- 1		
1	XAVIER BECERRA	
.2	Attorney General of California DIANN SOKOLOFF	
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General	
4	Laura Pedicini Deputy Attorney General	
.5	State Bar No. 200934	
6	1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor P.O. Box 70550	
İ	Oakland, CA 94612-0550 Telephone: (510) 879-0269	
7	Facsimile: (510) 622-2270	
.8	E-mail: Laura.Pedicini@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Complainant	
9		
10	BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS	
11	FOR THE BUREAU OF AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR	
12	STATE OF C.	ALIFORNIA
13		
14	To the Matter of the Assessment Assistant	GN- 77/16 17506
15	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 77/16-17596
16	FMC AUTOMOTIVE SERVICES; FABIO ARMANDO MENJIVAR, OWNER	
17	1137B Palmetto Ave Pacifica, CA 94044	ACCUSATION
18	Automotive Repair Dealer Registration No.	
19	ARD 273157	
20	Respondent.	
21		
22	Complainant Patrick Dorais alleges:	
23	PARTIES	
24	1. Complainant brings this Accusation solely in his official capacity as the Chief of the	
25	Bureau of Automotive Repair (Bureau), Department of Consumer Affairs.	
26	2. On or about May 24, 2013, the Bureau issued Automotive Repair Dealer Registration	
27	Number ARD 273157 to FMC Automotive Services; Fabio Armando Menjivar, Owner	
28	(Respondent). Respondent's automotive repair de	ealer registration was in full force and effect at
40		

all times relevant to the charges brought in this Accusation and will expire on May 31, 2019, unless renewed.

JURISDICTION

- 3. 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. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code (Code) unless otherwise indicated.
- 4. Code section 9882, subdivision (a) states, in relevant part:

 "There is in the Department of Consumer Affairs a Bureau of Automotive Repair under the supervision and control of the director. The duty of enforcing and administering this chapter is vested in the chief who is responsible to the director. The director may adopt and enforce those rules and regulations that he or she determines are reasonably necessary to carry out the purposes of this chapter and declaring the policy of the bureau, including a system for the issuance of citations for violations of this chapter as specified in Section 125.9."
- 5. Code section 9884.7, subdivision (c), states, in relevant part, that the Director may refuse to validate, or may invalidate temporarily or permanently, 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 the laws and regulations pertaining to an automotive repair dealer.
- 6. Code section 9884.13 states, in relevant part, that the expiration of a valid registration shall not deprive the Director of jurisdiction to proceed with a disciplinary proceeding against an automotive repair dealer or to render a decision invalidating a registration temporarily or permanently.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

- 7. Code section 9884.7 states, in relevant 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.
 - "(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."
 - 8. Code section 9884.8 states, in relevant part:

All work done by an automotive repair dealer, including all warranty work, shall be recorded on an invoice and shall describe all service work done and parts supplied...One copy of the invoice shall be given to the customer and one copy shall be retained by the automotive repair dealer.

9. Code section 9884.9 states, in relevant part:

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

28

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

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

(signature or initials)"

10. Code section 17200 states:

"As used in this chapter, unfair competition shall mean and include any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice and unfair, deceptive, untrue or misleading advertising and any act prohibited by Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 17500) of Part 3 of Division 7 of the Business and Professions Code."

11. Code section 17500 states:

It is unlawful for any person, firm, corporation or association, or any employee thereof with intent directly or indirectly to dispose of real or personal property or to perform services, professional or otherwise, or anything of any nature whatsoever or to induce the public to enter into any obligation relating thereto, to make or disseminate or cause to be made or disseminated before the public in this state, or to make or disseminate or cause to be made or disseminated from this state before the public in any state, in any newspaper or other publication, or any advertising device, or by public outcry or proclamation, or in any other manner or means whatever, including over the Internet, any statement, concerning that real or personal property or those services, professional or otherwise, or concerning any circumstance or matter of fact connected with the proposed performance or disposition thereof; 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, or for any person, firm, or corporation to so make or disseminate or cause to be so made or disseminated any such statement as part of a plan or scheme with the intent not to sell that personal property or those services, professional or otherwise, so advertised at the price stated therein, or as so advertised. Any violation of the provisions of this section is a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment in the county jail not exceeding six months, or by a fine not exceeding two thousand five hundred dollars (\$2,500), or by both that imprisonment and fine.

REGULATORY PROVISIONS

12. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section (Regulation) 3353 states, in relevant part:

"No work for compensation shall be commenced and no charges shall accrue without

specific authorization from the customer in accordance with the following requirements:

- "(a) Estimate for Parts and Labor. Every dealer shall give to each customer a written estimated price for parts and labor for a specific job."
 - 13. Regulation section 3356 states, in relevant part:
 - (a) All invoices for service and repair work performed, and parts supplied, as provided for in Section 9884.8 of the Business and Professions Code, shall comply with the following:
 - (2) The invoice shall separately list, describe and identify all of the following:
 - (A) All service and repair work performed, including all diagnostic and warranty work, and the price for each described service and repair.
 - (B) Each part supplied, in such a manner that the customer can understand what was purchased, and the price for each described part. The description of each part shall state whether the part was new, used, reconditioned, rebuilt, or an OEM crash part, or a non-OEM aftermarket crash part.
 - 14. Regulation section 3371 states, in relevant 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..."

15. 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

16. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in relevant part, that the 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, 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.

UNDERCOVER OPERATION #1: 2001 TOYOTA

- 17. On February 15, 2017, at approximately 12:00 p.m., an undercover operator (operator) employed by the Bureau drove the Bureau's 2001 Toyota to Respondent's shop (FMC Auto) and requested a brake inspection. Bureau technicians had just assembled and installed the Toyota's brake system to meet manufacturer's specifications; however, the Bureau also intentionally created a malfunction impacting the front brake pads. The only required repair was replacement of the front brake pads. The other components of the brake system, including the front and rear brakes, calipers, brake rotors, and rear brake shoe set, were in good condition.
- 18. After the operator dropped off the Toyota at FMC Auto, the Respondent technician told the operator that he would call her back later that day to inform her of the results of the brake inspection. The operator did not receive an estimate from Respondent technician before leaving the shop.
- 19. At or about 2:54 p.m. on February 15, 2017, the operator called the facility and spoke with Respondent technician. Respondent technician told her that the front brake pads were worn out and needed to be replaced. He also told the operator that the following repairs were needed:
 - a. The front brake caliper was leaking and needed to be rebuilt or replaced.
 - b. A front brake rotor was bent and needed to be replaced.
 - c. The rear brakes needed adjustment.
- Respondent technician did not provide an estimate for the repairs. The operator told Respondent technician she would call him back.
- 20. At or about 3:05 p.m. on February 15, 2017, the operator called Respondent technician, who re-confirmed the same repairs listed in paragraph 19, above, were required, and quoted the operator \$360.00 for parts and labor. The operator authorized \$360.00 for the repairs. Respondent technician told the operator the work would be completed the next day, February 16, 2017, and she could pick up the Toyota then. The operator did not receive a written estimate from FMC Auto.

- 21. On February 16, 2017, when the operator called to check on the status of the repairs, Respondent technician told her the repair work was complete. Respondent technician also explained that he did not remember how much he previously quoted the operator. He said that although the actual charge for the completed work was \$681.21, he was only going to charge the operator \$436.21. Respondent technician requested a cash payment for the repair work.
- 22. At approximately 1:25 p.m. on February 16, 2017, the operator picked up the Toyota at FMC Auto. After paying \$436.21 cash for the repairs, she was provided with an unnumbered invoice dated February 16, 2017. The invoice listed a total cost for services of \$436.21. After reviewing the invoice and inspecting the Toyota on February 7, 2017, the Bureau inspector identified the following invoice-specific errors:
 - a. The invoice did not describe the diagnostic work completed.
 - b. The invoice was not signed or initialed by the operator.
 - c. The invoice did not include a notation by Respondent technician confirming oral consent by the operator for the repairs.
 - d. The invoice did not list parts for the charged "caliper rebuilted." (sic)
 - e. The invoice did not include the brake fluid used for the caliper rebuild and brake bleed.
- 23. The Bureau inspector also determined that although invoiced and paid for by the operator, the caliper piston seals were not replaced and the rear brake wheel cylinders were not bled. Respondent technician also failed to properly bleed the brake hydraulic system as invoiced. In total, the following repair-related deficiencies were identified:
 - a. The front brake rotors were unnecessarily replaced.
 - b. Rebuilding the right front brake caliper, including replacement of the dust boots, was unnecessary. The caliper piston seals were not replaced.
 - c. The rear brake shoe adjustment was unnecessary and improperly performed. The rear brake shoes were over-adjusted beyond the manufacturer's specifications, causing the rear wheels to drag; as a result, the Toyota vibrated at highway speeds.
 - d. The brake system as a whole was not properly bled.

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

Making or Authorizing Untrue or Misleading Statements (Bus. & Prof. Code sections 9884.7, subds. (a)(1) and (6) and 17200; Cal. Code of Regs., title 16, section 3371)

24. Respondent has subjected its ARD registration to discipline for publishing or making untrue or misleading statements (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 9884.7, subd. (a)(1), (6) and 17200; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 16, § 3371). On or about February 15, 2017, Respondent represented that the Toyota's brake caliper system needed to be rebuilt, the brake pads needed to be replaced, and other brake-related work was necessary. However, most of the repair-related recommendations were untrue and misleading, because only the front brake pads required repair. When the Board inspector re-inspected after the work was completed and paid for, it was discovered that significant portions of the work had not been completed, or had been improperly performed. Additionally, Respondent charged for and accepted payment for some repairs that were unnecessary. The circumstances are further explained in paragraphs 17-23, above.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE Fraud

(Bus. and Prof. Code section 9884.7, subd. (a)(4))

25. Respondent has subjected its ARD registration to discipline for fraud (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 9884.7, subd. (a)(4)). On or about February 16, 2017 Respondent fraudulently charged for and received payment for automotive parts that were not provided and labor that was not performed, or unnecessarily performed. The circumstances are further explained in paragraphs 17-23, above.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

Failing to Comply with Invoice Requirements (Bus. & Prof. Code section 9884.8; Cal. Code of Regs., title 16, sections 3356, subd. (a)(2)(B) and 3373)

26. Respondent has subjected its ARD registration to discipline for failing to comply with invoice requirements, including failing to describe all service work performed on the invoice. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 9884.8; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 16, § 3356). On or about February 16, 2017, Respondent misrepresented the work completed on the invoice by including misleading

and untrue representations about the work. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 16, § 3373.) The circumstances are further explained in paragraphs 17-23, above.

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

Failing to Give a Customer a Written Estimate for Parts and Labor (Bus. & Prof. Code section 9884.9, subd. (a); Cal. Code of Regs., title 16, section 3353, subd. (a))

27. Respondent has subjected its ARD registration to discipline because, on or about February 15, 2017, he failed to provide the operator/customer a written estimate for parts and labor for a specific job. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 9884.9, subd. (a); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 16, § 3353, subd. (a)). The circumstances are further explained in paragraphs 17-23, above.

FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE Failing to Properly Document Oral Consent (Bus. & Prof. Code section 9884.9, subd. (a)(2))

28. Respondent has subjected its ARD registration to discipline because, on or about February 15-16, 2017, he failed to properly document oral consent for additional repairs, either by having the customer sign or provide initial acknowledgment of notice and consent or by documenting the facts of oral consent on the invoice. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 9884.9, subd. (a)(2)). The circumstances are further explained in paragraphs 17-23, above.

SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE Unfair Competition (Bus. & Prof. Code section 17500)

29. On or about February 15-16, Respondent subjected its ARD registration to discipline by committing acts, including making false and misleading statements, that constitute unfair competition. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 17500). The circumstances are further explained in paragraphs 17-23, above.

UNDERCOVER OPERATION #2: 2001 CHEVROLET

30. On August 30, 2017, an undercover operator with the Bureau took the Bureau's 2001 Chevrolet to Respondent's shop for inspection. A Bureau technician determined that repair of the Chevrolet's engine misfire required replacement of the inoperative number five fuel injector. No other repairs were required. The "check engine light" was on, and Diagnostic

¹ The operator gave Respondent \$740.00 in cash to pay the \$721.86 bill and did not tell Respondent to keep the change.

Trouble Codes (DTCs) identified the following issues: P0300, Engine Misfire Detected and P0205, Injector 5 Control Circuit. The Bureau technician installed tamper indicators on various system components within the Chevrolet to detect access or removal of those components.

- 31. At approximately 11:20 a.m., the operator asked Respondent technician to diagnose the cause of the check engine light and identify why the engine was running rough. Later that day, Respondent technician called the operator, told him that repair costs would be between \$400.00 and \$500.00, and identified the following repairs as required: a fuel injector, fuel rail pipe, spark plugs, and an engine tune up. The operator gave FMC Auto permission to proceed with the repairs. At no point on August 30, 2017, did the operator sign or receive a written estimate.
- 32. On August 31, 2017, at approximately 4:15 p.m., Respondent technician confirmed that the repairs were completed and the operator indicated he would pick up the car the next day. Respondent technician did not provide the operator with an estimate for the repair costs.
- 33. On September 1, 2017, at approximately 11:10 a.m., the operator returned to FMC Auto to pick up the Chevrolet. Respondent technician explained that the charge for the repairs was \$918.18; however, he had discounted the cost to \$721.86. Respondent technician provided the operator with an unsigned, unnumbered invoice, and failed to return the change that the operator was owed totaling \$18.14¹.
- 34. On February 25, 2009, the Bureau technician inspected the vehicle and found that FMC Auto performed unnecessary repairs on the Chevrolet. Furthermore, in addition to addressing the required repair, FMC Auto charged for, but did not perform, other repairs. Specifically, the following problems were identified by the Bureau inspector after reviewing the invoice and re-inspecting the Chevrolet:
 - a. The spark plugs and spark plug wires were not in need of replacement.
 - b. The PCV valve was not in need of replacement
 - c. The fuel filter, air filter, and fuel rail were not in need of replacement.

- d. The manifold bolts did not require tightening.
- e. The fuel injector cleaning service was unnecessary.
- f. Although the items listed in a-d, above, were invoiced, they were not actually replaced or repaired.

SEVENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE Making or Authorizing Untrue or Misleading Statements (Bus. & Prof. Code sections 9884.7, subdivision (a)(1) and (6) and 17200; Cal. Code of Regs., title 16, section 3371)

35. Respondent has subjected its ARD registration to discipline for publishing or making untrue or misleading statements (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 9884.7, subd. (a)(1), (6) and 17200; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 16, § 3371). On or about August 31, 2017, Respondent represented that the Chevrolet needed services and repairs that were beyond the scope and in excess of the only service that was required, that of the replacement of the number five fuel injector. The underlying facts relevant to this cause for discipline are set forth in paragraphs 30-34, above.

EIGHTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE Fraud (Bus. & Prof. Code section 9884.7, subd. (a)(4))

36. Respondent has subjected its ARD registration to discipline for fraud (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 9884.7, subd. (a)(4)). On or about September 1, 2017, Respondent fraudulently charged for and received payment for automotive parts that were not provided and labor and parts that was not performed, or unnecessarily performed. The underlying facts relevant to this cause for discipline are set forth in paragraphs 30-34, above.

NINTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE Failing to Comply with Invoice Requirements (Bus. & Prof. Code section 9884.8; Cal. Code of Regs., title 16, sections 3356, subd. (a)(2)(B) and 3373)

37. Respondent has subjected its ARD registration to discipline for failing to comply with invoice requirements. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 9884.8; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 16, § 3356). On or about September 1, 2017, Respondent misrepresented the work he completed by providing misleading and untrue representations about the work on the invoice. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 16, § 3373). The circumstances are further explained in paragraphs 30-34, above.

TENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

Failing to Give a Customer a Written Estimate for Parts and Labor (Bus. & Prof. Code section 9884.9, subd. (a);
Cal. Code of Regs., title 16, section 3353, subd. (a))

38. Respondent has subjected its ARD registration to discipline for failing, on or about August 31, 2017, to give the operator/customer a written estimate for parts and labor for a specific job. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 9884.9, subd. (a); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 16, § 3353, subd. (a)). The circumstances are further explained in paragraphs 30-34, above.

ELEVENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE Failing to Properly Document Oral Consent (Bus. & Prof. Code section 9884.9, subd. (a)(2))

39. Respondent has subjected its ARD registration to discipline for failing on or about August 31, 2017 and September 1, 2017, to properly document oral consent for additional repairs, either by having the customer sign or provide initial acknowledgment of notice and consent, or by documenting the facts of oral consent on the invoice. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 9884.9, subd. (a)(2)). The circumstances are further explained in paragraphs 30-34, above.

TWELFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE Unfair Competition (Bus. & Prof. Code section 17500)

40. Respondent has subjected its ARD registration to discipline by committing acts, including making false and misleading statements, that constitute unfair competition. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 17500). The circumstances are further explained in paragraphs 30-34, above.

UNDERCOVER OPERATION #3: 2001 MITSUBISHI

- 41. On November 16, 2017, at or about 11:45 a.m., a Bureau undercover operator took the Bureau's 2001 Mitsubishi to FMC Auto for a check engine diagnosis. A Bureau inspector had previously determined that the Mitsubishi only required replacement of the Exhaust Gas Recirculation (EGR) solenoid. The Mitsubishi's "check engine" light was on, and its engine was idling "rough." The Bureau technician installed tamper indicators on various system components within the Mitsubishi to detect access or removal of those components.
- 42. Respondent technician told the operator that the Mitsubishi might need a new engine, but that he would call him with an update once the diagnosis was complete. At no point on

November 16, 2017 did the operator sign or receive a written estimate.

- 43. At approximately 2:49 p.m., Respondent technician called the operator and explained that while the Mitsubishi did not need a new engine, it required a cylinder head valve job, new spark plugs, and an EGR solenoid. He quoted the operator \$1,600 for the repairs, which he explained would require removing the two cylinder heads and sending them to a machine shop.
- 44. At or about 5:00 p.m., the operator called Respondent technician, who confirmed that the repairs described in paragraph 43, above, were necessary. The operator authorized the repairs, and Respondent technician said the Mitsubishi would be ready for pickup the next day.
- 45. On November 20, 2017, Respondent technician called the operator and told him that although the repair costs totaled \$1,656.66, he had decided to give him a 50% discount, so the repair costs would only be \$862.80. When the operator returned to pick up the Mitsubishi, he received an unsigned, unnumbered invoice, totaling \$1,656.66, with a separate, handwritten total charge of \$862.80.
- 46. On November 20, 2017, the Bureau technician inspected the Mitsubishi and found that, in addition to addressing the required repair, FMC Auto performed unnecessary repairs. Further, FMC Auto charged for, but did not perform, other repairs. Specifically, the following problems were identified by the Bureau inspector after reviewing the invoice and re-inspecting the Mitsubishi:
 - a. The invoice did not itemize costs for the EGR solenoid, nor did it indicate that the EGR solenoid had been replaced.
 - b. Although invoiced, no tune-up parts were installed; a tune-up was unnecessary.
 - c. Although invoiced, compression checks were not completed on the cylinders.
 - d. Although invoiced, the manifold bolts were not tightened; such tightening was unnecessary.
 - e. Although invoiced, a valve clearance service was not performed; valve clearance is not adjustable on a 2001 Mitsubishi.
 - f. Although invoiced, no "machine shop" services were provided, nor were these services required.

THIRTEENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

Making or Authorizing Untrue or Misleading Statements (Bus. and Prof. Code sections 9884.7, subds. (a)(1) and (6) and 17200; Cal. Code of Regs., title 16, section 3371)

47. Respondent has subjected its ARD registration to discipline for publishing or making untrue or misleading statements (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 9884.7, subd. (a)(1), (6) and 17200; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 16, § 3371). On or about November 16-20, 2017, Respondent misled the operator into believing that the Mitsubishi needed services and repairs that were not required. The circumstances are further explained in paragraphs 41-46, above.

FOURTEENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

Fraud

(Bus. & Prof. Code section 9884.7, subd. (a)(4))

48. Respondent has subjected its ARD registration to discipline for fraud (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 9884.7, subd. (a)(4)). On or about November 20, 2017, Respondent fraudulently charged for and received payment for automotive parts that were not provided and labor and parts that was not performed, or unnecessarily performed. The circumstances are further explained in paragraphs 41-46, above.

FIFTEENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

Failing to Comply with Invoice Requirements
(Bus. & Prof. Code section 9884.8;
Cal. Code of Regs., title 16, sections 3356, subds. (a)(2)(B) and 3373)

49. Respondent has subjected its ARD registration to discipline for failing to comply with invoice requirements. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 9884.8; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 16, § 3356). On or about November 20, 2017, Respondent misrepresented the work he completed by including misleading and untrue representations about the work on the invoice. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 16, § 3373). The circumstances are further explained in paragraphs 41-46, above.

SIXTEENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

Failing to Give a Customer a Written Estimate for Parts and Labor (Bus. & Prof. Code section 9884.9, subd. (a);
Cal. Code of Regs., title 16, section 3353, subd. (a))

50. On or about November 16-20, 2017, Respondent subjected its ARD registration to discipline for failing to provide the operator/customer a written estimate for parts and labor for a

specific job. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 9884.9, subd. (a); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 16, § 3353, subd. (a)). The circumstances are further explained in paragraphs 41-46, above.

SEVENTEENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE Failing to Properly Document Oral Consent (Bus. and Prof. Code section 9884.9, subd. (a)(2))

51. On or about November 16-20, 2017, Respondent subjected its ARD registration to discipline for failing to properly document oral consent for additional repairs, either by having the customer sign or provide initial acknowledgment of notice and consent, or by documenting the facts of oral consent on the invoice. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 9884.9, subd. (a)(2)). The circumstances are further explained in paragraphs 41-46, above.

EIGHTEENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE Unfair Competition (Bus. & Prof. Code section 17500)

52. On or about November 16-20, 2017, Respondent subjected its ARD registration to discipline by committing acts, including making false and misleading statements, that constitute unfair competition. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 17500).) The circumstances are further explained in paragraphs 41-46, above.

OTHER MATTERS

- 53. Under Business and Professions 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 FMC Automotive Services or Fabio Armando Menjivar upon a finding that they engaged in a course of repeated and willful violations of the laws and regulations pertaining to an automotive repair dealer.
- 54. Under Health and Safety Code section 44072.8, if Automotive Repair Dealer Registration Number ARD 273157, issued to FMC Automotive Services; Fabio Armando Menjivar, Owner, is revoked or suspended, any additional license issued under this chapter in the name of said licensee may likewise be suspended or revoked.

//

//

28