BEFORE THE 1 CALIFORNIA GAMBLING CONTROL COMMISSION 2 3 CGCC Case No. GCCC-2018-1115-9D In the Matter of the Application for Approval 4 of Third-Party Player Services License for Supervisor, Player or Other Employee 5 DECISION AND ORDER Regarding: 6 LLOYD DEREK MARIN, JR. Hearing Dates: Wednesday, May 8, 2019 7 Time: 10:00 a.m. Applicant. 8 This matter was heard by the California Gambling Control Commission (Commission) 9 pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 19870 and 19871 and Title 4, California 10 Code of Regulations (CCR) section 12060, in Sacramento, California, on Wednesday, May 8, 11 2019 at 10:00 a.m. 12 Deputy Attorney General Collin Wood, Department of Justice, Attorney General's Office, 13 State of California, represented complainant Stephanie Shimazu, Jr., Chief of the Bureau of 14 Gambling Control (Bureau), Department of Justice, State of California (Complainant). 15 Applicant Lloyd Derek Marin, Jr. was present on his own behalf without representation 16 (Applicant). 17 During the administrative hearing, Presiding Officer Jason Pope took official notice of the 18 Conclusion of Prehearing Conference Letter, the Complainant's Statement of Reasons, 19 Applicant's signed Notice of Defense, and the Notice of Hearing, which included Applicant's 20 State Gambling Application and the Bureau's Report. 21 During the administrative hearing, Presiding Officer Jason Pope accepted into evidence 22 the following exhibits offered by the Complainant: 23 (1) Statement of Reasons; Statement to Applicant; excerpts from the California 24 Business and Professions Code and CCR; Certificate of Service by 25 Certified Mail Service; and a Notice of Defense, dated December 3, 2018, 26 Bates Nos. 001-025; 27 (2) Commission Memorandum, Notices and Letters: 28 Decision and Order, CGCC Case No: GCCC-2018-1115-9D

1	a	. November 2, 2018, Notice of Scheduled Commission Meeting, Bates
2		Nos. 026;
3	b	. CGCC Licensing Division Memorandum for November 15, 2018
4		Commission Meeting for Application for Initial Third-Party
5		Proposition Player License for Applicant with attachments, Bates Nos.
6		027-033;
7	С	November 16, 2018, Referral of Third-Party Proposition Player
8		Services License to an Evidentiary Hearing for Applicant, Bates Nos.
9		034-035;
10	d	. Notice of Hearing dated February 12, 2019, with attachments, Bates
11		Nos. 036-056;
12	e	. March 26, 2019, Conclusion of Pre-hearing Conference, Bates Nos.
13		057-063.
14	(3) T	he Bureau's Registration History for Applicant and Certification of
15	C	Official Records, Bates Nos. 064-065;
16	(4) R	edacted copy of Applicant's Application for Third-Party Proposition
17	P	layer Services License for Supervisor, Player or Other Employee, and
18	L	evel I Supplemental Information, dated February 18, 2015, Bates Nos.
19	0	66-079;
20	(5) A	redacted copy of the Bureau's September 2018, Third-Party Player
21	Е	ackground Investigation Report, Level III, for Applicant, Bates Nos. 080-
22	0	94;
23	(6) F	ebruary 2017 through November 2018, letters, e-mail correspondence and
24	te	elephone contact sheets to and from the Bureau relating to Applicant,
25	Е	ates Nos. 095-115;
26	(7) N	Notices to Appear, Court Records and DMV Records for Applicant, Bates
27	N	Jos. 116-123;
28		

also discovered that Applicant's Driver's License was suspended on October 15, 2009 as a result of his failure to appear in relation to a September 24, 2009 traffic citation.

- 4. On or about September 7, 2018, the Bureau submitted a Third-Party Player Background Investigation Report (Bureau Report) to the Commission recommending the Commission deny Applicant's Application on the basis that Applicant failed to pay fines relating to traffic citations and he has derogatory employment history.
- 5. At its November 15, 2018, meeting, the Commission referred Applicant's Application to an evidentiary hearing, pursuant to CCR section 12054, subdivision (a)(2) to be held pursuant to CCR section 12060 with the Bureau to serve as Complainant.
- 6. On or about December 6, 2018, Applicant submitted a Notice of Defense requesting an evidentiary hearing.
- 7. The Bureau filed a Statement of Reasons with the Commission alleging one cause for denial of the Application based on Applicant's history of disregard for the law demonstrating unsuitability for licensure for five vehicle code infractions, failure to pay fines associated with the infractions, and driving on a suspended license.³
- 8. At the hearing, the Bureau admitted as evidence search results from the Superior Court of California, County of San Diego's website, identifying five case numbers associated with Applicant in the court's Traffic Online Payment System. The Bureau also admitted the results of a Criminal and Traffic/Minor Offense Record Search from the San Diego Superior Court's Central Division and South County Division, which only identified four cases involving Applicant. Additionally, the Bureau admitted copies of three Notices to Appear issued by the San Diego and Chula Vista Police Departments for traffic offenses. From these documents, the following information is provided for the case numbers associated with Applicant:
 - (1) Case Number Y848611 for a violation on September 24, 2009 for failing to stop at a stop sign and failure to show proof of insurance, with a disposition of a warrant issued December 24, 2009;

 $^{^3}$ The Statement of Reasons, unlike the Bureau Report, does not allege Applicant's derogatory employment history as a basis for denial.

- (2) Case Number Y400851 for a violation on August 3, 2009 for speeding and failing to change address on his driver's license and registration, with a disposition of a warrant issued January 13, 2010;
- (3) Case Number Y806188 for a violation on May 20, 2009 for speeding, with a disposition of a warrant issued August 6, 2009;
- (4) Case Number Y08271SD, with a disposition of a warrant issued on December 19, 2003. No information was provided as to the type or date of the violation;
- (5) Case Number K373081 with a citation date of December 12, 2008. No information is provided regarding the type of violation or disposition.
- 9. Applicant did not pay all fines associated with his traffic citations and a remaining balance is owed to AllianceOne Receivables Management, Inc., a collection agency. The exact amount owed and which case numbers have remaining balances is not clear from the evidence admitted.
- 10. Applicant testified that he first learned that his Driver's License was suspended and that he owed money for unpaid traffic citations when he received a phone call from a representative of AllianceOne in 2013. Applicant testified that he did not initially believe the AllianceOne representative was truthful because: (1) Applicant did not receive any documents from the DMV notifying him that his license was suspended; (2) the representative told Applicant that one of the violations occurred in 2003 and Applicant did not own a vehicle at that time; and (3) AllianceOne would not provide Applicant with any documents verifying that the traffic citations or fines were issued against him.
- 11. Applicant testified that because he is certain that he did not receive a traffic citation in 2003, he questioned whether he was truly responsible for the other citations/fines as well. Applicant testified that he was reluctant to make any payments to AllianceOne without further verification. Applicant's testimony was consistent with an April 21, 2007 written statements that he provided to the Bureau.
 - 12. Applicant testified that neither AllianceOne nor the Bureau would provide him with

any documents verifying that Applicant received the traffic citations and failed to pay fines.

Applicant testified that now that he has seen the three Notices to Appear admitted as exhibits by the Bureau, he agrees that he was the driver/recipient of those citations, although he cannot recall being pulled over, receiving tickets/notice to appear, or going to court for those incidents.

However, Applicant maintains his position that he did not receive a 2003 traffic citation.

- 13. Applicant testified that in 2009 he moved his family to Nevada in anticipation of the birth of his daughter. Applicant testified that he may have put the 2009 ticket "on the back burner" due to the upcoming relocation of his family and birth of his daughter. However, Applicant acknowledged that his move and birth of his daughter did not excuse his obligation to pay the outstanding fines.
- 14. Applicant testified that he intends to satisfy the obligation owed to AllianceOne, but it will take him some time because he has five kids and other debts, and does not have the resources to pay the balance in full now. Applicant testified that he makes periodic payments to AllianceOne based on what he can afford and also pays through a lien on his tax returns and he has already satisfied fines associated with some of the citations.
- 15. Applicant's driver's license was suspended effective October 15, 2009 and expired on April 13, 2010. Applicant has not had a valid driver's license since.
- 16. Applicant testified that he did not know that his license was suspended and continued to drive. Applicant first learned of the suspension in 2013 in a phone call with a representative of AllianceOne. Applicant admitted that he continued to drive even after learning from AllianceOne that his license was suspended. Applicant testified that he stopped driving in 2014 or 2015 and began using Lyft, Uber, or receiving rides from his wife and brother.
- 17. Applicant wrote to the Bureau on April 21, 2017 stating that he would commit to not driving and at that time his primary source of transportation was still for his wife or brother to drive him to work and utilizing Uber and Lyft.
- 18. Applicant testified that he did his best to cooperate with the Bureau and to answer the follow up questions he received during the background investigation process. Applicant also

testified that he is not a strong writer and he had difficulty answering some of the Bureau's questions because such long periods of time would pass between inquiries.

- 19. Applicant admitted a letter of reference from David Kato, Senior Manager at L.E. Gaming, Inc. Mr. Kato states that Applicant has been the primary trainer for the company for approximately three years and he is a trusted, loyal, and dedicated employee. Mr. Kato states that he has no concerns about the quality of Applicant's character.
- 20. Applicant admitted a letter of reference prepared by his brother, Sean Marin. Mr. Marin wrote that Applicant has outstanding character and continues to positively impact others. In his letter, Mr. Marin shared personal stories regarding the positive influence, concern, and guidance that Applicant has offered to his family and coworkers over the years.
- 21. The reference letters offered by Applicant are persuasive and evidence that Applicant is a person of good character, honestly, and integrity.
- 22. There was no evidence presented during the evidentiary hearing that Applicant has ever been convicted of a crime or that he has received a traffic citation since August 3, 2009.
- 23. There was no evidence presented during the evidentiary hearing that Applicant has had any employment-related issues during his approximately six year career in controlled gambling. In fact, the evidence presented during the evidentiary hearing is persuasive that Applicant is an excellent employee and has been successful in his work in controlled gambling.
- 24. Based on the letters of reference, Applicant's untarnished employment history in the controlled gambling industry, and the fact that Applicant's only criminal history involves traffic violations, Applicant has met his burden of proving that he is a person of good character, honesty and integrity.
- 25. The Commission is concerned that Applicant continued to drive his vehicle with a suspended driver's license, even after being told by AllianceOne in 2013 that his license was suspended. Further, even if Applicant did not know that his license was suspended, he should have realized that it was expired. However, Applicant's testimony that he does not currently drive is credible. Applicant is advised that any future violations regarding driving without a valid

license will be taken very seriously by the Commission.

- 26. The Commission is also concerned with Applicant's initial failure to pay, resolve, or dispute the unpaid fines relating to the traffic citations, which is the basis for a condition being placed on Applicant's license.
- 27. All documentary and testimonial evidence submitted by the parties that is not specifically addressed in this Decision and Order was considered but not used by the Commission in making its determination on Applicant's Application.

LEGAL CONCLUSIONS

- 28. Division 1.5 of the Business and Professions Code, the provisions of which govern the denial of licenses on various grounds, does not apply to licensure decisions made by the Commission under the Gambling Control Act. (Business and Professions Code section 476(a).)
- 29. At an evidentiary hearing pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 19870 and 19871 and Title 4, CCR section 12060(b), the burden of proof rests with the applicant to prove his qualifications to receive any license under the Gambling Control Act. (Title 4, CCR section 12060(i); Business and Professions Code section 19856(a).)
- 30. Public trust and confidence can only be maintained by strict and comprehensive regulation of all persons, locations, practices, associations, and activities related to the operation of lawful gambling establishments and the manufacture and distribution of permissible gambling equipment. (Business and Professions Code section 19801(h).)
- 31. An application to receive a license constitutes a request for a determination of the applicant's general character, integrity, and ability to participate in, engage in, or be associated with, controlled gambling. (Business and Professions Code section 19856(b).)
- 32. The Commission has the responsibility of assuring that licenses, approvals, and permits are not issued to, or held by, unqualified or disqualified persons, or by persons whose operations are conducted in a manner that is inimical to the public health, safety, or welfare. (Business and Professions Code section 19823(a)(1).)
 - 33. An "unqualified person" means a person who is found to be unqualified pursuant to

the criteria set forth in Business and Professions Code section 19857, and "disqualified person" means a person who is found to be disqualified pursuant to the criteria set forth in Business and Professions Code section 19859. (Business and Professions Code section 19823(b).)

- 34. The Commission has the power to limit, condition, or restrict any license for any cause deemed reasonable by the Commission. (Bus. & Prof. Code section 10982(b).)
- 35. No gambling license shall be issued unless, based on all of the information and documents submitted, the commission is satisfied that the applicant is a person of good character, honesty and integrity. (Business and Professions Code section 19857(a).)
- 36. No gambling license shall be issued unless, based on all of the information and documents submitted, the commission is satisfied that the applicant is a person whose prior activities, criminal record, if any, reputation, habits, and associations do not pose a threat to the public interest of this state, or to the effective regulation and control of controlled gambling, or create or enhance the dangers of unsuitable, unfair, or illegal practices, methods, and activities in the conduct of controlled gambling or in the carrying on of the business and financial arrangements incidental thereto. (Business and Professions Code section 19857(b).)
- 37. The commission shall deny a license to any applicant who is disqualified for failure of the applicant to provide information, documentation, and assurances required by this chapter or requested by the chief, or failure of the applicant to reveal any fact material to qualification, or the supplying of information that is untrue or misleading as to a material fact pertaining to the qualification criteria. (Business and Professions Code section 19859(b).)
- 38. A requester shall be ineligible for licensing as a third party proposition player if the requester has failed to meet the requirements of Business and Professions Code sections 19856 or 19857. (CCR section 12218.11(e).)
- 39. Applicant has met his burden of proving that he is a person of good character, honesty, and integrity. Therefore, Applicant is qualified to receive a third party proposition player license pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 19857(a). As a result, Applicant is not ineligible to receive a third party proposition player license pursuant to CCR section 12218.11(e).

40. Applicant met his burden of proving that with appropriate conditions he is a person whose prior activities, criminal record, if any, reputation, habits, and associations do not pose a threat to the public interest of this state, or to the effective regulation and control of controlled gambling, or create or enhance the dangers of unsuitable, unfair, or illegal practices, methods, and activities in the conduct of controlled gambling or in the carrying on of the business and financial arrangements incidental thereto. Therefore, Applicant is qualified to receive a third party proposition player license pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 19857(b). As a result, Applicant is not ineligible to receive a third party proposition player license pursuant to CCR section 12218.11(e).

41. Applicant has met his burden of proving that he is not disqualified from licensure pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 19859 nor ineligible for licensing as a third party proposition player pursuant to CCR section 12218.11.

NOTICE OF APPLICANT'S APPEAL RIGHTS

Applicant has the following appeal rights available under state law: CCR section 12064, subsections (a) and (b) provide, in part:

An applicant denied a license, permit, registration, or finding of suitability, or whose license, permit, registration, or finding of suitability has had conditions, restrictions, or limitations imposed upon it, may request reconsideration by the Commission within 30 calendar days of service of the decision, or before the effective date specified in the decision, whichever is later. The request shall be made in writing to the Commission, copied to the Bureau, and shall state the reasons for the request, which must be based upon either newly discovered evidence or legal authorities that could not reasonably have been presented before the Commission's issuance of the decision or at the hearing on the matter, or upon other good cause which the Commission may decide, in its sole discretion, merits reconsideration.

Business and Professions Code section 19870, subdivision (e) provides:

A decision of the commission denying a license or approval, or imposing any condition or restriction on the grant of a license or approval may be reviewed by petition pursuant to Section 1085 of the Code of Civil Procedure. Section 1094.5 of the Code of Civil Procedure shall not apply to any judicial proceeding described in the foregoing sentence, and the court may grant the petition only if the court finds that the action of the commission was arbitrary and capricious, or that the action exceeded the commission's jurisdiction.

CCR section 12066, subsection (c) provides: A decision of the Commission denying an application or imposing conditions on license shall be subject to judicial review as provided in Business and Professions Code section 19870, subdivision (e). Neither the right to petition for judicial review nor the time for filing the petition shall be affected by failure to seek reconsideration. /// /// /// **Decision and Order, CGCC Case No:** GCCC-2018-1115-9D

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

2122

23

2425

26

27

28

1. LLOYD DEREK MARIN, JR.'s Application for Approval of Third-Party Proposition Player Services License is APPROVED with the following condition:

- a. Applicant must provide a status update to the Bureau every 90 days regarding his efforts to pay, resolve, and/or dispute his outstanding accounts with AllianceOne.
- 2. No costs are to be awarded.
- 3. Each side to pay its own attorneys' fees.

This Order is effective on July 1, 2019.

Dated:	5	30	19
			1

Dated: 5/30/19

ted: 5/30/19

Dated: 5/30/19

Signature:

.

Signature:

Paula LaBrie, Commissioner

Signature:

Gareth Lacy, Commissioner

Signature:

Trang To, Commissioner