1	ROB BONTA Attorney General of California		
2	Attorney General of California CHAR A. SACHSON Supervising Deputy Attorney General		
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General JUSTIN R. SURBER		
	Deputy Attorney General 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000		
4	San Francisco, CA 94102-7004 Telephone: (415) 355-5437		
5	Facsimile: (415) 703-5480 Attorneys for Complainant Bureau of Automotive Repair		
6	BEFORE THE		
7	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS FOR THE BUREAU OF AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR		
8	STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
9	In the Matter of the Accusation and Petition to Revoke Probation Against:	Case Number: 79/21-13696	
10	CHEVREM CORPORATION	ACCUSATION AND	
11	Dba Clear Blue Test Only Smog Station Fatih Tekin, President	PETITION TO REVOKE PROBATION	
12	2850 Crow Canyon Road San Ramon, CA 94583		
13	Automotive Repair Dealer No. ARD 241700		
14	Smog Check Station License No. TC 241700		
15	Shahzad Mark 5 The Trees Drive		
16	Concord, CA 94518		
17	Smog Check Inspector (EO) License No. EO 136985		
18	D aga an dant		
19	Respondent.		
20	Complainant alleges:		
21	<u>PARTIES</u>		
22	1. Patrick Dorais (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in his official capacity as		
23	the Chief of the Bureau of Automotive Repair, Department of Consumer Affairs.		
24	2. On or about January 1, 2005, the Bureau issued Auto	motive Repair Dealer	
25	Registration No. ARD 241700 to Chevrem Corporation (Respondent Chevrem) dba Clear Blue		
26	Test Only Smog Station. Fatih Tekin is president of Respondent	Chevrem. The Automotive	
27	Repair Dealer Registration will expire on September 30, 2022, unless renewed.		
28			
	1		

- 3. On or about February 16, 2016, the Bureau issued Smog Check, Test Only, Station License No. TC 241700 to Respondent Chevrem. The Smog Check, Test Only, Station License will expire on September 30, 2022, unless renewed.
- 4. In 2003, the Director issued Advanced Emission Specialist Technician License Number EA 136985 to Shahzad Mark (Respondent Mark). Respondent's advanced emission specialist technician license expired and was cancelled on January 31, 2013. Pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 3340.28, subdivision (e), the license was renewed, pursuant to Respondent Mark's election, as Smog Check Inspector License EO 136985. Respondent's Smog Check Inspector License will expire on January 31, 2023, unless renewed.
- 5. In disciplinary actions titled "In the Matter of the Accusations Against Chevrem Corporation, et al., Case Nos. 79/17-1195, 79/17-1998, 79/17-1999, 79/17-1202, 79/17-1224, 79/17-1226, and 79/17-1229, the Department of Consumer Affairs issued an Order effective April 21, 2021, in which Respondent Chevrem's Automotive Repair Dealership Registrations and Smog Check Station Licenses were revoked. However, the revocations were stayed and Respondent Chevrem's Automotive Repair Dealership Registrations and Smog Check Station Licenses were placed on probation for five (5) years with certain terms and conditions. A copy of that Decision and Order is attached as Exhibit A and is incorporated by reference.
- 6. In a disciplinary action titled "In the Matter of the Accusation Against Chevrem Corporation, et al., Case No. 79/17-1202, the Department of Consumer Affairs issued an Order effective May 25, 2021, in which Respondent Mark's Smog Check Inspector License was revoked. However, the revocation was stayed and Respondent Mark's Smog Check Inspector License were placed on probation for one (1) year with certain terms and conditions. A copy of that Decision and Order is attached as Exhibit B and is incorporated by reference.

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

### **JURISDICTION FOR ACCUSATION**

7. This Accusation is brought before the Director of the Department of Consumer
Affairs (Director) for the Bureau of Automotive Repair, under the authority of the following laws.

### STATUTORY AND REGULATORY PROVISIONS FOR ACCUSATION

- 8. Section **9884.7** of the Business and Professions Code ("Code") states, in pertinent part:
- (a) The director, where the automotive repair dealer cannot show there was a bona fide error, may deny, suspend, revoke, or place on probation the registration of an automotive repair dealer for any of the following acts or omissions related to the conduct of the business of the automotive repair dealer, which are done by the automotive repair dealer or any automotive technician, employee, partner, officer, or member of the automotive repair dealer.
- (1) Making or authorizing in any manner or by any means whatever any statement written or oral which is untrue or misleading, and which is known, or which by the exercise of reasonable care should be known, to be untrue or misleading.

. . .

(3) Failing or refusing to give to a customer a copy of any document requiring the customer's signature as soon as the customer signs the document.

. . .

(4) Any other conduct that constitutes fraud.

. .

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

. . .

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

. . .

- (e) For purposes of this section, "fraud" includes, but is not limited to, violations of this chapter involving misrepresentations and all of the following:
- (1) Any act or omission that is included within the definition of either "actual fraud" or "constructive fraud," as those terms are defined in Sections 1572 and 1573 of the Civil Code.
- (2) A misrepresentation in any manner, whether intentionally false or due to gross negligence, of a material fact.
  - (3) A promise or representation not made honestly and in good faith.
  - (4) An intentional failure to disclose a material fact.
  - (5) Any act in violation of Section 484 of the Penal Code.
- 9. Code section **9884.13** provides, in pertinent part, that the expiration of a valid registration shall not deprive the director or chief of jurisdiction to proceed with a disciplinary proceeding against an automotive repair dealer or to render a decision invalidating a registration temporarily or permanently.
- 10. Section **44002** of the Health and Safety Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Director has all the powers and authority granted under the Automotive Repair Act for enforcing the Motor Vehicle Inspection Program.
- 11. Section **44012** of the Health and Safety Code requires that tests at smog check stations be performed in accordance with procedures prescribed by the department.
  - 12. Section **44059** of the Health and Safety Code states, in pertinent part:

"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 application form which is required by this chapter or Chapter 20.3 (commencing with Section 9880) of Division 3 of the Business and Professions Code, constitutes perjury and is punishable as provided in the Penal Code."

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

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

"(2) Smog Check Manual, dated November 2, 2017, which is hereby incorporated by reference. This manual shall become effective on August 2, 2018."

### **COSTS FOR ACCUSATION**

22. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that a Board (including the Bureau of Automotive Repair) 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, with failure of the licentiate to comply subjecting the license to not being renewed or reinstated. If a case settles, recovery of investigation and enforcement costs may be included in a stipulated settlement.

### **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

- 23. In 2021, a Bureau Representative prepared a 2002 Dodge (Dodge) to fail a smog inspection due to a defective Evaporative Emission Control Canister. The canister had a large hole in it. In this condition the Dodge would not pass a properly performed smog inspection. The Dodge would fail the visual portion of the smog inspection.
- 24. On or about October 19, 2021, an undercover operation was performed at Respondent Chevrem's smog station Clear Blue Test Only Smog Station to confirm compliance with the Smog Check Program. An operator drove the Dodge to Clear Blue Test Only Smog Station and requested a smog inspection. The operator was asked to sign a work order, which he did. The operator was not given a copy of the work order.
- 25. Respondent Mark personally performed the Smog Inspection on the 2002 Dodge, which "passed" the smog inspection. The operator was given copies of an invoice and a Vehicle Inspection Report (VIR). Respondent Chevrem issued Smog Certificate of Compliance #SI384055C for the Dodge. Respondent Mark entered "Pass" into the OIS for the Visual Inspection category "Fuel Evaporative System (EVAP)," when in fact the vehicle should have failed. Respondents caused a certificate of compliance to be issued for the Dodge. The VIR falsely stated that the smog inspection was performed in accordance with all bureau requirements.

#### FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

### (False or misleading Statements- Registration)

- 26. Respondent Chevrem has subjected its Registration to disciplinary action under section 9884.7, subdivision(a)(1), in that Respondents made false or misleading statements that they knew or should have known were false or misleading as follows:
- a. Respondent Chevrem transmitted information to the Vehicle Information Database stating the Dodge passed the Fuel Evaporative System (EVAP) visual inspection.
- b. Respondent Chevrem created a VIR stating the Dodge passed the Fuel Evaporative System (EVAP) visual inspection.
- c. The VIR stated that smog inspection was performed in accordance with all bureau requirements.

### SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

### (Failure to Provide Copy of Signed Documents)

27. Respondent Chevrem has subjected its Registration to disciplinary action under section 9884.7, subdivision (a)(3), in that it failed to provide the operator with a copy of the signed work order. The circumstances are further described in the Factual Background section, above.

#### THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

### (Violation of Laws and Regulations-Registration)

- 28. Respondent Chevrem has subjected its Registration to disciplinary action under section 9884.7, subdivision (a)(6), in that Respondent violated the following laws and regulations:
- a. Respondent violated Code section 9884.9(a) by failing to provide the operator with a written estimate prior to performing the smog inspection.
- b. Respondent violated California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 3340.24, subdivision (c), in that Respondent falsely issued a certificate of compliance to the Dodge.
- c. Respondent violated California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 3340.35, subdivision (c), in that Respondent issued a certificate of compliance to a vehicle that did not have all the required emission control equipment and devices installed and functioning correctly.

- d. Respondent violated California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 3340.42, subdivision (b) in that Respondent failed to provide a proper visual inspection of the Dodge.
- e. Respondent violated California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 3340.42, in conjunction with California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 3340.45, subdivision (b), in that Respondent failed to provide a proper visual inspection on the Dodge as prescribed in the Smog Check Manual.
- f. Respondent violated California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 3371, in that Respondent made untrue or misleading statements as described in paragraphs 21-24, above.
- g. Respondent violated California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 3373, in that Respondent made untrue or misleading statements on a Vehicle Inspection Report. The Vehicle Inspection Report stated that the vehicle passed the Fuel Evaporative System visual inspection.

### **FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

### (Dishonesty or Deceit)

29. Respondent Chevrem has subjected its Smog Station license to disciplinary action under Health and Safety Code section 44072.2, subdivision (d), in that Respondent committed acts involving dishonesty or deceit whereby another was injured. The circumstances are described in paragraphs 21-24, above.

### FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

### (Violation of Laws and Regulations)

- 30. Respondent Cheverm has subjected its Smog Station license to disciplinary action under Health and Safety Code section 44072.2, subdivision(s) (a), (c) and/or (g), in that Respondent violated the following laws and regulations:
- a. Respondent violated Health and Safety code section 44012, subdivision (f), in that Respondent failed to perform a smog check on the Dodge according to the procedures prescribed by the department. Respondent failed to perform a proper visual inspection.
- b. Respondent violated Health and Safety code section 44015, subdivision (a)(1), in that Respondent issued a certificate of compliance to a vehicle that had been tampered with.

- c. Respondent violated California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 3340.24, subdivision (c), in that Respondent falsely issued a certificate of compliance to the Dodge.
- d. Respondent violated California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 3340.35, subdivision (c), in that Respondent issued a certificate of compliance to a vehicle that did not have all the required emission control equipment and devices installed and functioning correctly.
- e. Respondent violated California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 3340.42, subdivision (b) in that Respondent failed to perform a proper visual inspection of the Honda.
- f. Respondent violated California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 3340.42 in conjunction with California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 3340.45, subdivision (b), in that Respondent failed to perform a proper visual inspection on the Honda as prescribed in the Smog Check Manual.

### SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

### (Dishonesty or Deceit)

31. Respondent Mark has subjected his Smog Inspector license to disciplinary action under Health and Safety Code section 44072.2, subdivision (d), in that Respondent committed acts involving dishonesty or deceit whereby another was injured. The circumstances are described in paragraphs 21-24, above.

#### SEVENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

### (Violation of Laws and Regulations)

- 32. Respondent Mark has subjected his Smog Inspector license to disciplinary action under Health and Safety Code section 44072.2, subdivision(s) (a), (c) and/or (g), in that Respondent violated the following laws and regulations:
- a. Respondent violated Health and Safety code section 44012, subdivision (f), in that Respondent failed to perform a smog check on the Dodge according to the procedures prescribed by the department. Respondent failed to perform a proper visual inspection.
- b. Respondent violated Health and Safety code section 44015, subdivision (a)(1), in that Respondent issued a certificate of compliance to a vehicle that had been tampered with.

- c. Respondent violated California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 3340.24, subdivision (c), in that Respondent falsely issued a certificate of compliance to the Dodge.
- d. Respondent violated California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 3340.35, subdivision (c), in that Respondent issued a certificate of compliance to a vehicle that did not have all the required emission control equipment and devices installed and functioning correctly.
- e. Respondent violated California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 3340.42, subdivision (b) in that Respondent failed to perform a proper visual inspection of the Honda.
- f. Respondent violated California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 3340.42 in conjunction with California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 3340.45, subdivision (b), in that Respondent failed to perform a proper visual inspection on the Honda as prescribed in the Smog Check Manual.

### JURISDICTION FOR PETITION TO REVOKE PROBATION

33. This Petition to Revoke Probation against Respondent Chevrem is brought before the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs (Director) for the Bureau of Automotive Repair under Probation Term and Condition Number 9 of the Decision and Order In the Matter of the Accusations Against Chevrem Corporation, et al., Case Nos. 79/17-1195, 79/17-1998, 79/17-1999, 79/17-1202, 79/17-1224, 79/17-1226, and 79/17-1229. That term and condition states:

Violation of Probation. If Respondent violates or fails to comply with the terms and conditions of probation in any respect, the Director, after giving notice and opportunity to be heard may set aside the stay order and carry out the disciplinary order provided in the decision. Once Respondent is served notice of BAR's intent to set aside the stay, the Director shall maintain jurisdiction, and the period of probation shall be extended until final resolution of the matter.

34. This Petition to Revoke Probation Against Respondent Mark is brought before the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs (Director) for the Bureau of Automotive Repair under Probation Term and Condition Number 6 of the Decision and Order In the Matter of the Accusation and Against Chevrem Corporation, et al., Case No. 79/17-1202. That term and condition states:

Violation of Probation. If Respondent violates or fails to comply with the terms and conditions of probation in any respect, the Director, after giving notice and opportunity to be heard may set aside the stay order and carry out the disciplinary order provided in the decision. Once Respondent is served notice of BAR's intent to set aside the stay, the Director shall maintain jurisdiction, and the period of probation shall be extended until final resolution of the matter.

### FIRST CAUSE TO REVOKE PROBATION

(Obey All Laws- Chevrem)

35. At all times after the effective date of Respondent Chevrem's probation, Condition One stated:

"Obey All Laws. During the period of probation, Respondent shall comply with all federal and state statutes, regulations and rules governing all BAR registrations and licenses held by Respondent"

36. Respondent Chevrem's probation is subject to revocation because it failed to comply with Probation Condition One, referenced above. Respondent violated state statutes, regulations and rules governing the BAR registrations and licenses held by Respondent Chevrem as described in the Causes for Discipline, above.

#### SECOND CAUSE TO REVOKE PROBATION

(Obey All Laws- Mark)

37. At all times after the effective date of Respondent Mark's probation, Condition One stated:

"Obey All Laws. During the period of probation, Respondent shall comply with all federal and state statutes, regulations and rules governing all BAR registrations and licenses held by Respondent"

38. Respondent Mark's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to comply with Probation Condition One, referenced above. Respondent Mark violated state statutes, regulations and rules governing the license held by Respondent Mark as described in the Causes for Discipline, above.

///

## 

# 

## 

# 

### 

## 

# 

## 

### 

### 

### 

# 

## 

### 

# 

### 

# 

### **DISCIPLINE CONSIDERATIONS**

- 39. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent Chevrem, Complainant alleges that on or about June 27, 2003, in a prior action, an accusation was filed against Gurnur International Corporation and its President, Fatih Tekin, d.b.a. GIC Smog Station for causing the issuance of 13 fraudulent Smog Check Inspection Certificates of Compliance to be issued. The business name for GIC Smog Station was changed to Walnut Creek Star Smog and ownership of the facility is under Chevrem Corporation with Fatih Tekin as President. On December 6, 2004, the Department of Consumer Affairs adopted a decision in the matter of Accusation 79/04-00 which revoked GIC Smog Station's Smog Check Station licenses and Automotive Repair Dealer registrations. However, the revocations were stayed and the stations were placed on three years' probation.
- 40. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent Chevrem, Complainant alleges that on or about September 21, 2005, in a prior action, Chevrem Corporation and its President, Fatih Tekin, d.b.a. Clear Blue Test Only Smog Station applied for an Automotive Repair Dealer Registration and a Smog Check Station License. The parties stipulated that Accusation 79/04-00 was deemed to constitute a Statement of Issues for the purpose of the denial of Respondent's application. The parties entered into a stipulation and agreement which was adopted as a decision and order only to the Statement of Issues against Fatih Tekin. On January 30, 2006, the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs adopted a decision and order issuing an Automotive Repair Dealer Registration and a Smog Check Station License to Respondent and immediately revoking the licenses, with the revocations stayed, following the terms and conditions of probation as set forth in Accusation 79/04-00.
- 41. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent Chevrem, Complainant alleges that on or about September 15, 2008, in a prior action, an accusation was filed on Chevrem Corporation and its President, Fatih Tekin, d.b.a. Clear Blue Test Only Smog Station, Clear Blue Test Only Smog Station 2, Clear Blue Test Only Station 3, Test Only Smog Station II, and GIC Smog Station for causing the issuance of 13 fraudulent Smog Check Inspection Certificates of Compliance. On April 6, 2009, the Department of Consumer Affairs

adopted a decision in the matter of Accusation 79/09-21 which revoked all Smog Check Station licenses and Automotive Repair Dealer registrations for each facility. However, the revocations were stayed and the stations were placed on five years' probation. In addition, each station was suspended anywhere from 5 to 45 days.

- 42. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent Chevrem, Complainant alleges that on or about September 14, 2015, in a prior action, the Bureau issued Citation Number C2015-2133 and ordered Respondent to pay a \$1,500.00 fine. The citation was based on Respondent's issuance of a certificate of compliance to a vehicle using the BAR97 procedure when an OBD Inspection System was required. The citation was modified to an Order of Abatement. That Citation is now final and is incorporated by reference as if fully set forth.
- 43. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent Mark, Complainant alleges that on or about January 13, 2010, in a prior action, the Bureau issued Citation Number M2010-0668 for violating Health and Safety Code section 44032 in that he issued a certificate of compliance to a Bureau undercover vehicle with the ignition timing adjusted beyond specifications. That Citation is now final and is incorporated by reference as if fully set forth.
- 44. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent Mark, Complainant alleges that on or about October 27, 2014, in a prior action, the Bureau issued Citation Number M2014-1317 directing him to complete an 8-hour BAR certified training course and ordered Respondent to pay a \$1,500.00 fine. Respondent Mark issued a certificate of compliance to a Bureau undercover vehicle with a missing Pulsed Secondary Air Injection (PAIR) System. That Citation is now final and is incorporated by reference as if fully set forth.
- 45. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent Chevrem, Complainant alleges on or about April 22, 2021, a Program Representative conducted a Probation Conference with Respondent Chevrem's station manager for Clear Blue Test Only Smog. During the conference, Respondent Chevrem was advised the Bureau may send an undercover car to confirm compliance with the Automotive Repair Act. Respondent Chevrem was warned that failure to comply with the terms and conditions of probation, the Laws and Regulations contained

within the Automotive Repair Act, and other applicable laws and regulations may result in disciplinary action.

46. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent Mark, Complainant alleges on or about May 27, 2021, a Program Representative conducted a Probation Conference with Respondent Mark. During the conference, Respondent Mark was advised the Bureau may send an undercover car to confirm compliance with the Automotive Repair Act. Respondent Mark was warned that failure to comply with the terms and conditions of probation, the Laws and Regulations contained within the Automotive Repair Act, and other applicable laws and regulations may result in disciplinary action.

### **OTHER MATTERS**

- 47. Pursuant to Code section 9884.7, subdivision (c), the Director may suspend, revoke, or place on probation the registration for all places of business operated in this state by Respondent Chevrem, upon a finding that Respondent Chevrem has, or is, engaged in a course of repeated and willful violations of the laws and regulations pertaining to an automotive repair dealer.
- 48. Pursuant to Health & Safety Code section 44072.8, if Respondent Chevrem's Station License is revoked or suspended, any additional license issued under Chapter 5 of Part 5 of Division 26 of the Health and Safety Code in the name of said licensee may be likewise revoked or suspended by the director.
- 49. Pursuant to Health & Safety Code section 44072.8, if Respondent Mark's Smog Check Inspector license is revoked or suspended, any additional license issued under Chapter 5 of Part 5 of Division 26 of the Health and Safety Code in the name of said 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. Revoking the probation that was granted by the Director in Case Nos. 79/17-1195, 79/17-1998, 79/17-1999, 79/17-1202, 79/17-1224, 79/17-1226, and 79/17-1229 and imposing the

1	DATED: As of Digital Signature Date
2	PATRICK DORAIS Chief
3	Bureau of Automotive Repair Department of Consumer Affairs State of California
4	State of California Complainant
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	17
	ACCUSATION AND PETITION TO REVOKE PROBATION