent part, that
30 "[c]lean piping' for the purposes of Health and Safety Code section 44072.10(c)(1), means the
31 use of a substitute exhaust emissions sample in place of the actual test vehicle's exhaust in order
32 to cause the EIS to issue a certificate of compliance for the test vehicle".

33 //

34 //

1 **COST RECOVERY**

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

6 **UNDERCOVER OPERATION #1: 1989 TOYOTA & 1994 HONDA**

7 20. The Bureau received a consumer complaint, indicating that the consumer had paid
8 Respondent Carrillo \$300 for the issuance of a smog check certificate for their vehicle and that
9 the vehicle was disassembled at the time it was allegedly smog tested. The Automotive Center is
10 not a licensed smog check station and Carrillo is not a licensed smog check technician.

11 21. On or about October 15, 2013, a representative of the Bureau, acting in an undercover
12 capacity (“operator”), took the Bureau’s 1989 Toyota (“Toyota”) to Carrillo’s facility. A
13 defective coolant temperature sensor had been installed in the Bureau-documented vehicle,
14 causing the “check engine” light to illuminate on the dashboard. The operator met with Carrillo
15 and requested an oil change on the Toyota as well as a diagnosis of the check engine light.
16 Carrillo told the operator that he would contact him once he determined what was causing the
17 check engine light to illuminate. The operator left the facility.

18 22. At approximately 1134 hours that same day, Carrillo called the operator and told him
19 that the computer was not communicating with the vehicle, which was a common problem with
20 that model Toyota. Carrillo told the operator that he would purchase a Zener Diode from Radio
21 Shack and that it would cost \$120 to install it in the vehicle. The operator authorized the work,
22 then asked Carrillo if he could have the Toyota “smogged” (smog tested) following the repair.
23 Carrillo told the operator that he could smog the vehicle for an additional \$49 and that the Toyota
24 would be ready the next day.

25 23. On October 16, 2013, the operator called Carrillo to check on the status of the Toyota.
26 Carrillo told the operator that the Toyota passed the smog inspection, but still was not operating
27 properly. Carrillo stated that the Toyota ran rough when it was cold and that he wanted to check
28 the fuel filter to see if it was plugged.

1 24. Information from the Bureau's vehicle information database ("VID") showed that on
2 October 16, 2013, between 1202 and 1216 hours, Jose Rojas ("Jose"), a smog check technician
3 employed by Martin Rojas ("Martin"), the owner of Dinuba Smog, located at 1818 East El Monte
4 Way, Suite C, in Dinuba, performed a smog inspection on the Toyota, on behalf of Martin,
5 resulting in the issuance of electronic smog Certificate of Compliance No. [REDACTED]

6 25. On October 18, 2013, the operator returned to Carrillo's facility. Carrillo told the
7 operator that he went to the wrecking yard and located a used coolant temperature sensor and
8 coolant control box for the Toyota. The operator asked Carrillo if he knew someone who could
9 smog a vehicle for him that was located out of state. The operator explained that his son's Honda
10 was modified, that his son went to school in Nevada, and that the registration was expired.
11 Carrillo told the operator that he could have the vehicle smogged for \$350.

12 26. On October 21, 2013, the operator went to the facility to pick up the Toyota and paid
13 Carrillo \$414.49 in cash for the repairs. Carrillo gave the operator copies of an estimate, invoice,
14 and vehicle inspection report. The operator provided Carrillo with the registration renewal form
15 for the Bureau's 1994 Honda ("Honda"). Carrillo told the operator that he would have the smog
16 check done in a couple of days. The operator left the facility.

17 27. On October 22, 2013, the Bureau inspected the Toyota using the invoice for
18 comparison. The Bureau found that Carrillo installed a used coolant temperature sensor on the
19 vehicle that was in poor condition, failed to record the repair on the invoice, and performed
20 additional repairs that were not necessary on the vehicle.

21 28. On October 23, 2013, the operator called Carrillo and asked him if the smog for the
22 Honda was ready. Carrillo told the operator that "his guy" wanted the registration for the Honda.

23 29. On October 24, 2013, the operator went to the facility and gave Carrillo the
24 registration as requested.

25 30. On and between October 25 and October 29, 2013, the operator called Carrillo
26 several times to check on the status of the vehicle, but Carrillo did not answer the phone.

27 31. The Bureau's VID data showed that on October 29, 2013, between 1350 and 1404
28 hours, Jose performed a smog inspection on the Honda, on behalf of Martin, resulting in the

1 issuance of electronic smog Certificate of Compliance No. [REDACTED] The VID data also
2 showed that the vehicle information, including the odometer reading, engine size, etc., was
3 entered into the Emissions Inspection System ("EIS") by scanning the registration.

4 32. On October 30, 2013, the operator called Carrillo. Carrillo told the operator that the
5 smog for the Honda was completed and that the price for the smog had increased to \$400.
6 Carrillo stated that "his smog guy" called a friend who had the same model Honda that he could
7 use as a substitute to perform the test. Carrillo told the operator that all of the necessary forms for
8 the smog check had already been submitted electronically to the DMV. The operator stated that
9 he would be arriving at the facility in approximately one hour. Carrillo told the operator that he
10 had to attend a meeting, but would leave the documents with his employee, Rodrigo, and that the
11 operator could pay Rodrigo the \$400.

12 33. On October 31, 2013, the operator went to the facility and met with Rodrigo.
13 Rodrigo gave the operator the registration and renewal notice for the Honda and a vehicle
14 inspection report. The operator paid Rodrigo \$400 in cash, then left the facility.

15 **FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

16 **(Fraud)**

17 34. Respondent Carrillo's registration is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Bus. &
18 Prof. Code section 9884.7, subdivision (a)(4), in that Respondent committed acts constituting
19 fraud, as follows: Respondent Carrillo conspired with agents, employees, and/or representatives
20 of Dinuba Smog, including, but not limited to, Martin Rojas and Jose Rojas,² to have a fraudulent
21 smog inspection performed on the Bureau's 1994 Honda using clean piping methods, resulting in
22 the issuance of a fraudulent electronic smog certificate of compliance for the vehicle.
23 Consequently, a bona fide inspection was not conducted of the emission control devices and
24 systems on the vehicle, thereby depriving the People of the State of California of the protection
25 afforded by the Motor Vehicle Inspection Program.

26 _____
27 ² Martin Rojas, the owner of Dinuba Smog, and Jose Rojas have been charged in a
28 separate Accusation with violations of the Automotive Repair Act and the Motor Vehicle
Inspection Program relating to the undercover operation.

1 each part supplied on the Bureau's 1989 Toyota, specifically, the installation of the used coolant
2 temperature sensor on the vehicle.

3 **UNDERCOVER OPERATION #2: 2007 FORD & 2000 ACURA**

4 38. On November 6, 2013, Bureau Representative J. G., acting in an undercover capacity
5 ("operator"), went to Carrillo's facility and met with Rodrigo Mares ("Mares"). The operator
6 gave Mares DMV registration forms and registration renewal notices for the Bureau's 2007 Ford
7 and 2000 Acura. The operator told Mares that he had written his telephone number on one of the
8 registration forms, and asked Mares to call him when the "smogs" (smog inspections) were done
9 on the vehicles. The operator left the facility.

10 39. On November 8, 2013, at approximately 1500 hours, the operator received a call from
11 an unidentified male. The unidentified male told the operator that Carrillo wanted to know the
12 model of the vehicles to be "smogged". The operator gave the unidentified male the information
13 and asked him if the smogs would be done that day. The unidentified male stated that the smogs
14 would be done "in a little while".

15 40. At approximately 1630 hours, Carrillo called the operator and told him that the smogs
16 were ready. The operator asked Carrillo about the cost of the smogs. Carrillo told the operator
17 that the smogs cost \$400 each, for a total of \$800.

18 41. On November 12, 2013, The operator went to the facility and met with Carrillo.
19 Carrillo gave the operator vehicle inspection reports ("VIR's") for the 2007 Ford and 2000 Acura.
20 The bottom portions of the VIR's had been torn or cut off. Carrillo also returned the registration
21 forms and registration renewal notices to the operator. The operator paid Carrillo \$800 in cash
22 and left the facility.

23 42. Information from the Bureau's vehicle information database ("VID") showed that on
24 November 8, 2013, between 1515 and 1522 hours, Respondent Randhawa ("Randhawa")
25 performed a smog inspection on the 2007 Ford, on behalf of Respondent Pannu ("Pannu"), the
26 owner of Selma Smog, resulting in the issuance of electronic smog Certificate of Compliance No.
27 [REDACTED] The VID data also showed that between 1527 and 1546 hours on that same day,
28 Randhawa performed a smog inspection on the 2000 Acura, on behalf of Pannu, resulting in the

1 issuance of electronic smog Certificate of Compliance No. [REDACTED] Both vehicles were in
2 the custody of the Bureau at the time of the alleged inspections.

3 43. On December 5, 2013, Bureau Representative E. L. made a field visit to Selma Smog
4 and met with Randhawa. E. L. requested and obtained invoices and VIR's that had been issued
5 by the facility from November 2, 2013, to November 14, 2013, including VIR's pertaining to the
6 Bureau's 2007 Ford and 2000 Acura. E. L. showed Randhawa the VIR's. Randhawa stated that
7 the signatures appearing on the VIR's, including the VIR's for the 2007 Ford and 2000 Acura,
8 were his and that he was the only smog check technician who performed smog inspections at the
9 facility from November 2 to November 14, 2013.

10 44. At the conclusion of their investigation, the Bureau determined that Randhawa
11 fraudulently certified the 2007 Ford and 2000 Acura using clean piping methods.

12 **FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

13 **(Fraud)**

14 45. Respondent Carrillo's registration is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Bus. &
15 Prof. Code section 9884.7, subdivision (a)(4), in that Respondent committed acts constituting
16 fraud, as follows: Respondent Carrillo conspired with agents, employees, and/or representatives
17 of Selma Smog, including, but not limited to, Respondent Randhawa, to have fraudulent smog
18 inspections performed on the Bureau's 2007 Ford and 2000 Acura using clean piping methods,
19 resulting in the issuance of fraudulent electronic smog certificates of compliance for the vehicles.
20 Consequently, bona fide inspections were not conducted of the emission control devices and
21 systems on the vehicles, thereby depriving the People of the State of California of the protection
22 afforded by the Motor Vehicle Inspection Program.

23 **SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

24 **(Untrue or Misleading Statements)**

25 46. Respondent Pannu's registration is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Bus. &
26 Prof. Code section 9884.7, subdivision (a)(1), in that Respondent made or authorized statements
27 which he knew or in the exercise of reasonable care should have known to be untrue or
28 misleading, as follows:

1 a. Respondent Pannu's smog check technician, Respondent Randhawa, certified under
2 penalty of perjury on the VIR dated November 8, 2013, pertaining to the Bureau's 2007 Ford that
3 he performed the smog inspection on the vehicle in accordance with all Bureau requirements and
4 that the vehicle had passed inspection and was in compliance with applicable laws and
5 regulations. In fact, Randhawa used clean piping methods in order to issue a certificate for the
6 vehicle and did not test or inspect the vehicle as required by Health & Saf. Code section 44012.
7 Further, the wiring to the exhaust gas recirculation system was disconnected, the wiring to the
8 engine coolant sensor was disconnected, and the malfunction indicator light was illuminated. As
9 such, the vehicle would not pass the inspection required by Health & Saf. Code section 44012.

10 b. Respondent Pannu's smog check technician, Respondent Randhawa, certified under
11 penalty of perjury on the VIR dated November 8, 2013, pertaining to the Bureau's 2000 Acura
12 that he performed the smog inspection on the vehicle in accordance with all Bureau requirements
13 and that the vehicle had passed inspection and was in compliance with applicable laws and
14 regulations. In fact, Randhawa used clean piping methods in order to issue a certificate for the
15 vehicle and did not test or inspect the vehicle as required by Health & Saf. Code section 44012.
16 Further, the positive crankcase ventilation system had been modified and as such, the vehicle
17 would not pass the inspection required by Health & Saf. Code section 44012.

18 **SEVENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

19 **(Fraud)**

20 47. Respondent Pannu's registration is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Bus. &
21 Prof. Code section 9884.7, subdivision (a)(4), in that Respondent committed acts that constitute
22 fraud by issuing electronic smog certificates of compliance for the Bureau's 2007 Ford and 2000
23 Acura without ensuring that bona fide inspections were performed of the emission control devices
24 and systems on the vehicles, thereby depriving the People of the State of California of the
25 protection afforded by the Motor Vehicle Inspection Program.

26 //

27 //

28 //

1 **EIGHTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

2 **(Violations of the Motor Vehicle Inspection Program)**

3 48. Respondent Pannu's smog check station license is subject to disciplinary action
4 pursuant to Health & Saf. Code section 44072.2, subdivision (a), in that Respondent failed to
5 comply with provisions of that Code, as follows:

6 a. **Section 44012:** Respondent failed to ensure that the emission control tests were
7 performed on the Bureau's 2007 Ford and 2000 Acura in accordance with procedures prescribed
8 by the department.

9 b. **Section 44015:** Respondent issued electronic smog certificates of compliance for the
10 Bureau's 2007 Ford and 2000 Acura without ensuring that the vehicles were properly tested and
11 inspected to determine if they were in compliance with Health & Saf. Code section 44012.

12 **NINTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

13 **(Failure to Comply with Regulations Pursuant**
14 **to the Motor Vehicle Inspection Program)**

15 49. Respondent Pannu's smog check station license is subject to disciplinary action
16 pursuant to Health & Saf. Code section 44072.2, subdivision (c), in that Respondent failed to
17 comply with provisions of California Code of Regulations, title 16, as follows:

18 a. **Section 3340.35, subdivision (c):** Respondent Pannu issued electronic smog
19 certificates of compliance for the Bureau's 2007 Ford and 2000 Acura even though the vehicles
20 had not been inspected in accordance with section 3340.42.

21 b. **Section 3340.41, subdivision (c):** Respondent Pannu authorized or permitted his
22 smog check technician, Respondent Randhawa, to enter false information into the EIS by entering
23 vehicle identification information or emission control system identification data for a vehicle(s)
24 other than the ones being tested.

25 c. **Section 3340.42:** Respondent Pannu failed to ensure that the required smog tests
26 were conducted on the Bureau's 2007 Ford and 2000 Acura in accordance with the Bureau's
27 specifications.

28 //

1 **TENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

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

3 50. Respondent Pannu's smog check station license is subject to disciplinary action
4 pursuant to Health & Saf. Code section 44072.2, subdivision (d), in that Respondent committed
5 dishonest, fraudulent or deceitful acts whereby another is injured by issuing electronic smog
6 certificates of compliance for the Bureau's 2007 Ford and 2000 Acura without ensuring that bona
7 fide inspections were performed of the emission control devices and systems on the vehicles,
8 thereby depriving the People of the State of California of the protection afforded by the Motor
9 Vehicle Inspection Program.

10 **ELEVENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

11 **(Violations of the Motor Vehicle Inspection Program)**

12 51. Respondent Randhawa's smog technician licenses are subject to disciplinary action
13 pursuant to Health & Saf. Code section 44072.2, subdivision (a), in that Respondent failed to
14 comply with section 44012 of that Code in a material respect, as follows: Respondent failed to
15 perform the emission control tests on the Bureau's 2007 Ford and 2000 Acura in accordance with
16 procedures prescribed by the department.

17 **TWELFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

18 **(Failure to Comply with Regulations Pursuant**
19 **to the Motor Vehicle Inspection Program)**

20 52. Respondent Randhawa's smog technician licenses are subject to disciplinary action
21 pursuant to Health & Saf. Code section 44072.2, subdivision (c), in that Respondent failed to
22 comply with provisions of California Code of Regulations, title 16, as follows:

23 a. **Section 3340.30, subdivision (a):** Respondent failed to inspect and test the Bureau's
24 2007 Ford and 2000 Acura in accordance with Health & Saf. Code sections 44012 and 44035,
25 and California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 3340.42.

26 b. **Section 3340.41, subdivision (c):** Respondent entered false information into the EIS
27 by entering vehicle identification information or emission control system identification data for a
28 vehicle(s) other than the ones being tested.

1 c. **Section 3340.42:** Respondent failed to conduct the required smog tests on the
2 Bureau's 2007 Ford and 2000 Acura in accordance with the Bureau's specifications.

3 **THIRTEENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

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

5 53. Respondent Randhawa's smog technician licenses are 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 is injured by issuing electronic smog
8 certificates of compliance for the Bureau's 2007 Ford and 2000 Acura without performing bona
9 fide inspections of the emission control devices and systems on the vehicles, thereby depriving
10 the People of the State of California of the protection afforded by the Motor Vehicle Inspection
11 Program.

12 **OTHER MATTERS**

13 54. Pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code section 9884.7, subdivision (c), the Director may
14 suspend, revoke, or place on probation the registration for all places of business operated in this
15 state by Respondent Rumaldo Mike Carrillo, owner of Automotive Center, upon a finding that
16 Respondent has, or is, engaged in a course of repeated and willful violations of the laws and
17 regulations pertaining to an automotive repair dealer.

18 55. Pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code section 9884.7, subdivision (c), the Director may
19 suspend, revoke, or place on probation the registration for all places of business operated in this
20 state by Respondent Paul Singh Pannu, owner of Selma Smog, upon a finding that Respondent
21 has, or is, engaged in a course of repeated and willful violations of the laws and regulations
22 pertaining to an automotive repair dealer.

23 56. Pursuant to Health & Saf. Code section 44072.8, if Smog Check, Test Only, Station
24 License Number TC 222686, issued to Respondent Paul Singh Pannu, owner of Selma Smog, is
25 revoked or suspended, any additional license issued under this chapter in the name of said
26 licensee, including, but not limited to, Pannu's Smog Check Inspector License Number EO
27 631488 and Smog Check Repair Technician License Number EI 631488, may be likewise
28 revoked or suspended by the Director.

1 the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and
2 Professions Code section 125.3;

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

4
5 DATED: 7-15-14

PATRICK DORAIS by 
PATRICK DORAIS
Chief Assist. Chief
Bureau of Automotive Repair
Department of Consumer Affairs
State of California
Doug BARATT,
Complainant

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

SA2014114903