

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA GAMBLING CONTROL COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Application for Gambling
Establishment Key Employee License of:

TERRANCE DOUGLAS SEGLEM

GEKE-002504

Applicant.

BGC Case No. BGC-HQ2021-00039SL
CGCC Case No. CGCC-2021-1021-6A

DECISION AND ORDER

Hearing Date: May 16, 2022
Time: 10:00 a.m.

This matter was heard by the California Gambling Control Commission (Commission) pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 19870 and 19871, and title 4, California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 12060, in Sacramento, California, and held via Zoom video conference, on May 16, 2022.

Neil Houston, Deputy Attorney General, State of California (DAG Houston), represented complainant Yolanda Morrow, Acting Director of the Bureau of Gambling Control (Bureau), Department of Justice, State of California. Terrance Douglas Seglem (Seglem) attended on his own behalf without representation.

During the evidentiary hearing, Presiding Officer Kate Patterson (Presiding Officer) took official notice of the Notice and Agenda of Commission Hearing, the Commission’s Conclusion of Prehearing Conference letter, the Commission’s Notice of Hearing with attachments (A) Seglem’s Application, and (B) the Bureau’s background investigation report, the Bureau’s Statement of Reasons, and Seglem’s signed Notice of Defense.

Pursuant to a stipulation between the parties, the Presiding Officer accepted into evidence Exhibits 1 through Exhibit 14 offered by the Bureau, which contain bates numbering “Complainant – 001” through “Complainant – 308” with a Table of Contents that separately identifies each document. Also pursuant to the stipulation, the Presiding Officer accepted into evidence Applicant’s Exhibit A, which contains Bates numbering APP001-APP003 and includes the following:

- 1 (1) Letter from Seglem to Focus Management Financial Credit Services, Bates No.
2 APP001;
3 (2) Letter of reference by Jessica Carroll, Bates No. APP002; and
4 (3) Letter of reference by Maria Lowe, Bates No. APP003.

5 The record was closed and the matter was submitted for decision on May 16, 2022.

6 FINDINGS OF FACT

7 **PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

8 1. On July 8, 2020, the Bureau received an Application for Interim Key Employee
9 License from Seglem.

10 2. On July 8, 2020, the Bureau received an initial application for a Gambling
11 Establishment Key Employee License and the Key Employee Supplemental Background
12 Investigation Information form (collectively, Application) from Seglem to work as a key
13 employee at Casino Marysville. The Bureau notified Seglem on January 15, 2021, that the
14 Application was complete and deemed filed as of January 14, 2021.

15 3. Seglem was issued interim key employee license GEKE-002504 on November 19,
16 2020.

17 4. The Bureau performed a background investigation on Seglem and on July 30, 2021,
18 Yolanda Morrow, then Assistant Director, and Frances Asuncion, Manager II with the Bureau,
19 called Seglem and informed him generally of the basis for the Bureau's recommendation to deny
20 his Application.

21 5. In August 2021, the Commission received a Level III Gambling Establishment Key
22 Employee Initial Background Investigation Report (Report) on Seglem from the Bureau. In this
23 report, the Bureau recommends that the Commission deny Seglem's Application.

24 6. At its October 21, 2021 meeting, the Commission considered the Application and
25 voted to refer the matter of Seglem's Application to an evidentiary hearing pursuant to CCR
26 section 12054, subdivision (a)(2), to be conducted as a hearing under the Gambling Control Act
27 (Act), Government Code section 19800 et seq., pursuant to CCR section 12060. On October 22,
28

1 2021, the Commission notified Seglem of its action upon the Application and provided him with
2 a Notice of Defense form.

3 7. On or about November 15, 2021, the Bureau received a signed Notice of Defense from
4 Seglem requesting an evidentiary hearing on the consideration of his Application.

5 8. On March 15, 2022, the Commission sent a Notice of Hearing to Seglem and DAG
6 Houston. The hearing was set for May 16, 2022.

7 9. On or about March 29, 2022, the Bureau sent a Statement of Reasons to Seglem via
8 certified mail. The Commission received the Statement of Reasons on March 29, 2022. In the
9 Statement of Reasons, the Bureau requests that the Commission deny Seglem's Application.

10 10. On or about April 5, 2022, the noticed Prehearing Conference was held before
11 the Presiding Officer. DAG Houston attended on behalf of the Bureau. Seglem attended without
12 representation.

13 11. On April 5, 2022, the Commission sent a Conclusion of Prehearing Conference letter,
14 via e-mail and regular mail, to Seglem and DAG Houston.

15 **SEGLEM'S CRIMINAL HISTORY**

16 12. It is undisputed that Seglem was convicted of three criminal offenses in the State of
17 Washington between September 9, 1994, and February 28, 2002, that are equivalent to
18 misdemeanors under California law. Seglem was also convicted of two infractions, one in the
19 State of Washington on July 18, 1994 and one in Las Vegas Township, Nevada on May 12, 2008.
20 In summary, these are as follows:

21 a. July 19, 1994: Pierce County District Court, Washington, negligent driving the second
22 degree, whether or not this was classified as an infraction or a misdemeanor is unknown.

23 b. September 9, 1994: Whatcom County, Washington, driving while license suspended in
24 the third degree (misdemeanor) (sentenced to 90 days/suspended).

25 c. September 9, 1994: Whatcom County, Washington, reckless endangerment (criminal
26 non-traffic) (gross misdemeanor) (sentenced to 365 days/364 days suspended).

27 d. February 28, 2002: Pierce County District Court, Washington, negligent driving in the
28

1 first degree (sentenced to 90 days/80 days suspended, this sentence falls within the range of
2 misdemeanor sentences in California).

3 e. May 12, 2008: Las Vegas Township Justice Court, Nevada, failure to obey a traffic
4 control device (red light) (\$145 fine).

5 **SEGLEM’S FAILURE TO PROVIDE REQUESTED INFORMATION TO THE BUREAU**

6 13. Seglem failed to provide significant amounts of information required by the
7 Application. The Bureau made numerous attempts to obtain the missing information from
8 Seglem. Initially, Seglem did not provide any of the following information requested on the
9 Application or even attempt to explain that the items were not applicable:

- 10 • Schedule A (Assets – Gross Annual Household Income);
- 11 • Schedule B (Assets – Cash);
- 12 • Schedule C (Assets – Stocks and Bonds);
- 13 • Schedule D (Assets – Accounts and Notes Receivable);
- 14 • Schedule E (Assets – Real Estate);
- 15 • Schedule F (Assets – Other Assets);
- 16 • Schedule G (Liabilities – Accounts Payable);
- 17 • Schedule H (Liabilities – Taxes Payable);
- 18 • Schedule I (Liabilities – Notes Payable);
- 19 • Schedule J (Liabilities – Mortgages Payable);
- 20 • Schedule K (Liabilities – Contingent and Other Liabilities); and
- 21 • Bankruptcy Filings.

22 14. The Bureau sent letters to Seglem dated July 21, 2020, October 9, 2020, October 23,
23 2020, December 18, 2020, and a notice of potential abandonment of the Application dated
24 January 4, 2021, to prompt Seglem to provide the missing information from the Application.
25 After receiving partial responses, the Bureau notified Seglem on January 15, 2021, that the
26 Application was complete and deemed filed as of January 14, 2021.

27 15. After it deemed the Application filed, the Bureau attempted to conduct an initial
28

1 background investigation with respect to Seglem's Application. The investigation included
2 several further requests for additional information from Seglem. By letter dated March 24, 2021,
3 the Bureau requested additional information regarding Seglem's personal history, employment
4 history, business interests, personal finances, taxes, and liabilities. The Bureau's letter gave
5 Seglem until April 6, 2021, to provide the requested information. The Bureau received an
6 incomplete response on April 5, 2021.

7 16. On April 14, 2021, the Bureau made a final attempt to obtain the information it
8 requested on March 24, 2021, and gave Seglem until April 26, 2021, to provide it. Seglem
9 responded. However, his responses were deficient in material respects.

10 17. The Bureau's March 4, 2021, and April 14, 2021, letters requested that Seglem
11 provide a statement explaining why he failed to disclose his employment with Refuge Yuba City
12 in 2017-2018 on his Application. Seglem failed to provide a response.

13 18. The Bureau's March 4, 2021, and April 14, 2021, letters requested a copy of the loan
14 agreement for a loan Seglem obtained in June of 2019, and a statement explaining why he failed
15 to disclose the loan on the Application. Seglem failed to provide a response. The parties'
16 submissions to the Commission do not include any loan agreements.

17 19. The Bureau's March 4, 2021, and April 14, 2021, letters requested information about
18 four bank accounts, including bank statements and reasons why Seglem failed to disclose the
19 accounts on the supplemental application. Seglem failed to provide a complete response. The
20 parties' exhibits do not include any bank statements.

21 20. The Bureau's March 4, 2021, and April 14, 2021, letters requested a copy of the
22 following tax records: "2017 Form 1099R – Boston" and "2017 Form W-2 for AEG Processing
23 Center No. 58 Inc." The parties' exhibits do not include these tax records.

24 21. The Bureau's March 4, 2021, and April 14, 2021, letters requested specific
25 information about three charge-off accounts and two collections accounts. The Bureau requested
26 Seglem provide proof of payments, payments plans, or current balances for Capital One, Chrysler
27 Capital, and First Premier. Seglem failed to provide the requested documents. The parties'
28

1 exhibits do not include any records from Seglem’s lenders.

2 **SEGLEM’S COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE BUREAU REGARDING HIS EMPLOYMENT HISTORY**

3 22. Seglem worked for Casino Marysville from March 2010, to the present as a dealer.

4 The Bureau attempted several times to verify his employment with Casino Marysville. As of the
5 date of the Report, the Bureau did not receive a response.

6 23. Seglem worked for Colusa Casino from December 2013, to September 2017, as a
7 table-games dealer. Seglem disclosed on his Application that he left his employment with Colusa
8 Casino for a “better job opportunity.” On March 24, 2021, and April 14, 2021, the Bureau
9 requested that Seglem provide an additional statement explaining his reason for leaving Colusa
10 Casino. As of the date of the Report, the Bureau did not receive a response.

11 24. Seglem worked for Casino Royale in Sacramento from September 5, 2008, to August
12 2010, as a card dealer and dealer coordinator. Seglem disclosed on his Application that he left his
13 employment with Casino Royale because the “business closed.” However, Casino Royale ceased
14 operation on November 3, 2014, pursuant to an emergency order issued by the Bureau and has
15 remained closed. On March 24, 2021, and April 14, 2021, the Bureau requested that Seglem
16 provide an additional statement to further explain his reason for leaving his employment with
17 Casino Royale. As of the date of the Report, the Bureau did not receive a response.

18 **THE BUREAU WAS UNABLE TO COMPLETE SEGLEM’S BACKGROUND INVESTIGATION**

19 25. During the evidentiary hearing, Andrea Farris (Farris), Staff Services Manager I, who
20 supervises the Bureau’s Cardroom Key Employment Unit, testified on behalf of the Bureau.
21 Farris testified that the Bureau reviews personal and financial information during its background
22 investigation of applicants. Farris testified that Seglem provided some, but not all of the personal
23 and financial information requested by the Bureau.

24 26. Farris testified, and the Report provides, that Seglem failed to provide information,
25 documentation, or assurances requested by the Bureau despite repeated written requests for
26 information concerning his personal history (spouses and residences), employment history
27 (agreements with gambling establishments, reasons for leaving prior employment and statements
28

1 of disclosure of previous employment, and self-employment as a proposition player with Casino
2 Marysville), real estate transactions, multiple collection/charge-off accounts, and a limousine
3 business interest. Seglem also failed to provide all income tax forms, a loan agreement, and 12
4 months of bank statements for at least two bank accounts that were not originally disclosed on his
5 supplemental information form.

6 27. Farris testified, and the Report provides, that as a result of Seglem's failure to provide
7 this information and documentation, the Bureau was not able to conduct a full review of Seglem's
8 finances, and was unable to complete its background investigation.

9 **SEGLEM'S TESTIMONY**

10 28. Seglem testified about his 30-years of experience in the gambling industry. He has
11 held a gambling license in the State of Washington while working for tribal casinos, and has
12 worked as a dealer in casinos in the State of Nevada. He is currently licensed only in California.
13 He has never faced disciplinary action from any gambling regulators. Seglem testified that he is a
14 good employee and suggested derogatory employment-related information about him does not
15 exist.

16 29. Seglem confirmed the criminal history summarized above.

17 30. On September 4, 2014, Seglem filed for Chapter 7 Bankruptcy with the United States
18 Bankruptcy Court, Eastern District of California. His debts were discharged on January 6, 2015.

19 31. Seglem testified that he is getting back on track with making payments to his existing
20 lenders. He currently has four or five overdue accounts. He owes a total of around \$5,000. He
21 pays on three of those accounts. He will be debt free in about eight months.

22 32. Seglem did not dispute that he failed to provide the information requested by the
23 Bureau. In fact, he testified that his "negligence" was to blame for his failure to provide the
24 requested information, and the Bureau was not at fault. He testified that he did not seek any
25 assistance with his Application. He knew it was a difficult application to fill out. He stated that he
26 would do his best to find and will now provide the information requested by the Bureau.

27 33. Seglem testified that he did not provide bank statements to the Bureau because the
28

1 amount in the account did not justify the effort.

2 **SEGLEM’S LETTERS OF REFERENCE**

3 34. Seglem submitted two letters of reference. The first was from Jessica Carroll, General
4 Manager of Marysville Casino, and the second was from Maria Lowe, who appears to be a former
5 co-employee at Colusa Casino.

6 35. The two letters of reference are individualized and candid, and relate to both
7 Seglem’s work in controlled gambling and his personal attributes outside of work. These
8 attributes include Seglem’s professional demeanor, responsibility, and honesty.

9 LEGAL CONCLUSIONS

10 36. The hearing on this matter “need not be conducted according to technical rules
11 relating to evidence and witnesses. Any relevant evidence may be considered, and is sufficient in
12 itself to support a finding, if it is the sort of evidence on which responsible persons are
13 accustomed to rely in the conduct of serious affairs, regardless of the existence of any common
14 law or statutory rule that might make improper the admission of that evidence over objection in a
15 civil action.” (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19871, subd. (a)(4); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 4, § 12060, subd.
16 (g)(2).)

17 37. Division 1.5 of the Business and Professions Code, the provisions of which govern
18 the denial of licenses on various grounds, does not apply to licensure decisions made by the
19 Commission under the Gambling Control Act. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 476, subd. (a).)

20 38. Public trust that permissible gambling will not endanger public health, safety, or
21 welfare requires that comprehensive measures be enacted to ensure that gambling is free from
22 criminal and corruptive elements, that it is conducted honestly and competitively, and that it is
23 conducted in suitable locations. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19801, subd. (g).)

24 39. Public trust and confidence can only be maintained by strict and comprehensive
25 regulation of all persons, locations, practices, associations, and activities related to the operation
26 of lawful gambling establishments and the manufacture and distribution of permissible gambling
27 equipment. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19801, subd. (h).)

28

1 40. The Commission has the responsibility of assuring that licenses, approvals, and
2 permits are not issued to, or held by, unqualified or disqualified persons, or by persons whose
3 operations are conducted in a manner that is inimical to the public health, safety, or welfare. (Bus.
4 & Prof. Code, § 19823, subd. (a)(1).)

5 41. An “unqualified person” means a person who is found to be unqualified pursuant to
6 the criteria set forth in Section 19857, and “disqualified person” means a person who is found to
7 be disqualified pursuant to the criteria set forth in Section 19859. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19823,
8 subd. (b).)

9 42. The Commission has the power to deny any application for a license, permit, or
10 approval for any cause deemed reasonable by the Commission. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19824,
11 subd. (b).)

12 43. The Commission has the power to take actions deemed to be reasonable to ensure
13 that no ineligible, unqualified, disqualified, or unsuitable persons are associated with controlled
14 gambling activities. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19824, subd. (d).)

15 44. Every key employee shall apply for and obtain a key employee license. (Bus. & Prof.
16 Code, § 19854, subd. (a).)

17 45. No person may be issued a key employee license unless the person would qualify
18 for a state gambling license. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19854, subd. (b).)

19 46. The burden of proving his or her qualifications to receive any license from the
20 Commission is on the applicant. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19856, subd. (a); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 4, §
21 12060, subd. (i).)

22 47. An application to receive a license constitutes a request for a determination of the
23 applicant’s general character, integrity, and ability to participate in, engage in, or be associated
24 with, controlled gambling. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19856, subd. (b).)

25 48. In reviewing an application for any license, the commission shall consider
26 whether issuance of the license is inimical to public health, safety, or welfare, and whether
27 issuance of the license will undermine public trust that the gambling operations with respect to
28

1 which the license would be issued are free from criminal and dishonest elements and would be
2 conducted honestly. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19856, subd. (c).)

3 49. No gambling license shall be issued unless, based on all of the information and
4 documents submitted, the commission is satisfied that the applicant is a person of good character,
5 honesty, and integrity. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19857, subd. (a).)

6 50. No gambling license shall be issued unless, based on all of the information and
7 documents submitted, the commission is satisfied that the applicant is a person whose prior
8 activities, criminal record, if any, reputation, habits, and associations do not pose a threat to the
9 public interest of this state, or to the effective regulation and control of controlled gambling, or
10 create or enhance the dangers of unsuitable, unfair, or illegal practices, methods, and activities in
11 the conduct of controlled gambling or in the carrying on of the business and financial
12 arrangements incidental thereto. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19857, subd. (b).)

13 51. No gambling license shall be issued unless, based on all of the information and
14 documents submitted, the commission is satisfied that the applicant is a person that is in all other
15 respects qualified to be licensed as provided in this chapter. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19857, subd.
16 (c).)

17 52. An application will be denied if the Commission finds that the applicant has not
18 satisfied the requirements of Business and Professions Code section 19857. (Cal. Code Regs., tit.
19 4, § 12040, subd. (a)(1).)

20 53. An application will be denied if the applicant fails to clearly establish eligibility
21 and qualification in accordance with the Act. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19859, subd. (a).)

22 54. An application will be denied if the applicant fails “to provide information,
23 documentation, and assurances required by this chapter or requested by the chief, or failure of the
24 applicant to reveal any fact material to qualification, or the supplying of information that is untrue
25 or misleading as to a material fact pertaining to the qualification criteria.” (Bus. & Prof. Code, §
26 19859, subd. (b).)

27 55. An applicant for licensing or for any approval or consent required by the Act,
28

1 “shall make full and true disclosure of all information to the department and the commission as
2 necessary to carry out the policies of this state relating to licensing, registration, and control of
3 gambling.” (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19866.)

4 56. The Bureau relies, in large part, on the applicant’s disclosures while conducting a
5 background investigation. The failure to honestly and accurately disclose complete information in
6 response to the Bureau’s inquiries subverts the Bureau’s efforts to conduct a thorough and
7 complete investigation. (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 19826, subd. (a), 19866.)

8 57. Both the substance of an applicant’s disclosures, and the truthfulness and
9 thoroughness of an applicant’s disclosures, are considered by the Bureau in making a
10 recommendation as to the applicant’s suitability for licensure, and by the Commission in making
11 a determination whether to approve or deny a license application. (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 19824,
12 subd. (a) & (d), 19826, subd. (a), 19866.)

13 58. All of the information requested on the Application has been considered through
14 the legislative and regulatory processes and determined necessary in order for the Commission to
15 discharge its duties properly. An applicant is neither expected, nor permitted, to determine the
16 importance of the information requested, and instead is required to provide full and complete
17 information as requested.

18 **ASSESSMENT OF SEGLEM’S SUITABILITY FOR LICENSURE**

19 59. The information the Bureau sought, but did not receive from Seglem, is relevant and
20 material for the Commission to determine whether he is qualified to hold a key employee license.
21 The information the Bureau sought, but did not receive from Seglem, prevented the Bureau from
22 fulfilling its duty to thoroughly investigate Seglem’s application. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19826,
23 subd. (a).) Importantly, the information the Bureau sought, but did not receive from Seglem,
24 prevents the Commission from determining whether Seglem is qualified to receive a key
25 employee license. (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 19856, subd. (a), 19857.)

26 60. The Bureau’s inability to conduct a full review of Seglem’s finances prevents the
27 Commission from determining his suitability for licensure under several provisions of the Act.
28

1 Seglem's failure to provide requested information to the Bureau necessarily means that he has failed
2 to clearly establish eligibility and qualification in accordance with the Act. Therefore, Seglem is
3 not qualified for the issuance of a key employee license pursuant to Business and Professions Code
4 section 19857, and disqualified pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 19859,
5 subdivisions (a) and (b). (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 19854, subd. (b); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 4, §12040
6 (a)(1), (a)(2).)

7 61. At the hearing, Seglem admitted that he did not provide the information requested
8 by the Bureau. He also testified that he is willing now to provide the requested information to the
9 Bureau. However, the Application required this information in the first instance, and the Bureau
10 provided multiple opportunities for Seglem to provide the necessary information to the Bureau.
11 During the lengthy background investigation process, Seglem repeatedly missed the chances
12 provided by the Bureau to comply with its requests for information. Importantly, without a
13 complete review of Seglem's finances, the Commission is unable to conclude that he meets the
14 qualification criteria provided in the Act. (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 19856, subd. (a), 19857.) Based
15 on the foregoing, Seglem's Application must be denied pursuant to CCR section 12040,
16 subdivision (a)(1).

17 62. Moreover, Seglem's failure to provide requested information to the Bureau in
18 connection with his Application renders him unable to meet his burden of demonstrating that he is
19 qualified to hold a key employee license. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19856, subd. (a).)

20 63. Additionally, Seglem's failure to provide the requested information in connection with his
21 Application to the Bureau renders him unqualified for issuance of a key employee license pursuant to
22 Business and Professions Code section 19857, subdivision (c). Based on the foregoing, Seglem's
23 Application must be denied pursuant to CCR section 12040, subdivision (a)(1).

24 64. Independent of Business and Professions Code sections 19856 and 19857, Seglem's
25 failure to provide requested information in connection with his Application to the Bureau necessarily
26 means that he failed to clearly establish eligibility and qualification in accordance with the Act
27 pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 19859, subdivision (a). Based on the foregoing,
28

1 Seglem’s Application must be denied pursuant to CCR section 12040, subdivision (a)(2).

2 65. Also, independent of Business and Professions Code sections 19856, 19857, and 19859,
3 subdivision (a), Seglem’s failure to provide requested information to the Bureau also renders him
4 disqualified from holding a key employee license pursuant to Business and Professions Code section
5 19859, subdivision (b). Based on the foregoing, Seglem’s Application must be denied pursuant to
6 CCR section 12040, subdivision (a)(2).

7 66. Based on the foregoing, as Seglem is unqualified and disqualified for a key
8 employee license, his interim key employee license GEKE-002504 is cancelled. (Bus. & Prof.
9 Code, § 19824, subd. (d).)

10 67. All documentary and testimonial evidence submitted by the parties that is not
11 specifically addressed in this Decision and Order was considered but not used by the Commission
12 in making its determination on Seglem’s Application.

13 NOTICE OF APPLICANT’S APPEAL RIGHTS

14 Seglem has the following appeal rights available under state law.

15 1. CCR section 12064, provides, in part:

16
17 (a) After the Commission issues a decision following a GCA hearing conducted
18 pursuant to Section 12060, an applicant denied a license, permit, registration, or
19 finding of suitability, or whose license, permit, registration, or finding of
20 suitability has had conditions, restrictions, or limitations imposed upon it, may
request reconsideration by the Commission. A request for reconsideration must
be:

21 (1) Made in writing to the Commission, copied to the complainant. The
Bureau may provide a written response to the Commission within 10 calendar days
of receipt of the request; and,

22 (2) Received by the Commission and complainant within 30 calendar days of
23 service of the decision, or before the effective date specified in the decision,
whichever is earlier.

24 (b) A request for reconsideration must state the reasons for the request, which
25 must be based upon either:

26 (1) Newly discovered evidence or legal authorities that could not reasonably
27 have been presented before the Commission’s issuance of the decision or at the
hearing on the matter; or,

28 (2) Other good cause which the Commission may decide, in its sole discretion,
merits reconsideration.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

2. Business and Professions Code section 19870, subdivision (f) provides:

A decision of the commission after an evidentiary hearing, 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 held to consider that petition, 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.

3. CCR section 12066, subsection (c) provides:

A decision of the Commission denying an application or imposing conditions on a license after an evidentiary hearing will be subject to judicial review as provided in Business and Professions Code section 19870, subdivision (f). Neither the right to petition for judicial review nor the time for filing the petition shall be affected by failure to seek reconsideration.

///
///
///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ORDER

- 1. Terrance Douglas Seglem’s Application for Gambling Establishment Key Employee License is DENIED.
- 2. Terrance Douglas Seglem’s interim key employee license (GEKE-002504) is cancelled.
- 3. No costs are awarded.
- 4. Each side to pay its own attorneys’ fees.

This Order is effective on August 8, 2022.

Dated: 7/7/2022 Signature: 
DocuSigned by: 38D0AB38C651466...
 Paula LaBrie, Chair

Dated: 7/7/2022 Signature: 
DocuSigned by: 3D1DB086E9274AA...
 Cathleen Galgiani, Commissioner

Dated: 7/7/2022 Signature: 
DocuSigned by: 2B4CE9520E8845C...
 Eric Heins, Commissioner

Dated: 7/7/2022 Signature: 
DocuSigned by: 7722F4571120449...
 William Liu, Commissioner

Dated: 7/7/2022 Signature: 
DocuSigned by: 14B4AD3B90F8462...
 Edward Yee, Commissioner