STATE OF OREGON DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES DIVISION OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE SECURITIES

In the Matter Of:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

Case No. DM-11-0049

1st American Law Center, Inc. and Dean Gregory Chandler,

Final Order to Cease and Desist and Final Order Assessing Civil Penalty Entered by Default

Respondent.

On July 22, 2011, Director of the Department of Consumer and Business Services for the State of Oregon ("Director"), acting by and pursuant to the authority of the Oregon Mortgage Lending Law, ORS 86A.100 *et seq.*, and the Oregon Debt Management Service Providers Law, ORS 697.602 *et seq.*, issued Administrative Order No. DM-11-0049 to Cease and Desist, Proposed Order Assessing Civil Penalty and Notice of Right to a Hearing ("Order") against 1st American Law Center, Inc. and Dean Gregory Chandler ("Respondents").

Respondents were duly served with a true copy of the Proposed Order by certified and first-class U.S. mail. Respondents have not made a written demand for a contested case hearing in this matter and the time to do so has expired.

NOW THEREFORE, after consideration of the file in this matter maintained by the Oregon Department of Consumer and Business Services, the Director hereby issues the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Final Orders.

25 ///

26 ///

Division of Finance and Corporate Securities Labor and Industries Building 350 Winter Street NE, Suite 410 Salem, OR 97301-3881

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. Respondent Dean Gregory Chandler was an attorney licensed to practice law in the State of California, Bar No. 163090 and, as of January 3, 2011, is no longer eligible to practice law in California according to California State Bar Records. Respondent Chandler lists his address as Chandler law Group, PO Box 546, Bonsall, CA 92003 and as 2101 El Camino Real, Ste. 204, Oceanside, CA 92054.
- 2. Respondent 1st American Law Center, Inc. lists its address as 2101 El Camino Real, Ste. 204, Oceanside, CA 92054 and is neither registered to do business nor has an active member of the Oregon State Bar as a Member of the 1st American Law Center.
- 3. Respondent Chandler is neither a licensed Oregon attorney nor authorized to practice law in Oregon.
- 4. On September 15, 2009, an Oregon resident entered into a contract with Respondents. The contract provided that Respondents would renegotiate the Oregon resident's mortgage for residential real property located in Hubbard, Oregon.
- 5. Respondents required the Oregon resident to pay \$2,495 in exchange for Respondents' promise to modify the Oregon resident's mortgage.
- 6. On October 18, 2010, the Division wrote a letter to Respondents advising them of their violation of Oregon Law and requesting that the Oregon resident harmed by their activity receive a full and complete refund. The letter asked Respondent to provide the Division with a list of Oregon consumers that had entered into a loan modification agreement with Respondent. Finally, the letter stated that violations of Oregon's Mortgage Lender Law are subject to a \$20,000 civil penalty and requested a response within 21 days. Respondents did not respond to this letter or issue a refund.
- 7. On March 10, 2011, the Division sent a second letter to Respondents. This letter specifically requested that Respondents provide a refund by March 24, 2011. The letter advised Respondents that a failure to issue a refund would result in the issuance of a notice

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

26

CALL IN THE PARTY OF THE PARTY	23
ate of Orea	24

order. As of the date of this order, no refund has been issued.

- 8. As a result of Respondents operating in Oregon, an Oregon resident suffered harm in the amount of \$2,495.
 - 9. At no time have Respondents been registered with the Oregon Secretary of State.
- 10. At no time have Respondents been licensed or authorized to practice law in Oregon.
- 11. At no time have Respondents been licensed as a mortgage banker or broker in Oregon.
- 12. At no time have Respondents been licensed as mortgage loan originators in Oregon.
- 13. Respondents have not obtained a unique identifier from the Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System and Registry.
- 14. At no time have Respondent been registered as a debt management service provider in Oregon.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based upon the Findings of Fact, the Director concludes that:

- 15. Respondents acted as "mortgage brokers" as defined by ORS 86A.100(7)(a)(C) when they offered to negotiate a mortgage loan in exchange for receiving compensation.
- 16. Respondents engaged in a "residential mortgage transaction in this state" as defined by ORS 86A.103(2) when they offered to negotiate a home mortgage loan secured by residential real estate located in Oregon.
- 17. Respondents violated ORS 86A.103(1) when they engaged in residential mortgage transactions in this state without first being licensed as either a mortgage banker or mortgage broker.
- 18. Respondents violated ORS 86A.154(2) when they knowingly made an untrue statement of material fact by telling an Oregon resident that Respondents would attempt to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

26

negotiate a residential real estate loan when in reality Respondents did not conduct any substantive conversations with the Oregon resident's mortgage lender that have resulted in a modification of the Oregon resident's residential real estate loan.

- 19. Respondents may not rely upon the exemption contained in ORS 86A.100(7)(b)(G) because they are not attorneys licensed in Oregon.
- 20. Respondents performed a "debt management service" as defined by ORS 697.602(2)(c) when they offered to modify terms and conditions of an existing loan or obligation in exchange for \$2,495 in compensation.
- 21. Respondents violated ORS 697.612(1)(a) when they performed a debt management service without first registering with the Director under ORS 697.632.
- 22. The \$2,495 fee collected by Respondents exceeded the amount permitted by ORS 697.692(1).
- 23. Respondents violated ORS 697.662(7)(a) when they collected fees from an Oregon resident that exceeded the amounts permitted by ORS 697.692(1).
- 24. Respondents violated ORS 697.662(4) when they offered to perform a debt management service without evaluating, as part of the budget analysis the debt management service provider must perform under ORS 697.652(2), whether the debt management service is or would be advantageous to the consumer.
- 25. Respondents violated ORS 697.662(5) when they performed a debt management service without having a good faith belief formed after conducting an evaluation described in ORS 697.662(4) that the consumer can or will comply with the terms of the agreement described in ORS 697.652.
- 26. Respondents may not rely upon the exemption from registration contained in ORS 697.612(3)(b) because Respondents are not attorneys licensed or authorized to practice law in Oregon.
 - 27. Pursuant to ORS 697.718(1), Respondents are liable to consumers for any

1

ascertainable loss of money or property because they were required to register as a debt