FILED

MAY 1 2 2021 DEPT. OF REAL ESTATE

LAURENCE D. HAVESON, Counsel (SBN 152631) Department of Real Estate 320 West 4th Street, Suite 350 Los Angeles, California 90013-1105 Telephone: (213) 576-6982 Direct: (213) 576-6854 Fax: (213) 576-6917 Attorney for Complainant

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation of WINDFALL SPRINGS, INC., BARBARA BAKER, individually and as designated officer of Windfall Springs, Inc., and MARY ELIZABETH STORM, Respondents.

No. H-05211-SD

ACCUSATION

The Complainant, Veronica Kilpatrick, a Supervising Special Investigator for the Department of Real Estate ("Department" or "DRE") of the State of California, for cause of Accusation against WINDFALL SPRINGS, INC. ("WSI"), BARBARA BAKER ("BAKER"), also known as Barbara Ohmann, and MARY ELIZABETH STORM ("STORM"), collectively, "Respondents," is informed and alleges in her official capacity as follows:

- The Complainant, Veronica Kilpatrick, acting in her official capacity as a 1. Supervising Special Investigator, makes this Accusation against Respondents.
- 2. All references to the "Code" are to the California Business and Professions Code and all references to "Regulations" are to Title 10, Chapter 6, California Code of Regulations.

LICENSE HISTORY

Respondent WSI has been licensed by the Department as a real estate corporation, 3. License ID, License ID 01847410, from on or about June 14, 2008, through the present, with

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

DRE Case No. H-05211-SD

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

///

///

- b. No final subsequent determination be made, after hearing or upon stipulation, that cause for disciplinary action occurred within two years from the effective date of the decision;
- c. WSI and BAKER pay the sum of \$8,278 for the Commissioner's cost of the audit that led to this disciplinary action;
- d. WSI and BAKER pay the Commissioner's reasonable cost, not to exceed \$12,417 for an audit to determine if Respondents have corrected the violations found in the Determination of Issues; and
- e. All licenses and licensing rights of WSI and BAKER be indefinitely suspended until Respondents pay the sum of \$1,872 for the Commissioner's reasonable cost of the investigation and enforcement that led to this disciplinary action.
- 7. The Stipulation and Agreement filed January 13, 2017 was adopted as the Decision of the Real Estate Commissioner, effective February 2, 2017.

PRIOR DISCIPLINE: DRE CASE NO. H-41675 LA

- 8. On or about February 24, 2021, in DRE Case No. H-41675 LA, the DRE filed a Stipulation and Agreement for WSI and BAKER. Under the Stipulation and Agreement, all licenses and licensing rights of WSI and BAKER under the Real Estate Law were suspended for a period of 90 days from the effective date of the Commissioner's Decision provided, however, that the initial 30 days of the suspensions would be stayed for three years if WSI and BAKER each paid a monetary penalty of \$75 per day for a total of \$2,250 each, with the remaining 60 days stayed on condition that:
 - a. WSI and BAKER obey all laws, rules, and regulations governing the rights, duties, and responsibilities of a real estate licensee in the State of California; and,
 - No final subsequent determination be made, after hearing or upon stipulation, that cause for disciplinary action occurred within three years from the effective date of the decision;
 - c. WSI and BAKER pay the sum of \$1,355.30 for the Commissioner's reasonable cost of the investigation and enforcement that led to this disciplinary action;

- d. WSI and BAKER pay the sum of \$16,205.68 for the Commissioner's cost of the audit that led to this disciplinary action;
- e. WSI and BAKER pay the Commissioner's reasonable cost, not to exceed \$20,257.10 for an audit to determine if Respondents have corrected the violations found in the Determination of Issues; and
- f. BAKER successfully complete a continuing education course on trust fund accounting and handling.
- 9. The Stipulation and Agreement filed February 24, 2021 was adopted as the Decision of the Real Estate Commissioner, effective March 26, 2021.

BROKERAGE: WSI

10. At all times mentioned, in Riverside County, WSI acted as a real estate broker, conducting licensed activities within the meaning of Code section 10131(a): selling and buying real property for others. At all times mentioned, WSI was acting by and through BAKER as its D.O. pursuant to Code Section 10159.2 who was responsible for ensuring compliance with the Real Estate Law.

FACTS DISCOVERED BY DRE

11. On or about September 9, 2020, the DRE received a complaint from E.J. and S.J. ("Sellers") regarding STORM, Realty One Group Southwest (one of WSI's licensed fictitious business names), and BAKER, alleging that on April 22, 2020, E.J. the Sellers entered a residential listing agreement with STORM to sell their house in Murrieta, California. The listing agreement contained additional terms, including that, "Seller intends to include a contingency to purchase a replacement property as part of any resulting transaction" ("replacement property contingency"). The replacement property contingency was required because the Sellers would only be able to sell their house if they could qualify for financing on another house. The property was listed by the Sellers for \$477,770.

26 || .

¹ Initials are used in place of an individual's full name to protect their privacy. Documents containing the individuals' full names will be provided during the discovery phase of this case to Respondents and/or their attorney(s), after service of a timely and proper request for discovery on Complainant's counsel.

- 12. On or about August 10, 2020, F.B. and M.B. ("Buyers") made an offer to purchase the Sellers' house for \$465,000, contained in a Residential Purchase Agreement. The proposed purchase agreement included under "Other Terms" the statement: "Seller to credit buyer \$10,000 towards recurring and non-recurring costs." The Residential Purchase Agreement did not contain any additional terms regarding the replacement property contingency for the Sellers.
- 13. On or about August 11, 2020, the Sellers made their first counter offer, prepared by STORM, stating the sales price as \$472,000, and including seven other items under "Other Terms." However, the other terms again did not include the replacement property contingency for the Sellers.
- 14. Thereafter on or about August 11, 2020, the Buyers made a counter offer regarding recurring and non-recurring closing costs. The other terms again did not include the replacement property contingency for the Sellers.
- 15. Thereafter on or about August 11, 2020, the Sellers made a counter offer to the Buyers' counter offer prepared by STORM. The other terms again did not include the replacement property contingency for the Sellers.
- 16. On or about August 11, 2020, the Buyers and Sellers reached agreement and the Sellers signed the residential purchase agreement. There was no reference in the purchase agreement to the replacement property contingency for the Sellers.
- VA loan, they discovered that they could not get VA financing and they discussed the replacement property contingency with their listing agent, STORM. The Sellers then learned that the replacement property contingency was in the multiple listing service advertising for the property, but was not included in the purchase agreement that the Sellers signed for sale of the property.
- 18. On or about August 26, 2020, the Sellers sent the Buyers "Notice of Unforeseen Coronavirus Circumstances," cancellation of contract, release of deposit, and cancellation of escrow documents, however, the Buyers refused to agree.

|| ///

28 || ///

VIOLATIONS OF THE REAL ESTATE LAW - CAUSES FOR DISCIPLINE

19. In the course of the activities described above in Paragraph 10, and based on the facts discovered by the DRE, as described in Paragraphs 11 through 18 above, Respondents acted in violation of the Code and Regulations as follows.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACCUSATION

- 20. The Complainant realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 19 above with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.
- 21. STORM's acts and/or omissions in failing to ensure that the replacement property contingency was included in the purchase agreement or the Sellers' counter offers are in violation of Code sections 10177(d) and/or 10177(g) and constitute cause to suspend or revoke the real estate licenses and license rights of Respondent STORM pursuant to Code sections 10177(d) and/or 10177(g).

SECOND CAUSE OF ACCUSATION

- 22. The Complainant realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 21 above with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.
- 23. WSI's acts and/or omissions, as alleged above in paragraphs 1 through 21, are in violation of Code sections 10177(d) and/or 10177(g) and constitute cause to suspend or revoke the real estate licenses and license rights of Respondent WSI pursuant to Code sections 10177(d) and/or 10177(g).

THIRD CAUSE OF ACCUSATION

- 24. The Complainant realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 23 above with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.
- 25. BAKER's acts and/or omissions, as alleged above in paragraphs 1 through 23, are in violation of Code sections 10159.2, 10177(h), and 10177(d) and/or 10177(g), and Regulation ///

]	2725, and constitute cause to suspend or revoke the real estate licenses and license rights of
2	Respondent BAKER pursuant to Code sections 10177(h), and 10177(d) and/or 10177(g).
3	
4	(INVESTIGATION AND TOTAL
5	(INVESTIGATION AND ENFORCEMENT COSTS) 26. Code section 10106 provides
6	provides, in pertinent part that in any order issued in
7	of a disciplinary proceeding before the DRE, the Commissioner may request the
8	administrative law judge to direct a licensee found to have committed a violation of this part to
9	pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of investigation and enforcement of the case.
	WHEREFORE, Complainant prays that a hearing be conducted on the allegations of this
10	Accusation and that upon proof thereof, a decision be rendered imposing disciplinary action
11	against all the licenses and license rights of Respondents WINDFALL SPRINGS, INC.
12	BARBARA BAKER, and MARY ELIZABETH STORM under the Real Estate Law, for the costs
13	of investigation and enforcement as permitted by law, and for such other and further relief as may
14	be proper under other applicable provisions of law.
15	
16	Dated at San Diego, California this 10 day of May 2021.
17	
18	
19	Veronica Kilpatrick
20	Veronica Kilpatrick Supervising Special Investigator
21	cc: WINDFALL SPRINGS INC
22	cc: WINDFALL SPRINGS, INC. BARBARA BAKER MARY ELIZABETH STORM
23	Veronica Kilpatrick Sacto.
24	Sacto.
25	
26	
27	
28	
	ACCI ICATION