

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 Approval
of Employee Category License: Third-Party
Proposition Player Service Worker License
Regarding:

NATASHA LINETTE JOHNSON

Respondent.

CGCC Case No. CGCC-2023-0810-4

BGC Case No. BGC-HQ2023-00007AL

DECISION AND ORDER

Hearing Date: August 27, 2024
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 August 27, 2024.

Thomas L. Rinaldi, Supervising Deputy Attorney General, State of California (DAG Rinaldi), represented complainant Yolanda Morrow, Director of the Bureau of Gambling Control (Bureau), Department of Justice, State of California.

Natasha Linette Johnson (Johnson) appeared on her own behalf during the evidentiary hearing.

During the evidentiary hearing, Presiding Officer Kate Patterson (PO Patterson), Attorney IV of the Commission, took official notice and admitted into the administrative record 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) Johnson’s Application for Employee Category License with a Commission Work Permit or Third-Party Proposition Player Services Worker: Supplemental Information form (Supplemental) (collectively, Application), and (B) the Bureau’s Background Investigation Report; the Bureau’s Statement of Reasons; and Johnson’s signed Notice of Defense form.

During the evidentiary hearing, pursuant to a stipulation between the parties, PO Patterson accepted into evidence: (1) Exhibits 1-14 Bates Nos. BGC 0001-0128, offered by the Bureau and

1 identified on the Bureau’s Evidentiary Exhibit Index; and (2) Exhibits A-B, offered by Johnson.

2 FINDINGS OF FACT

3 **Procedural History**

4 1. Johnson has been employed by third-party proposition player services provider L.E.
5 Gaming, Inc. (L.E. Gaming), since July 2022.

6 2. On or about August 1, 2022, the Bureau received the Application from Johnson to
7 continue work as a third-party proposition player for L.E. Gaming.

8 3. The Commission issued temporary third-party proposition player worker license
9 number TPWK-004733 to Johnson for her employment as a third-party proposition player for
10 L.E. Gaming. Johnson’s temporary third-party proposition player worker license expired on
11 August 31, 2024.

12 4. On or about June 15, 2022, the Commission received a Third-Party Worker Initial
13 Background Investigation Report, Level III, (Background Report) on Johnson from the Bureau. In
14 its Background Report, the Bureau alleges that Johnson failed to disclose three misdemeanor
15 convictions on the Supplemental and failed to establish eligibility and qualification for licensure.
16 Based on the foregoing, the Bureau recommends that the Commission deny Johnson’s
17 Application.

18 5. At its meeting on August 10, 2023, the Commission voted to refer the consideration
19 of Johnson’s Application to a Gambling Control Act (GCA) evidentiary hearing pursuant to CCR
20 section 12060. On August 16, 2023, the Commission notified Johnson of its action to refer her
21 Application to a GCA hearing and provided her with a Notice of Defense form.

22 6. On or about August 29, 2023, Johnson submitted a completed Notice of Defense form
23 to the Commission and the Bureau requesting an evidentiary hearing.

24 7. On May 8, 2024, the Commission notified Johnson that an evidentiary hearing would
25 be held via Zoom video conference before the Commission starting at 10:00 a.m. on August 27,
26 2024. Johnson was also notified that a prehearing conference would be held on July 16, 2023.

27 8. In July 2024, the Bureau sent a Statement of Reasons to Johnson via email, and to the
28 Commission. In the Statement of Reasons, the Bureau alleges two causes for denial of Johnson’s

1 Application: (1) she failed to disclose required material information (three misdemeanor
2 convictions) on her Application; and (2) she failed to establish that she is a person of good
3 character, honesty, and integrity because she failed to make full and true disclosures on her
4 Application as required by the GCA, and supplied information that is untrue or misleading. The
5 Bureau also alleges that Johnson failed to establish that her prior activities, criminal record, and
6 habits do not pose a threat to the public interest of this state, or to the effective regulation and
7 control of controlled gambling. Based on the foregoing, the Bureau requests that the Commission
8 deny Johnson's Application.

9 9. On July 16, 2023, the noticed prehearing conference was held before PO Patterson.
10 Johnson attended the prehearing conference on her own behalf. DAG Rinaldi attended on behalf
11 of the Bureau.

12 10. On July 16, 2023, PO Patterson sent a Conclusion of Prehearing Conference letter, via
13 email, to Johnson and DAG Rinaldi.

14 11. The Commission heard this matter via Zoom video conference on August 27, 2024.
15 PO Patterson closed the administrative record, and the matter was submitted for decision on
16 August 27, 2024.

17 **Johnson's Disclosures of Prior Convictions**

18 12. On her Supplemental, Johnson disclosed that she was convicted of committing a
19 misdemeanor for violating Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (b) (Driving with a Blood
20 Alcohol Level of .08% or Higher) in *People of the State of California v. Natasha Linette Johnson*
21 (Super. Ct. Sacramento County, 2014, No. 14T02699). It is undisputed that under penalty of
22 perjury, Johnson failed to disclose the following three convictions on the Application: (1) on or
23 around January 9, 2009, Johnson was convicted of one misdemeanor count of violating Vehicle
24 Code section 23152, subdivision (b) in the *People of the State of California v. Natasha Linette*
25 *Johnson* (Super. Ct. Sutter County, No. CR-TR-08-0003050); (2) on or around January 14, 2010,
26 she was convicted of one misdemeanor count of violating Vehicle Code section 23152,
27 subdivision (b), in *People v. State of California v. Natasha Linette Johnson* (Super. Ct. Sutter
28 County, 2010, No. CR-TR-09-0002951); and (3) on or around January 14, 2010, she was

1 convicted of one misdemeanor count of violating Vehicle Code section 14601.2 in *People v. State*
2 *of California v. Natasha Linette Johnson* (Super. Ct. Sutter County, 2010, No. CR-TR-09-
3 0002951). Collectively, hereafter, the last three misdemeanor convictions are referred to as the
4 “Convictions.”

5 **Johnson’s Application**

6 13. Johnson’s Application consists of two parts. The first part is three pages and contains
7 five sections, including applicant information. The instructions provide that “all responses must
8 be truthful and complete” and that any “misrepresentation or failure to disclose required
9 information or documentation may constitute cause for denial of the application or discipline of
10 the licensee.” (Emphasis in original). Johnson signed the Application on July 15, 2022.

11 14. The second part of the Application is the Supplemental, which is eight pages and
12 contains nine sections. The instructions on the Supplemental also provide that all “responses must
13 be truthful and complete” and that any “misrepresentation or failure to disclose required
14 information or documentation may constitute cause for denial of the application or discipline of
15 the licensee.” (Emphasis in original). The Supplemental requires that the applicant disclose,
16 among other things, all criminal conviction(s).

17 15. Section (4) of the Supplemental requires an applicant to disclose any and all criminal
18 convictions other than “infractions, i.e. speeding or parking tickets,” and any conviction sealed
19 pursuant to a court order.

20 16. On the Supplemental, Johnson checked the box marked “Yes” to the question have
21 “you ever been convicted or pled guilty or nolo contendere (no contest) to a misdemeanor or
22 felony?” (Emphasis in original). She disclosed that she had sustained a single criminal conviction
23 for a “D.U.I.” on the “approximate date” of “5/2024” in Sacramento County, California. The
24 exact date of this conviction is June 23, 2014, for one misdemeanor count of violating Vehicle
25 Code section 23152, subdivision (b) (Driving with a Blood Alcohol Level of .08% or Higher) in
26 *People of the State of California v. Natasha Linette Johnson* (Super. Ct. Sacramento County,
27 2014, 14T02699). As a result, Johnson was sentenced to five years of probation and ordered to
28 serve 165 days in jail and to complete a work program.

1 17. Section (9) of the Supplemental is a Declaration, signed by Johnson on
2 July 15, 2022, in which Johnson declared under penalty of perjury that the information provided
3 in the Supplemental was “true, accurate, and complete.” However, the Supplemental contained
4 information that was not true or accurate because Johnson failed to disclose the Convictions.

5 **Johnson’s Communications with the Bureau About the Convictions**

6 18. On September 26, 2022, the Bureau requested that Johnson provide information
7 explaining why she failed to disclose the Convictions on the Application. On October 11, 2022,
8 Johnson informed the Bureau that the reason she did not disclose them was “because it has been
9 so long and I wasn’t quite sure of the exact dates.” On October 14, 2022, the Bureau requested an
10 additional statement from Johnson explaining why she did not need to disclose the Convictions
11 when the Supplemental states the following: “You are required to disclose any and all criminal
12 convictions regardless of: a.) The date of conviction, i.e., it must be disclosed no matter how old
13 the conviction is.” On November 14, 2022, Johnson responded to the Bureau’s inquiry as follows:
14 “The reason I did not disclose the 2009 and 2010 convictions was because I honestly did not
15 know the exact dates. Also it has been so long and I completed what I needed to do to move
16 beyond those situations.”

17 **Johnson’s Testimony During the Evidentiary Hearing**

18 19. During the evidentiary hearing, Johnson’s testimony was consistent with her prior
19 written statements to the Bureau. She testified that she was fully aware of the Convictions at the
20 time she was filling out the Application because she “lived” them, but she was not aware of the
21 exact dates of the Convictions. She stated she was not trying to hide the Convictions. She testified
22 that she did not want to “put the wrong information” on the Application so she omitted the
23 Convictions in their entirety. She knew the Convictions would be revealed when her Application
24 was investigated by the Bureau. Johnson testified that she filled out the Application on her own.

25 20. Johnson admits she should have included the Convictions on the Application even
26 though she did not know the exact dates. Johnson testified that she was aware that her responses
27 on the Application had to be complete and accurate. She admits the Application was not complete
28 and accurate because she omitted the Convictions from the Application. She acknowledged she

1 rushed the Application because she was “desperate” to start a new life.

2 21. Johnson credibly testified that if she had to do it all over, she would list the
3 Convictions on the Application.

4 22. Johnson also credibly testified that her convictions stemmed from her use of alcohol.
5 She insists she is a different person now and has been sober for two years. She has no derogatory
6 work history in the gambling industry.

7 **Letters Supporting Johnson’s Application**

8 23. Johnson submitted two letters in support of the Application. One letter is from her
9 coworker who is a senior manager for L.E. Gaming, and another is from a friend who has known
10 Johnson for 28 years. The letters demonstrate that Johnson has made significant strides towards
11 rehabilitation from the circumstances that led to her four misdemeanor convictions, show that she
12 is a valuable employee, and reveal that she is well regarded by her employer, coworkers, and her
13 friends.

14 APPLICABLE STATUTORY AND REGULATORY PROVISIONS

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

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

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

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

28 28. The Commission has the responsibility of assuring that licenses, approvals, and

1 permits are not issued to, or held by, unqualified or disqualified persons, or by persons whose
2 operations are conducted in a manner that is inimical to the public health, safety, or welfare. (Bus.
3 & Prof. Code, § 19823, subd. (a)(1).)

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

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

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

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

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

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

22 35. In reviewing an application for any license, the commission shall consider whether
23 issuance of the license is inimical to public health, safety, or welfare, and whether issuance of the
24 license will undermine public trust that the gambling operations with respect to which the license
25 would be issued are free from criminal and dishonest elements and would be conducted honestly.
26 (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19856, subd. (c).)

27 36. No gambling license shall be issued unless, based on all of the information and
28 documents submitted, the Commission is satisfied that the applicant is a person of good character,

1 honesty, and integrity. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19857, subd. (a).)

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

9 38. No gambling license shall be issued unless, based on all of the information and
10 documents submitted, the Commission is satisfied that the applicant is a person that is in all other
11 respects qualified to be licensed as provided in this chapter. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19857, subd.
12 (c).)

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

18 40. An application will be denied if the Commission finds that the applicant has not
19 satisfied the requirements of Business and Professions Code section 19857. (CCR, § 12040, subd.
20 (a)(1).)

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

24 42. This evidentiary hearing need not be conducted according to technical rules relating to
25 evidence and witnesses. Any relevant evidence may be considered, and is sufficient in itself to
26 support a finding, if it is the sort of evidence upon which reasonable persons are accustomed to
27 rely upon in the conduct of serious affairs, regardless of the existence of any common law or
28 statutory rule that might make improper the admission of the evidence over objection in a civil

1 action. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19871, subd. (a)(4); CCR, § 12060, subd. (g)(2).)

2 43. An applicant for licensing or for any approval or consent required by this chapter,
3 shall make full and true disclosure of all information to the Bureau and the Commission as
4 necessary to carry out the policies of this state relating to licensing, registration, and control of
5 gambling. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19866.)

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

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

15 ASSESSMENT OF JOHNSON’S SUITABILITY FOR LICENSURE

16 46. For the reasons stated below, cause exists to deny Johnson’s Application. The
17 Commission finds that Johnson is disqualified for licensure under the GCA. (Bus. & Prof. Code,
18 §§ 19823, subd. (b), 19859, subd. (b).) Johnson is disqualified for licensure based on a
19 straightforward application of the material facts to Business and Professions Code section 19859,
20 subdivision (b). By failing to reveal the Convictions, Johnson: (1) failed to provide information
21 required by the GCA and its implementing regulations; (2) failed to reveal facts material to
22 qualification to the Bureau and the Commission; and/or (3) supplied untrue or misleading
23 information as to a material fact pertaining to the qualification criteria. (Bus. & Prof. Code, §
24 19859, subd. (b).)

25 **Johnson is Disqualified Under the GCA — (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19859, subd. (b))**

26 47. All of the information requested on the application has been considered through the
27 legislative and regulatory processes and determined necessary in order for the Commission to
28 discharge its duties properly. Criminal records are required to be disclosed by the GCA and its

1 implementing regulations, including the Supplemental. (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 19841, subd.
2 (a)(2), 19859, subd. (b), 19865, 19866.) An applicant is neither expected, nor permitted, to
3 determine the importance of the information requested, and instead is required to provide true,
4 accurate, and complete information. (*Ibid.*) To address any issues in completing the application,
5 and to ensure that the information disclosed on an application is “true, accurate, and complete,”
6 the burden is on the applicant to carefully and thoroughly read the application, and to seek
7 assistance with filling out the application if necessary. The applicant is responsible for both the
8 information they disclose, and for failing to disclose required information, on the application.

9 48. Under numerous sections of the GCA, the existence of, and details regarding, an
10 applicant’s criminal history denotes facts material to the qualification for licensure of an
11 applicant. (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 19801, subds. ((g), (j), 19841, subd. (a)(2), 19856, subd. (c),
12 19857, subd. (b), 19859, subd. (c), (d), 19865 & 19866.) For instance, criminal history
13 information may affect the assessment of the applicant’s general character, honesty, integrity,
14 and/or ability to participate in controlled gambling. Such information may lead to a finding that
15 the issuance of a license to such an applicant would be inimical to public health, safety, or
16 welfare, or undermine public trust that the gambling operations with respect to which the license
17 would be issued are free from criminal and dishonest elements, and would be conducted honestly.

18 49. Johnson was required to disclose on the Application that she was convicted of four
19 misdemeanors, the “approximate” date of the Convictions, the arresting agencies, court locations,
20 and a description of the factual circumstances that led to the convictions. By failing to reveal the
21 Convictions, Johnson failed to reveal facts material to qualification to the Bureau and the
22 Commission.

23 50. As a result of having knowingly marked the box “Yes” to the question on
24 Section 4 of the Supplemental asking whether she had ever been convicted of any crimes, but
25 only listing her one, most recent misdemeanor conviction, Johnson supplied information that is
26 untrue and/or misleading as to material facts pertaining to the qualification criteria of an applicant
27 for licensure by the Commission. The Bureau only determined that Johnson had been convicted
28 of four misdemeanors, not one, through conducting its background investigation. At the time she

1 was filling out the Application, Johnson admitted that she knew she was required to disclose all
2 four misdemeanor convictions on the Application. Due to her intentional failure to reveal the
3 Convictions on her Application, which clearly were required to be included in the Application,
4 Johnson's Application is subject to denial pursuant to Business and Professions Code section
5 19859, subdivision (b), and her Application must be denied pursuant to CCR section 12040,
6 subdivision (a)(2).

7 **Johnson is Not Unqualified Under the GCA — (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 19857, subd. (a))**

8 51. An applicant may demonstrate good character, honesty, and integrity by providing
9 truthful, accurate, and complete responses on their application and supplemental, in response to
10 Bureau inquiries during the Bureau's background investigation, and/or while testifying during the
11 evidentiary hearing before the Commission.

12 52. Conversely, an applicant may demonstrate a lack of good character, honesty, and
13 integrity by omitting pertinent information, and providing untrue, misleading, and/or
14 contradictory information on their application and supplemental, in response to Bureau inquiries,
15 and/or while testifying during the evidentiary hearing before Commission.

16 53. During her testimony before the Commission, Johnson did not fail to meet her burden
17 of proving that she is a person of good character, honesty, and integrity. In fact, Johnson made a
18 compelling case that she now possesses the ability to participate in controlled gambling, and that
19 the issuance of a license to her in the future would not be inimical to public health, safety, or
20 welfare, or undermine public trust that the gambling operations with respect to which the license
21 would be issued are free from criminal and dishonest elements, and would be conducted honestly.
22 Specifically, Johnson: (1) provided honest responses about her criminal convictions; (2) did not
23 omit all convictions from her Application; (3) admitted she was wrong in failing to disclose the
24 Convictions on the Application; (4) admitted that if she had to do it all over again she would not
25 omit the Convictions from any future licensing application; and (5) provided persuasive letters in
26 support of her Application. Therefore, the Application is not subject to denial pursuant to
27 Business and Professions Code section 19857, subdivision (a), and CCR section 12040,
28 subdivision (a)(1). Accordingly, due the unique circumstances of this case, Johnson may

1 immediately reapply for a license, or a work permit available under the GCA and its
2 implementing regulations.

3 54. All documentary and testimonial evidence submitted by the parties that is not
4 specifically addressed in this Decision and Order was considered but not used by the Commission
5 in making its determination on Johnson's Application.

6 **NOTICE OF APPLICANT'S APPEAL RIGHTS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

28 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.

CCR section 12066, subsection (c), provides, in part:

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. Natasha Linette Johnson’s Application for Employee Category License: Third-Party Proposition Player Service Worker License is DENIED.

2. Any temporary third-party proposition player worker license held by Natasha Linette Johnson after the effective date of this Order is cancelled, deemed void, and cannot be used hereafter. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 4, § 12122, subd. (d).)

3. Natasha Linette Johnson may immediately reapply for a license, or a work permit available under the Gambling Control Act and its implementing regulations.

4. No costs are awarded.

5. Each side to pay its own attorneys’ fees.

This Order is effective on October 28, 2024.

Dated: 9/27/2024 Signature: 
Paula LaBrie, Chair

Dated: 9/27/2024 Signature: 
Stacey Luna Baxter, Commissioner

Dated: 9/27/2024 Signature: 
Eric Heins, Commissioner

Dated: 9/27/2024 Signature: 
William Liu, Commissioner

Dated: 9/27/2024 Signature: 
Edward Yee, Commissioner