

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 a
Gambling Establishment Key Employee
License for:

DARIEL SANCHEZ

Applicant.

CGCC Case No. CGCC-2024-1219-5B
BGC Case No. BGC-HQ2024-00032AL

DECISION AND ORDER

Hearing Date: February 3, 2026
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, via Zoom video conference, on February 3, 2026.

Tiffany Lichtig (Attorney Lichtig) represented Dariel Sanchez (Applicant).

Michael Yi, Deputy Attorney General, State of California (DAG Yi), represented complainant Yolanda Morrow, Director of the Bureau of Gambling Control (Bureau), Department of Justice, State of California.

During the evidentiary hearing, Presiding Officer Russell Johnson (PO Johnson), Attorney IV of the Commission, took official notice of the following documents: the Commission’s Notice and Agenda of Commission Hearing; the Commission’s Conclusion of Prehearing Conference letter; the Commission’s Notice of Hearing and Prehearing Conference with attachments (A) Applicant’s Application for Employee Category License for a Key Employee and (B) the Bureau’s Gambling Establishment Key Employee Initial Background Investigation Report; the Bureau’s Statement of Reasons; and Applicant’s signed Notice of Defense.

During the evidentiary hearing, PO Johnson accepted into evidence: (1) Bureau’s Exhibits 1-13, Bates Nos. BGC-0001 to BGC-0232 which are identified on the Bureau’s Evidentiary Exhibit Index; and (2) Applicant’s Exhibits A-B, Bates Nos. DS001 to DS002. The parties stipulated to the admission into evidence of each other’s exhibits and also stipulated to allow the Commissioners to receive and review copies of their exhibits in advance of the hearing.

1 PO Johnson closed the administrative record, and the matter was submitted for decision
2 on February 3, 2026.

3 **FINDINGS OF FACT**

4 **Procedural History**

5 1. On June 23, 2023, the Bureau received an initial Application for Employee
6 Category License for a Key Employee License, Key Employee Supplemental Information
7 (Supplemental), and Supplemental Information: Schedules (collectively, Application) from
8 Applicant. The Application is to allow for Applicant’s employment as a key employee in a
9 gambling establishment.

10 2. On June 26, 2023, the Commission issued a Temporary Key Employee License,
11 number GEKE-002834, to Applicant with an expiration date of May 31, 2025.

12 3. In October 2024, the Commission received a Gambling Establishment Key
13 Employee Initial Background Investigation Report, Level III (Report) recommending denial of
14 the Application from the Bureau. The Report recommends the Commission deny the Application
15 on the following grounds: (1) Applicant provided misleading information to the Bureau regarding
16 his termination from Hollywood Park Casino; (2) Applicant admitted to the Bureau that he
17 purposely did not disclose his termination from Hollywood Park Casino; and (3) Applicant failed
18 to disclose one of his misdemeanor offenses and his charge-off account.

19 4. On December 19, 2024, the Commission notified Applicant that his Application
20 would be referred for an evidentiary hearing pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 4,
21 section 12054, subdivision (a)(4), to be conducted as a hearing under the Gambling Control Act,
22 Government Code section 19800 et seq. (GCA or Act), pursuant to California Code of
23 Regulations, title 4, section 12060.

24 5. The Commission timely received Applicant’s Notice of Defense dated December
25 20, 2024, which indicated that he was represented by Attorney Lichtig.

26 6. On September 19, 2025, the Commission sent a Notice of Hearing to Attorney
27 Lichtig and DAG Yi providing that a prehearing conference was scheduled for December 16,
28 2025, at 10:00 a.m. and a GCA hearing was scheduled for February 3, 2026, to be conducted via

1 Zoom video conference.

2 7. DAG Yi and Attorney Lichtig attended the prehearing conference on December
3 16, 2025. PO Johnson sent DAG Yi and Attorney Lichtig a letter the same day confirming the
4 information provided during the prehearing conference.

5 8. In October 2025, the Commission received a Statement of Reasons from the
6 Bureau. In the Statement of Reasons, the Bureau states that the Application is subject to
7 mandatory or discretionary denial on the grounds that Applicant is unsuitable for licensure
8 because he failed to disclose: (1) his conviction for violating Vehicle Code section 12500,
9 subdivision (a); and (2) a charge-off account on his Application. Applicant also provided false
10 information about the circumstances of his termination from Hollywood Park Casino. (Bus. &
11 Prof. Code, §§ 19856, 19857 [discretionary denial], 19859, subd. (b) [mandatory denial]; CCR §
12 12040, subs. (a)(1) & (2).)

13 **Applicant’s Employment History in Controlled Gambling**

14 9. Applicant was employed at Hawaiian Gardens Casino (aka, The Gardens Casino)
15 from August 2005 to November 2020, as a casino shift supervisor. Applicant was employed at
16 Hollywood Park Casino from November 10, 2020 to August 15, 2021, as a floorman. Applicant
17 was employed at Hustler Casino from July 2022 to January 2024, as a relief shift manager.
18 Applicant has been employed at Hawaiian Gardens Casino since January 2024 as a casino shift
19 supervisor. Applicant assumed key employee duties in February 2024.

20 **Applicant’s Criminal Convictions**

21 10. Applicant sustained one misdemeanor conviction for violating Vehicle Code
22 section 12500, subdivision (a) (driving without valid license), on May 11, 2005. Applicant
23 sustained one misdemeanor conviction for violating Penal Code section 12025,
24 subdivision(a)(1)/(b)(6) (concealed firearm in vehicle), on January 21, 2010.

25 **Applicant’s Testimony, Disclosures and Omissions Regarding the Application**

26 11. The Application consists of two parts. The first part is three pages and contains
27 five sections. The instructions provide that “all responses must be truthful and complete” and that
28 “any misrepresentation or failure to disclose required information or documentation may

1 constitute cause for denial of the application.” Applicant signed the first part of the Application
2 under penalty of perjury and declared that it was “true, accurate and complete,” and dated it June
3 14, 2023.

4 12. The second part of the Application is the Supplemental, which is twelve pages and
5 contains twelve sections. The instructions on the Supplemental also provide that “all responses
6 must be truthful and complete” and that “any misrepresentation or failure to disclose required
7 information or documentation may constitute cause for denial of the application.” The
8 Supplemental advises applicants to use a separate sheet to paper to answer a question “if the
9 space available is insufficient.” The Supplemental requires that the applicant disclose, among
10 other things, their criminal convictions and work history information.

11 13. Section 4 of the Supplemental requires an applicant to disclose their criminal
12 convictions. Applicant sustained one misdemeanor conviction for violating Vehicle Code
13 section 12500, subdivision (a) (driving without valid license), on May 11, 2005. Applicant failed
14 to disclose this conviction on the Supplemental, because he believed he previously disclosed it.
15 Applicant disclosed one misdemeanor conviction for violating Penal Code section 12025,
16 subdivisions (a)(1), (b)(6) (concealed firearm in vehicle), on January 21, 2010, on the
17 Supplemental. The court set aside and dismissed the conviction on October 9, 2012, pursuant to
18 Penal Code section 1203.4. Applicant provided a lengthy statement about his 2010 (concealed
19 firearm in vehicle) conviction on a separate page reserved for additional details if space on the
20 Application is not sufficient.

21 14. Section 6 of the Supplemental requires an applicant to disclose their employment
22 history information. For each employer in the last ten years, the applicant is required to provide
23 the reason for leaving employment. If the applicant was terminated, the applicant is required to
24 explain the circumstances for the termination. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19865.)

25 15. On the Supplemental, Applicant disclosed his prior employment with Hollywood
26 Park Casino and provided a reason for leaving that employment as follows: “I found a job close to
27 my residence.”

28 16. In fact, Applicant’s stated reason for leaving Hollywood Park Casino was not true

1 because, as the Bureau determined, Applicant was suspended by Hollywood Park Casino on
2 January 20, 2022, and was terminated on January 25, 2022, for physical misconduct towards a
3 patron.

4 17. Applicant signed a “Disciplinary Action Form” presented to him by Hollywood
5 Park Casino on January 20, 2022, informing him of his suspension from employment. On January
6 25, 2022, he also signed a “Notice to Employee as to Change in Relationship” form presented to
7 him by Hollywood Park Casino informing him that he was “Discharged effective: January 25,
8 2022.” In the comment section of this notice, Applicant wrote: “I pushed the patron away because
9 he was spitting on my face. I did not want him spitting on me.”

10 18. Applicant admitted not disclosing the true reasons for his termination from
11 Hollywood Park Casino on the Application. Applicant testified before the Commission that he
12 purposely did not disclose his termination from Hollywood Park Casino on the Application
13 because he did not want the Application to be denied without an opportunity to provide context to
14 the Bureau and the Commission in subsequent communications or during a hearing. During the
15 hearing, Applicant explained that he did not intend to hide anything from the Commission or the
16 Bureau. He acknowledged during the hearing that given the fact that he was terminated by
17 Hollywood Park Casino he was required to disclose this fact on his Application. By failing to
18 disclose that he had been terminated, Applicant realizes that he did not provide the necessary
19 details surrounding his termination as required by the Application. The facts and circumstances
20 regarding Applicant’s termination by Hollywood Park Casino were discovered by the Bureau
21 during its background investigation.

22 19. Section 12 of the Supplemental is a “Declaration.” Applicant signed Section 12
23 of the Supplemental under penalty of perjury and declared that it was “true, accurate and
24 complete,” and dated it June 14, 2023. However, as described above, the Supplemental contained
25 information that was not true or accurate because although Applicant was involuntarily
26 terminated by Hollywood Park Casino his stated reason on the Supplemental for leaving this
27 employment was: “I found a job close to my residence.” Additionally, the Supplemental was not
28 accurate because Applicant did not disclose his termination, and it was not complete because he

1 did not explain the circumstances that led to his termination by Hollywood Park Casino.

2 **Testimony of Andrea Farris**

3 20. Andrea Farris (Farris), supervisor with the Bureau, testified that she oversaw the
4 Bureau's background investigation and the Bureau's background investigation report concerning
5 the Applicant.

6 21. Farris testified that Applicant: (1) provided misleading information regarding his
7 reason for leaving employment at Hollywood Park Casino; and (2) Applicant admitted that he
8 purposely did not disclose being terminated from Hollywood Park Casino.

9 22. Farris testified that the Bureau recommended denial of the Application due to the
10 reasons provided above which indicate that Applicant is not a person of good character, honesty
11 and integrity. Specifically, she testified that it is an applicant's burden to prove that they are of
12 good character, honesty, and integrity. Farris explained that the Bureau relies on applicants to be
13 honest and forthcoming in order to help determine whether they are suitable for licensure. Farris
14 emphasized that when information is not disclosed, it leads the Bureau to believe that they are
15 being dishonest and are not suitable for licensure.

16 **Letters of Recommendation**

17 21. Applicant submitted two letters of recommendation in support of his Application
18 from: (1) Armando Viramontes, a retired software engineer, dated November 24, 2025; and the
19 General Counsel of The Gardens Casino, dated January 16, 2026. Collectively, these letters
20 request approval of the Application because the authors believe Applicant possesses the character,
21 judgment, and professionalism necessary to hold a license from the Commission.

22 **PERTINENT LEGAL AUTHORITY**

23 22. Division 1.5 of the Business and Professions Code, the provisions of which govern
24 the denial of licenses on various grounds, does not apply to licensure decisions made by the
25 Commission under the Act. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 476, subd. (a).)

26 23. The Act is an exercise of the police power of the state for the protection of the
27 health, safety, and welfare of the people of the State of California and shall be liberally construed
28 to effectuate those purposes. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19971.)

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

5 25. Public trust and confidence can only be maintained by strict and comprehensive
6 regulation of all persons, locations, practices, associations, and activities related to the operation
7 of lawful gambling establishments. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19801, subd. (h).)

8 26. An “unqualified person” means a person who is found to be unqualified pursuant
9 to the criteria set forth in Business and Professions Code section 19857, and “disqualified person”
10 means a person who is found to be disqualified pursuant to the criteria set forth in Business and
11 Professions Code section 19859. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19823, subd. (b).)

12 27. The Commission shall have all powers necessary and proper to enable it fully and
13 effectually to carry out the policies and purposes of this chapter. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19824.)

14 28. The Commission has the power to deny any application for a license, permit, or
15 approval for any cause deemed reasonable by the Commission. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19824,
16 subd. (b).)

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

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

24 31. The Bureau relies, in large part, on the applicant’s disclosures while conducting a
25 background investigation. The failure to honestly, accurately, and completely disclose
26 information on an application subverts the Bureau’s efforts to conduct a thorough and complete
27 investigation. (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 19826, subd. (a), 19866.)

28 32. Both the substance of an applicant’s disclosures, and the truthfulness and

1 thoroughness of an applicant’s disclosures, are considered by the Bureau in making a
2 recommendation as to the applicant’s suitability for licensure, and by the Commission in making
3 a determination whether to approve or deny a license application. (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 19824,
4 subd. (a), 19826, subd. (a), 19866.)

5 33. The burden of proving his or her qualifications to receive any license from the
6 Commission is on the applicant. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19856, subd. (a); CCR § 12060, subd. (k).)

7 34. Every key employee shall apply for and obtain a key employee license, no person
8 may be issued a key employee license unless the person would qualify for a state gambling
9 license. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19854.)

10 35. The Commission shall deny a license to any applicant who is disqualified for
11 failure of the applicant to clearly establish eligibility and qualification in accordance with the Act.
12 (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19859, subd. (a).)

13 36. The Commission shall deny a license to any applicant who is disqualified for
14 failure of the applicant to provide information, documentation, and assurances required by this
15 chapter or requested by the chief, or failure of the applicant to reveal any fact material to
16 qualification, or the supplying of information that is untrue or misleading as to a material fact
17 pertaining to the qualification criteria. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19859, subd. (b).)

18 37. An application will be denied if the Commission finds that any of the provisions of
19 Business and Professions Code section 19859 apply to the applicant. (CCR § 12040, subd. (a)(2).)

20 38. An applicant seeking a license or any approval or consent required by the Act shall
21 make full and true disclosure of all information to the Bureau and the Commission as necessary to
22 carry out the policies of this state relating to licensing, registration, and control of gambling. (Bus.
23 & Prof. Code, § 19866.)

24 **ASSESSMENT OF APPLICANT’S SUITABILITY FOR LICENSURE**

25 39. A straightforward application of the law to the undisputed facts requires the
26 Commission to determine that causes exist to deny the Application. Specifically, in connection
27 with his employment at Hollywood Park Casino, Applicant failed to provide full disclosure of
28 required information, failed to reveal facts material to qualification, or provided misleading

1 information on the Application as follows:

2 a. Applicant omitted from the Application the fact that he was terminated by
3 Hollywood Park Casino and failed to reveal the reason for his termination from Hollywood
4 Park Casino; and

5 b. Although Applicant left his employment at Hollywood Park Casino
6 because he was fired, he made a misleading statement about his reason for leaving his
7 employment there when he stated: "I found a job close to my residence."

8 (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 19859, subd. (b), 19866; CCR, § 12040, subd. (a)(2).)

9 40. All of the information requested on the Application has been considered through
10 the legislative and regulatory processes and determined necessary in order for the Bureau and the
11 Commission to discharge their duties properly. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19855.) An applicant is
12 neither expected, nor permitted, to determine the importance of the information requested, and
13 instead is required to provide true, accurate, and complete information as requested on the
14 Application. To address any issues in completing the application, and to ensure that the
15 information disclosed on an application is "true, accurate, and complete," the burden is on the
16 applicant to carefully and thoroughly read the application, and to seek assistance with filling out
17 the application if necessary. An applicant is responsible for both the information they disclose,
18 and for failing to disclose required information on the application.

19 41. The Application is not merely a paperwork exercise to hurdle on the way to
20 obtaining a key employee license. For Applicant, who has a long history of employment in
21 controlled gambling in this state, the Application serves as an important, formal written
22 presentation by which he places himself before the Bureau and the Commission for decision
23 whether he should be allowed to fulfill the high responsibilities required of a key employee in this
24 state. By allowing Applicant to make a full and truthful disclosure about his work history, the
25 Application provided him with the first opportunity to demonstrate his honesty before the Bureau
26 and the Commission. By failing to make a full and truthful disclosure about his derogatory work
27 history, Applicant stumbled at the first hurdle. As evaluators of the Application, the Bureau and
28 the Commission rely on the Application as being candid and complete. In this case, for two

1 independent reasons, because Applicant purposely omitted from the Application the fact that he
2 was terminated by Hollywood Park Casino and the circumstances of his termination, and
3 affirmatively made a misleading statement about his reason for leaving his employment there, the
4 Commission declines to grant the Application. (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 19859, subd. (b), 19866;
5 CCR, § 12040, subd. (a)(2).)

6 **APPLICANT FAILED TO PROVIDE AND REVEAL FACTS MATERIAL TO QUALIFICATION**

7 42. The existence of, and details regarding, an applicant's work history, particularly
8 their work history in controlled gambling, are facts material to the qualification for licensure of an
9 applicant. For instance, they may affect the assessment of the applicant's general character,
10 honesty, integrity, and/or ability to participate in controlled gambling. They may lead to a finding
11 that the issuance of a license to such an applicant would be inimical to public health, safety, or
12 welfare, or undermine public trust that the gambling operations with respect to which the license
13 would be issued are free from criminal and dishonest elements, and would be conducted honestly.
14 An applicant's work history, and particularly their work history in controlled gambling, may be
15 sufficient to support a factual finding and legal conclusion that the applicant poses a threat to the
16 public interest of this state, to the effective regulation and control of controlled gambling, or
17 creates or enhances the dangers of unsuitable, unfair, or illegal practices, methods, and activities
18 in the conduct of controlled gambling or in the carrying on of the business and financial
19 arrangements thereto.

20 43. Applicant failed to disclose his termination by Hollywood Park Casino on his
21 Supplemental. Additionally, and as a direct result of failing to disclose his termination, Applicant
22 failed to reveal the circumstances that led to his termination on his Supplemental. As provided
23 above, these details are facts material to Applicant's qualifications for licensure. By failing to
24 disclose his termination by Hollywood Park Casino and the circumstances that led to his
25 termination on his Supplemental, Applicant failed to provide and reveal facts material to his
26 qualifications for licensure. Generally, as here, when an applicant fails to disclose derogatory
27 employment history on an application, it may be subject to denial for mere nondisclosure since
28 the nondisclosure amounts to a representation of the nonexistence of the derogatory employment

1 history which were not disclosed. (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 19859, subd. (b), 19866; CCR, § 12040,
2 subd. (a) (2).)

3 44. The timing of when to disclose and reveal facts required by the licensing
4 application is not up to applicants. Applicant was required to disclose and reveal the
5 circumstances that led to his termination from Hollywood Park Casino on the Supplemental (Bus.
6 & Prof. Code, § 19865), as he did with his 2010 conviction. Not, as he explained, later in a
7 hearing before the Commission, a hearing by the way that may never have taken place had the
8 Bureau not found out that Applicant was terminated for cause from Hollywood Park Casino, and
9 also because the overwhelming number of applications are approved by the Commission without
10 the need to conduct a GCA hearing. Accordingly, the Application is subject to denial pursuant to
11 Business and Professions Code section 19859, subdivision (b), and CCR section 12040,
12 subdivision (a)(2), because Applicant failed to disclose his termination and reveal the
13 circumstances that led to his termination from Hollywood Park Casino on the Application.

14
15 **APPLICANT SUPPLIED INFORMATION THAT IS MISLEADING AS TO A MATERIAL FACT
PERTAINING TO THE QUALIFICATION CRITERIA**

16 45. As stated previously, the existence of, and details regarding, an applicant's work
17 history, and particularly their work history in controlled gambling, are facts material to the
18 qualification for licensure of an applicant. Not only did Applicant omit from his Application the
19 fact that he was terminated by Hollywood Park Casino, but he also compounded his error by
20 disclosing on the Supplemental that he left his employment with Hollywood Park Casino because:
21 "I found a job close to my residence." While this may be true by happenstance, Applicant's
22 response was misleading because the true reason he left his employment with Hollywood Park
23 Casino was because he was involuntary terminated by Hollywood Park Casino due to physical
24 misconduct towards a patron.

25 46. Had the Bureau taken Applicant's misleading explanation at face value, they
26 would never have investigated the reason why he left his employment with Hollywood Park
27 Casino. Applicant did not offer any explanation for why he made a misleading statement on the
28 Application when he stated he left his employment with Hollywood Park Casino to be closer to

1 his home. By supplying misleading information on his Supplemental regarding his reason for
2 leaving his employment with Hollywood Park, Applicant offered information that is misleading
3 regarding a material fact pertaining to the qualification criteria for licensure. Accordingly, the
4 Application is subject to denial pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 19859,
5 subdivision (b), and CCR section 12040, subdivision (a)(2).

6 47. For purposes of the qualification criteria in Business and Professions Code section
7 19857 of the Act, these letters of recommendation reflect favorably on the Applicant, but they do
8 not overcome the qualification criteria in Business and Professions Code sections 19859,
9 subdivision (b), and 19866.

10 48. 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 the Application.

13 **NOTICE OF APPLICANT’S APPEAL RIGHTS**

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

15 CCR section 12064, subdivisions (a) and (b) provide, in part:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4 CCR section 12066, subdivision (c) provides, in part:

A decision of the Commission denying an application or imposing conditions or restrictions on a license after an evidentiary hearing will 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 will 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. Dariel Sanchez’s Application for a Key Employee License is DENIED.
- 2. Dariel Sanchez’s temporary Key Employee License, number GEKE-002834 is void and cannot be used hereafter pursuant to CCR section 12122, subdivision (d).
- 3. No costs are awarded.
- 4. Each side to pay its own attorneys’ fees.

This Order is effective on May 7, 2026.

Dated: 4/7/2026 Signature: 
38D0AB38C651466...
 Paula LaBrie, Chair

Dated: 4/7/2026 Signature: 
7722F4571120449...
 William Liu, Commissioner

Dated: 4/7/2026 Signature: 
14B4AD3B90F8462...
 Edward Yee, Commissioner