

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

**AB-8640**

File: 20-214665 Reg: 06062352

7-ELEVEN, INC., WILLIAM PARGA, and LUCRETIA PARGA,  
dba 7-Eleven # 2131-13586  
913 Otay Lakes Road, Chula Vista, CA 91913,  
Appellants/Licensees

v.

DEPARTMENT OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL,  
Respondent

Administrative Law Judge at the Dept. Hearing: Rodolfo Echeverria

Appeals Board Hearing: November 1, 2007  
Los Angeles, CA

**ISSUED JANUARY 17, 2008**

7-Eleven, Inc., William Parga, and Lucretia Parga, doing business as 7-Eleven # 2131-13586 (appellants), appeal from a decision of the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control<sup>1</sup> which suspended their license for 15 days for their clerk selling an alcoholic beverage to a minor decoy, a violation of Business and Professions Code section 25658, subdivision (a).

Appearances on appeal include appellants 7-Eleven, Inc., William Parga, and Lucretia Parga, appearing through their counsel, Ralph B. Saltsman, Stephen W. Solomon, and Michael Akopyan, and the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, appearing through its counsel, David W. Sakamoto.

---

<sup>1</sup>The decision of the Department, dated October 17, 2006, is set forth in the appendix.

## FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Appellants' off-sale beer and wine license was issued on July 1, 1988. The Department filed an accusation against appellants charging that, on February 19, 2006, their clerk sold an alcoholic beverage to 17-year-old Ave Harrison, who was working as a minor decoy for the Department at the time.

At the administrative hearing held on August 2, 2006, documentary evidence was received and testimony concerning the sale was presented by Harrison (the decoy) and by Department investigator Sarah Hutson. Appellants presented no witnesses or documentary evidence.

The Department's decision determined that the violation charged was proved and no defense was established. Appellants then filed an appeal contending that the administrative law judge (ALJ) improperly denied appellants' motion to compel discovery, and the Department violated prohibitions against ex parte communications with the decision maker.<sup>2</sup>

## DISCUSSION

## I

Appellants assert in their brief that the ALJ improperly denied their pre-hearing motion to compel discovery. Their motion was brought in response to the Department's failure to comply with those parts of their discovery request that sought copies of any findings or decisions which determined that the present decoy's appearance was not that which could be generally expected of a person under the age of 21 and all

---

<sup>2</sup>Appellants also filed a motion asking the Board to augment the record with any Report of Hearing in the Department's file for this case. Our decision on the ex parte communication issue makes augmenting the record unnecessary, and the motion is denied.

decisions certified by the Department over a four-year period which determined that any decoy failed to comply with rule 141(b)(2). For all of the decisions specified, appellants also requested all photographs of the decoys in those decisions.

ALJ Gruen, who heard the motion, denied it because he concluded it would cause the Department an undue burden and consumption of time and because appellants failed to show that the requested items were relevant or would lead to admissible evidence. Appellants argue that the items requested are expressly included as discoverable matters in the Administrative Procedure Act (APA)<sup>3</sup> and the ALJ used erroneous standards in denying the motion.

This Board has discussed, and rejected, this argument numerous times before. Just as appellants' arguments are the same ones made before, our response is the same as before. We see no reason to once again go over our reasons for rejecting these arguments. Should appellants wish to review those reasons, they may find them fully set out in *7-Eleven, Inc./Virk* (2007) AB-8577, as well as many other Appeals Board opinions.

## II

Appellants contend the Department violated the APA by transmitting a report of hearing, prepared by the Department's advocate at the administrative hearing, to the Department's decision maker after the hearing but before the Department issued its decision. They rely on the California Supreme Court's holding in *Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 1 [145 P.3d 462, 50 Cal.Rptr.3d 585] (*Quintanar*) and an appellate court

---

<sup>3</sup>Government Code sections 11340-11529.

decision following *Quintanar, Chevron Stations, Inc. v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board* (2007) 149 Cal.App.4th 116 [57 Cal.Rptr.3d 6]. They assert that, at a minimum, this matter must be remanded to the Department for an evidentiary hearing regarding whether an ex parte communication occurred.

The Department disputes appellants' allegations of ex parte communications and asks the Appeals Board to remand this matter so that the factual question of whether such a communication was made can be resolved.

We agree with appellants that transmission of a report of hearing to the Department's decision maker is a violation of the APA. This was the clear holding of the Court in *Quintanar, supra*.

Both parties agree that remand is the appropriate remedy at this juncture. We agree, and as we have done in the numerous other cases involving this issue, we will remand the matter to the Department for an evidentiary hearing.

#### ORDER

The decision of the Department is affirmed as to the issue regarding discovery, but the matter is remanded to the Department for an evidentiary hearing regarding the issue of an ex parte communication.<sup>4</sup>

FRED ARMENDARIZ, CHAIRMAN  
SOPHIE C. WONG, MEMBER  
TINA FRANK, MEMBER  
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL  
APPEALS BOARD

---

<sup>4</sup>This order of remand is filed in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 23085, and does not constitute a final order within the meaning of Business and Professions Code section 23089.