

**BEFORE THE ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL APPEALS BOARD
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

AB-9990

File: 20-606054; Reg: 23093170

7-ELEVEN, INC. and GILL ENTERPRISES, INC.,
dba 7-Eleven Store #16373D
1110 Lemoore Avenue
Lemoore, CA 93245,
Appellants/Licensees

v.

DEPARTMENT OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL,
Respondent

Administrative Law Judge at the Dept. Hearing: Alberto Roldan

Appeals Board Hearing: February 9, 2024
Sacramento, CA/Videoconference

ISSUED FEBRUARY 14, 2024

Appearances: *Appellants:* Adam Koslin, of Solomon, Saltsman & Jamieson, as
counsel for 7-Eleven, Inc. and Gill Enterprises, Inc.;

Respondent: Jason Liu, as counsel for the Department of Alcoholic
Beverage Control.

OPINION

7-Eleven, Inc. and Gill Enterprises, Inc., doing business as 7-Eleven Store
#16373D (appellants), appeal from a decision of the Department of Alcoholic Beverage
Control¹ suspending their license for 25 days because their clerk sold an alcoholic

¹ The decision of the Department, dated October 10, 2023, is set forth in the
appendix.

beverage to a police minor decoy, in violation of Business and Professions Code² section 25658(a).

FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Appellants' off-sale beer and wine license was issued on July 30, 2019. There is one prior instance of departmental discipline against the license for violation of section 25658(a), which occurred on January 8, 2020. Appellant received a 10-day suspension based on that violation.

On May 9, 2023, the Department filed a single-count accusation against appellants charging that, on November 18, 2022, appellants' clerk, Charlene Howard (the clerk), sold an alcoholic beverage to 17-year-old T.B.³ (the decoy). Although not noted in the accusation, the decoy was working for the Kings County Sheriff's Department (KCSD) at the time.

At the administrative hearing held on August 8, 2023, documentary evidence was received, and testimony concerning the sale was presented by the decoy, KCSD School Resource Deputy (SRD) Kendall Van Bindsbergen, and KCSD Sergeant Andrew Mazza. A second decoy present during the sale, Jay Davis, also testified on behalf of the Department. Appellants did not present any witnesses.

Evidence established that the decoy and Davis went to the licensed premises with KCSD deputies on November 18, 2022. The decoy and Davis entered the licensed premises and searched for the beer cooler. The decoy selected a three-pack

² All statutory references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise stated.

³ We use the decoy's initials because he was younger than 18 years old at the time of the violation.

of Budweiser beer and carried it to the register where the clerk was working. Davis accompanied him.

The clerk asked the decoy for identification and the decoy handed her his valid California driver's license. The decoy's license had several identifiers indicating the decoy was under the age of 21 years old, including: the decoy's actual birth date, indicating that he was 17 years old on November 18, 2022, vertical configuration, a red box that said he would not be 21 until the year 2026, and a blue box that said the decoy would not be 18 until 2023. Despite this information, the clerk completed the transaction and sold the decoy the three pack of beer.

The decoy and Davis exited the licensed premises and met with KCSD deputies outside. SRD Van Bindsbergen reentered the licensed premises with the decoy. The decoy identified the clerk as the person who sold him the beer. A photograph of the clerk and the decoy was taken (exhibit D-6). The clerk was issued a citation for the sale to the decoy.

On August 17, 2023, the administrative law judge (ALJ) issued a proposed decision recommending the single count against appellants be sustained, and that appellants license be suspended for 25 days. The Department adopted the proposed decision on October 4, 2023, and issued a certificate of decision six days later.

Appellants filed a timely appeal contending that the Department cannot impose discipline where it has not shown that such discipline is necessary to protect the public.

DISCUSSION

Appellants contend that the Department has not shown that a suspension "would do anything ... to protect the public from the operations of Appellants' premises." (Appellants' Opening Brief at p. 5.) Appellants argue that the Department is not

empowered to issue any penalty without showing that the discipline is necessary to protect the public. (*Id.* at pp. 5-6.)

Article XX, section 22 of the California Constitution authorizes the Department to take disciplinary action to protect the public:

The department shall have the power, in its discretion, to deny, suspend, or revoke any specific alcoholic beverage license if it shall determine for good cause that the granting or continuance of such license would be contrary to public welfare or morals.

This general authority, however, does not mean that every violation must be specifically proven to be contrary to public welfare or morals. The criteria for establishing good cause for discipline has been explained as follows:

In order to establish good cause for suspension or revocation of an alcoholic beverage license due to violations of law that do not involve moral turpitude, there must be a rational relationship between the offense and the operation of the licensed business in a manner consistent with public welfare and morals or there must be evidence that the offense had an actual effect on the conduct of the licensed business.

(*H.D. Wallace & Associates, Inc. v. Dept. of Alcoholic Bev. Control* (1969) 271 Cal.App.2d 589, 593-594 [76 Cal.Rptr. 749].)

In contrast to the position appellants would have us take, previous courts have found that specific findings need not be made on whether conduct charged in an accusation is deleterious to public welfare and morals. In *Schieffelin*, the court found:

To the extent that Schieffelin argues that the Department failed to make a specific finding that its conduct was injurious to public welfare or morals, we note that **both the California Supreme Court and this court have held that a finding that a licensee has violated provisions of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act is tantamount to a finding of injury to public welfare and morals.** (*Martin v. Alcoholic Bev. etc. Appeals Bd.* (1959) 52 Cal.2d 287, 291 [341 P.2d 296]; *Mercurio v. Dept. Alcoholic etc. Control* (1956) 144 Cal. App. 2d 626, 631 [301 P.2d 474] (*Mercurio*).)

In *Mercurio*, this court held that a finding that licensees had violated a Department rule was in effect a finding that the licensees' acts were

contrary to public welfare and morals because the rule itself was an articulation of acts which the Department found to be contrary to public welfare and morals. (*Ibid.*)

Similarly, the Legislature has already determined that the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act is intended “for the protection of the safety, welfare, health, peace, and morals of the people of the State” and that the act involves “in the highest degree” the “moral well-being” of the state and its people. (See Business and Professions Code Section 23001.)[fn.]

(*Dept. of Alcoholic Bev. Control v. Alcoholic Bev. Control Appeals Bd.* (2005), 128 Cal.App.4th 1195, 1217 [27 Cal.Rptr.3d 766] (*Schieffelin*), emphasis added.)

Here, by finding that appellants violated provisions of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, the Department found that appellants’ acts were contrary to public welfare and morals. (*Martin, supra*, at p. 291; *Mercurio, supra*, at p. 631; *Schieffelin, supra*, at p. 1217.) There is no additional requirement that the Department show its discipline was necessary to protect the public, as that it already implied by finding there is an underlying violation.

ORDER

The decision of the Department is affirmed.⁴

SUSAN A. BONILLA, CHAIR
MEGAN McGUINNESS, MEMBER
SHARLYNE PALACIO, MEMBER
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL
APPEALS BOARD

⁴ This final order is filed in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 23088 and shall become effective 30 days following the date of the filing of this order as provided by section 23090.7.

Any party, before this final order becomes effective, may apply to the appropriate court of appeal, or the California Supreme Court, for a writ of review of this final order in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 23090 et seq. Service on the Board pursuant to California Rules of Court (Rule 8.25) should be directed to: 400 R Street, Ste. 320, Sacramento, CA 95811 and/or electronically to: abcboard@abcappeals.ca.gov.

APPENDIX

**BEFORE THE
DEPARTMENT OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE ACCUSATION
AGAINST:**

7 ELEVEN, INC., JS GILL ENTERPRISE, INC.
7 ELEVEN #16373D
1110 LEMOORE AVE.
LEMOORE, CA 93245-2348

OFF-SALE BEER AND WINE - LICENSE

Respondent(s)/Licensee(s)
Under the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act

FRESNO DISTRICT OFFICE

File: 20-606054

Reg: 23093170

CERTIFICATE OF DECISION

It is hereby certified that, having reviewed the findings of fact, determination of issues, and recommendation in the attached proposed decision, the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control adopted said proposed decision as its decision in the case on October 4, 2023. Pursuant to Government Code section 11519, this decision shall become effective 30 days after it is delivered or mailed.

Any party may petition for reconsideration of this decision. Pursuant to Government Code section 11521(a), the Department's power to order reconsideration expires 30 days after the delivery or mailing of this decision, or if an earlier effective date is stated above, upon such earlier effective date of the decision.

Any appeal of this decision must be made in accordance with Business and Professions Code sections 23080-23089. The appeal must be filed within 40 calendar days from the date of the decision, unless the decision states it is to be "effective immediately" in which case an appeal must be filed within 10 calendar days after the date of the decision. Mail your written appeal to the Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board, 400 R St, Suite 320, Sacramento, CA 95811. For further information, and detailed instructions on filing an appeal with the Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board, see: <https://abcab.ca.gov> or call the Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board at (916) 445-4005.



https://abcab.ca.gov/abcab_resources/

On or after November 20, 2023, a representative of the Department will contact you to arrange to pick up the license certificate.

**BEFORE THE
DEPARTMENT OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE ACCUSATION
AGAINST:**

7 ELEVEN, INC., JS GILL ENTERPRISE, INC.
7 ELEVEN #16373D
1110 LEMOORE AVE.
LEMOORE, CA 93245-2348

OFF-SALE BEER AND WINE - LICENSE

Respondent(s)/Licensee(s)
Under the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act

FRESNO DISTRICT OFFICE

File: 20-606054

Reg: 23093170

CERTIFICATE OF DECISION

Sacramento, California

Dated: October 10, 2023



Matthew D. Botting
General Counsel

**BEFORE THE
DEPARTMENT OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

IN THE MATTER OF THE ACCUSATION AGAINST:

7 Eleven, Inc., JS Gill Enterprise, Inc.
DBA: 7 Eleven #16373D
1110 Lemoore Ave.
Lemoore, California 93245-2348

Respondent

Off-Sale Beer & Wine License

} File: 20-606054
}
} Registration: 23093170
}
} License Type: 20
}
} Word Count: 17,431
}
} Reporter:
} Donna Cramin
} Kennedy Reporters
}

PROPOSED DECISION

Administrative Law Judge Alberto Roldan, Administrative Hearing Office, Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, heard this matter, via videoconference, on August 8, 2023.

Jason Liu, Attorney, represented the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (Department).

Adam Koslin, Attorney, represented Respondents 7 Eleven, Inc. and JS Gill Enterprise, Inc. (Respondents)

In the Accusation, the Department seeks to discipline the Respondents' license on the grounds that, on or about November 18, 2022, the Respondents' agent or employee, Charlene Howard, at said premises, sold, furnished, or gave alcoholic beverages to T.B.¹, an individual under the age of 21 in violation of Business and Professions Code section 25658(a).² (Exhibit D-1)

In the Accusation, the Department further alleged that there is cause for suspension or revocation of the license of the Respondents in accordance with section 24200 and sections 24200(a) and (b). The Department further alleged that the continuance of the license of the Respondents would be contrary to public welfare and/or morals as set forth in Article XX, Section 22 of the California State Constitution and sections 24200(a) and (b). (Exhibit D-1)

Oral evidence, documentary evidence, and evidence by oral stipulation on the record was received at the hearing. The matter was argued and submitted for decision on August 8, 2023.

¹ In this matter, the primary Decoy used by the Department was under 18 years of age at the time of the hearing. The primary decoy is referred to by initials in this proposed decision to protect his privacy.

² All statutory references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise noted.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Department filed the Accusation on May 9, 2023. (Exhibit D-1)
2. On July 30, 2019, the Department issued a type 20, off-sale beer and wine license to the Respondents for the above-described location (the Licensed Premises). The following is the record of prior Department discipline against the Respondents' license as established by official records introduced by the Department (Exhibit D-2):

Violation Date	Violation	Registration Date	Registration Number	Penalty
01/08/2020	25658(a)	03/02/2020	20089848	10-day suspension

3. On November 18, 2022, the Kings County Sheriff's Department (KCSD) conducted a minor decoy operation using two underage decoys. Both of the decoys were male and under the age of 18 years old. T.B. was the primary decoy, and he was 17 years old on the date of the operation. His birthdate was October 27, 2005. Davis was the secondary decoy, and he was 17 years old on the date of the operation. His birthdate was June 9, 2005.
4. T.B. appeared via videoconference and testified at the hearing. At the hearing on August 8, 2023, his appearance was generally as depicted in an image that was taken during the operation on November 18, 2022. T.B. grew approximately 2 inches and weighed 10-15 pounds more at the hearing. (Exhibit D-4) During the operation on November 18, 2022, T.B. was approximately 5'7" and 150 pounds. (Exhibit D-3) T.B. wore a brown jacket over a dark grey t-shirt and jeans on the date of the operation. T.B.'s face was exposed and his hair was combed back loosely and sat just above his shoulders. T.B. was clean shaven and had no visible tattoos or jewelry. (Exhibit D-4)
5. Davis also appeared via videoconference and testified at the hearing. At the hearing in this matter, his appearance was generally as depicted in an image that was taken during the operation on November 18, 2022. (Exhibit D-5) During the operation, Davis wore a grey, Pendleton style shirt untucked over blue jeans. Davis was clean shaven with a short haircut parted at the side during the operation. (Exhibit D-5) Davis had a thin build and was approximately 5'11" and 120 pounds on the date of the operation.
6. On November 18, 2022, T.B. and Davis went to the Licensed Premises with deputies from the KCSD to attempt to buy alcohol. T.B. and Davis were instructed about the requirements of 141³. They were required to carry their identifications for production if requested, and to be truthful about their age if asked. T.B. and Davis were briefed prior to the operation. They were involved in multiple investigations as decoys on November 18, 2022.

³ All rules referred to herein are contained in title 4 of the California Code of Regulations unless otherwise noted.

7. T.B. and Davis entered the Licensed Premises together during the evening of November 18, 2022. After entering, they searched for the beer cooler. After finding it, T.B. selected a 3-pack of Budweiser beer cans. T.B. carried the beer to the register. Davis accompanied him. T.B. and Davis walked up to the register where the female clerk was working. T.B. presented the 3-pack of Budweiser beer to the clerk for purchase by placing it on the counter. Davis stood behind T.B. while this occurred. Davis had no interactions with the clerk during the investigation.

8. The clerk asked T.B. for identification as she began the transaction. T.B. handed the clerk his California driver's license. The clerk looked at the license after T.B. handed it to her. The license T.B. presented was a vertical configuration license that had a red box that said he would not be 21 until the year 2026. It also had a blue box that said he would not be 18 until 2023. The license had T.B.'s correct date of birth showing that he was 17 years old. Despite this information, the clerk completed the transaction and sold the three pack of beer to T.B. During the transaction, the clerk asked no age-related questions of T.B. After receiving cash from T.B. to pay for the beer, the clerk gave T.B. change for the purchase and she placed the beer in a bag and gave it to T.B. He took possession of the beer and the change the clerk handed to T.B.

9. T.B. and Davis left the Licensed Premises with these items and they went to where the KCSO officers were waiting. T.B. told them what had just happened. The deputies then went into the Licensed Premises with T.B. KCSO Deputy K. Van Bindsbergen (Van Bindsbergen) approached the clerk and identified himself as a law enforcement officer. Van Bindsbergen determined that the clerk's name was Charlene Howard (Howard). Van Bindsbergen told Howard that he was investigating a sale of alcohol to a minor. T.B. stood with Van Bindsbergen and the other deputies while this occurred.

10. While T.B. was standing directly across the counter from Howard, Van Bindsbergen asked T.B. to identify the clerk who sold him the beer. T.B. stated "she did" while pointing toward Howard. T.B. and Howard were directly across from each other when T.B. identified her as the seller. The identification occurred after Van Bindsbergen told the clerk she was being investigated for selling beer to a minor. Howard was subsequently photographed while standing next to T.B. (Exhibit D-6) T.B. held the beer and his identification during this photograph. Van Bindsbergen asked Howard if the register gave her any prompts. Howard confirmed that it did. Howard showed the deputies an example of the prompt after they had her scan the beer again. (Exhibit D-7) Howard told Van Bindsbergen that she thought T.B.'s identification said he was born in 2000.

11. T.B. was in the immediate presence of Howard and the KCSO deputies from when they entered the Licensed Premises after the sale, until after the photograph with Howard. Subsequent to the photograph, Howard was issued a citation for the sale to T.B.⁴

⁴ In this matter, the citation was received as an exhibit. It referenced a time of 2138 hours. (Exhibit L-2). The image of the register prompt gathered during the investigation showed a time of 2145 hours. (Exhibit D-7) Respondents later argued that these exhibits, taken together, established that the citation was prepared prior to the investigation that included the face-to-face

12. Based on T.B.'s and Davis 'overall appearance, i.e., their physical appearances, clothing, poise, demeanor, maturity, and mannerisms shown at the hearing, and their appearances and conduct in front of Howard at the Licensed Premises on November 18, 2022, T.B. and Davis displayed the appearances which would generally be expected of persons less than 21 years of age during their interactions with Howard. T.B. and Davis's appearances were consistent with their chronological ages of 17. Howard did not testify in this matter to explain her age-related impressions of T.B. and Davis or why she sold alcohol to T.B. even though he presented an identification that showed in multiple ways that he was underage. T.B. and Davis both appeared to be youthful and they looked consistent with being 17-year-olds.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Article XX, section 22 of the California Constitution and section 24200(a) provide that a license to sell alcoholic beverages may be suspended or revoked if continuation of the license would be contrary to public welfare or morals.
 2. Section 24200(b) provides that a licensee's violation, or causing or permitting of a violation, of any penal provision of California law prohibiting or regulating the sale of alcoholic beverages is also a basis for the suspension or revocation of the license.
 3. Section 25658(a) provides that every person who sells, furnishes, gives, or causes to be sold, furnished, or given away, any alcoholic beverage to any person under the age of 21 years is guilty of a misdemeanor.
 4. Cause for suspension or revocation of the Respondents' license exists under Article XX, section 22 of the California State Constitution and sections 24200(a) and (b) on the basis that on November 18, 2022, the Respondents' clerk, Charlene Howard, inside the Licensed Premises, sold an alcoholic beverage to T.B., a person under the age of 21, in violation of Business and Professions Code section 25658(a) as alleged in the Accusation. (Findings of Fact ¶¶ 2-12)
 5. The Respondents argued that the decoy operation at the Licensed Premises failed to comply with rule 141 and, therefore, the accusation should be dismissed. Specifically, the Respondents argued that the law enforcement investigation failed to comply with rule 141(b)(5). This alleged violation, if established, would be an affirmative defense and require dismissal of the accusation pursuant to rule 141(c).
 6. There is no credible evidence supporting the assertion by the Respondent that there was a failure to comply with rule 141. Regarding the rule 141(b)(5) violation, *Acapulco Restaurants, Inc. v. Alcoholic Beverages Control Appeals Board* (1998) 67 Cal.App.4th 575 confirmed that a face to face must occur for compliance, but that case never established a baseline standard for what was a compliant face to face identification. The subsequent decision in *Department of*
-
- identification. On its face, Exhibit L-2 notes the date and time entries are in reference to the approximate time of the alleged violation, not the time of issuance of the citation.

Alcoholic Beverage Control v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2003) 109 Cal.App.4th 1687 held that the regulation at “section 141, subdivision (b)(5), ensures-admittedly not as artfully as it might-that the seller will be given the opportunity, soon after the sale, to come “face-to-face” with the decoy.” *Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board* (2003) 109 Cal.App.4th 1687, 1698. This decision confirmed that the purpose of the face to face was to give the seller notice of who the decoy was.

7. Further clarification of what constituted a compliant face to face occurred in *Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board* (2017) 18 Cal.App.5th 541. This case is particularly helpful since the identification of Howard by T.B. in this matter was substantively similar to the identification that was found to be compliant with rule 141(c) in that case. In finding that identification compliant, that court ruled:

“Here there is no violation of Rule 141, as explained above, because the decoy made a face-to-face identification by pointing out the clerk to the officer inside the store while approximately 10 feet from her, standing next to her when the officer informed her she had sold alcohol to a minor, and taking a photograph with her as the minor held the can of beer he purchased from her. She had ample opportunity to observe the minor and to object to any perceived misidentification. The rule requires identification, not confrontation. The identification here meets the letter and the spirit of Rule 141.” *Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board* (2017) 18 Cal.App.5th 541, 547

8. While, general due process considerations demand a fair identification be facilitated by law enforcement, these cases make clear that this particular regulation is focused on the narrower concern of allowing the *seller* the opportunity to be aware of the identity of any decoys involved. It stands to reason that compliance with Rule 141, subdivision (b)(5) occurs if the clerk and the decoy (or decoys), during the process of the investigation, prior to the citation being issued or departure of the decoy(s), are brought in reasonable proximity to each other to assure that the seller knows (or reasonably ought to know) that he or she is being identified as the seller by the decoy(s).

9. Prior to the face-to-face identification, Van Bindsbergen approached Howard at the counter, got her attention, and identified himself as a KCSD deputy investigating the sale of alcohol to T.B. While the sale to T.B. was discussed between Van Bindsbergen and Howard at the counter, T.B. and the other officers stood in the immediate presence of Van Bindsbergen and Howard. In the immediate presence of Howard, T.B. was asked to identify the seller. T.B. verbally and physically identified Howard as the seller while standing directly across the counter from her at a distance of approximately 6 feet. Howard was clearly aware that the decoy described by Van Bindsbergen was T.B. based on their interaction. Howard clearly came face to face with T.B., prior to being cited, under circumstances that made it clear to Howard that she had been identified as the person who sold T.B. beer and that T.B. was the minor at issue. (Findings of Fact ¶¶ 2-12)

10. None of the evidence presented by the Respondents rebutted the credible evidence presented by the Department that these were fully compliant identifications that allowed Howard to become aware that T.B. was the decoy she sold to. Respondents have offered no credible evidence suggesting that the identification violated state or federal due process considerations. While it was argued by the Respondents that the citation preceded the investigation and identification, as has been previously explained, the citation time reflected the approximate time of the violation, not the time of the citation issuance. All of the law enforcement witnesses testified credibly that the citation was issued after the face-to-face identification and the photograph with T.B. and Howard. Given the totality of the evidence presented by the Department credibly establishing compliance with rule 141(b)(5), the Respondents' assertions that compliance did not occur are unsupported. The Department has established compliance with rule 141(b)(5) and the Respondent has failed to rebut this evidence. (Findings of Fact ¶¶ 2-12)

11. Except as set forth in this decision, all other allegations in the Accusation and all other contentions of the parties lack merit.

PENALTY

Since a prior violation within three years has been established, the standard penalty in this matter would be a 25-day suspension.

The Department recommended that the Respondents' license be suspended for 25 days. The Department argued that there was no support for a mitigated penalty.

The Respondents argued for a mitigated penalty, if the Accusation were to be sustained. The Respondents cited the existence of policies to prevent underage sales although little evidence was received as to what those policies were or if they had been improved subsequent to the incident to prevent future sales. Given the lack of concrete evidence from the Respondents, there is little support for a downward departure from the standard penalty.

The Respondent has been licensed since July 30, 2019, and this is already their second incident. The Department has shown repeated violations in a relatively short period of time and the sale in this matter involved alcoholic beverages sold to 17-year-olds. Mitigation is not warranted.

The penalty recommended herein complies with rule 144.

7 Eleven, Inc., JS Gill Enterprise, Inc.
DBA: 7 Eleven #16373D
File: 20-606054
Registration: 23093170
Page 7

ORDER

The Respondents' off-sale beer and wine license is hereby suspended for a period of 25 days.

Dated: August 17, 2023



Alberto Roldan
Administrative Law Judge

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adopt
<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Adopt: _____
By: _____ <i>J. McCallister</i>
Date: _____ <i>10/04/23</i>