

**BEFORE THE
SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY AND AUDIOLOGY AND HEARING AID
DISPENSERS BOARD
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

Case No. 1C-2010-122

**RANDY JESTER
c/o Menifee Hearing Aid LLC
26010 McCall Blvd. Suite G
Menifee, CA 92586
Hearing Aid Dispenser No. HA 1572**


Respondent.

DECISION AND ORDER

The attached Stipulated Surrender of License and Order is hereby adopted by the Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensers Board, Department of Consumer Affairs, as its Decision in this matter.

This Decision shall become effective on October 4, 2013.

It is so ORDERED September 4, 2013.


ALISON GRIMES, CHAIR
FOR THE SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY AND
AUDIOLOGY AND HEARING AID DISPENSERS BOARD
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

1 KAMALA D. HARRIS
Attorney General of California
2 ROBERT MCKIM BELL
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
3 WENDY WIDLUS
Deputy Attorney General
4 State Bar No. 82958
California Department of Justice
5 300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702
Los Angeles, California 90013
6 Telephone: (213) 897-2867
Facsimile: (213) 897-9395
7 E-mail: Wendy.Widlus@doj.ca.gov
Attorneys for Complainant
8

9 **BEFORE THE**
SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY AND AUDIOLOGY AND HEARING AID
10 **DISPENSERS BOARD**
11 **DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS**
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

12 In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

Case No. 1C-2010-122

13 **RANDY JESTER**
14 **c/o Meniffee Hearing Aid LLC**
15 **26010 McCall Blvd. Suite G**
16 **Sun City, CA 92586**
Hearing Aid Dispenser License No. HA 1572

**STIPULATED SURRENDER OF
LICENSE AND ORDER**

17 Respondent.

18 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the parties in this
19 proceeding that the following matters are true:
20

21 **PARTIES**

22 1. Annemarie Del Mugnaio (Complainant) is the Executive Officer of the Speech-
23 Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensers Board. She brought this action
24 solely in her official capacity and is represented in this matter by Kamala D. Harris, Attorney
25 General of the State of California, by Wendy Widlus, Deputy Attorney General.

26 2. RANDY JESTER (Respondent) is representing himself in this proceeding and has
27 chosen not to exercise his right to be represented by counsel.

28 3. On or about January 15, 1983, the Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology and
Hearing Aid Dispensers Board issued Hearing Aid Dispenser License No. HA 1572 to RANDY

1 JESTER (Respondent). The Hearing Aid Dispenser License was in full force and effect at all
2 times relevant to the charges brought in Accusation No. 1C-2010-122 and will expire on May 31,
3 2013, unless renewed.

4 JURISDICTION

5 4. Accusation No. 1C-2010-122 was filed before the Speech-Language Pathology and
6 Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensers Board (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs, and is
7 currently pending against Respondent. The Accusation and all other statutorily required
8 documents were properly served on Respondent on March 29, 2012. Respondent timely filed his
9 Notice of Defense contesting the Accusation. A copy of Accusation No. 1C-2010-122 is attached
10 as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.

11 ADVISEMENT AND WAIVERS

12 5. Respondent has carefully read, and understands the charges and allegations in
13 Accusation No. 1C-2010-122. Respondent also has carefully read, and understands the effects of
14 this Stipulated Surrender of License and Order.

15 6. Respondent is fully aware of his legal rights in this matter, including the right to a
16 hearing on the charges and allegations in the Accusation; the right to be represented by counsel, at
17 his own expense; the right to confront and cross-examine the witnesses against him; the right to
18 present evidence and to testify on his own behalf; the right to the issuance of subpoenas to compel
19 the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents; the right to reconsideration and
20 court review of an adverse decision; and all other rights accorded by the California
21 Administrative Procedure Act and other applicable laws.

22 7. Respondent voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently waives and gives up each and
23 every right set forth above.

24 CULPABILITY

25 8. Respondent admits the truth of each and every charge and allegation in Accusation
26 No. 1C-2010-122, agrees that cause exists for discipline, and hereby surrenders his Hearing Aid
27 Dispenser License No. HA 1572 for the Board's formal acceptance.
28

1 2. Respondent shall lose all rights and privileges as a Hearing Aid Dispenser in
2 California as of the effective date of the Board's Decision and Order.

3 3. Respondent shall cause to be delivered to the Board his pocket license and, if one was
4 issued, his wall certificate on or before the effective date of the Decision and Order.

5 4. If Respondent should ever apply or reapply for a new license or certification, or
6 petition for reinstatement of a license, with the Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology and
7 Hearing Aid Dispensers Board or by any other health care licensing agency in the State of
8 California, all of the charges and allegations contained in Accusation No. 1C-2010-122 shall be
9 deemed to be true, correct, and admitted by Respondent for the purpose of any Statement of
10 Issues or any other proceeding seeking to deny or restrict licensure.

11 5. Respondent shall make restitution in the amount of \$7,500.00 to patient, Ms. B H., as
12 identified in Accusation No. 1C-2010-122, prior to making an application to the Speech-
13 Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensers Board for a new license or
14 certification, or petition for reinstatement of a license. Respondent shall make restitution in the
15 amount of \$7,500.00 to patient, Ms. B H., as identified in Accusation No. 1C-2010-122, prior to
16 making an application for any license issued by any other health care licensing agency in the
17 State of California.

18 6. Respondent shall make restitution in the amount of \$5995.00 to patient Ms. G. H.'s
19 son, Mr. T. H., as identified in Accusation No. 1C-2010-122, prior to making an application to the
20 Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensers Board for a new license
21 or certification, or petition for reinstatement of a license. Respondent shall make restitution in the
22 amount of \$5995.00 to Ms. G. H.'s son, Mr. T. H., as identified in Accusation No. 1C-2010-122,
23 prior to making an application for any license issued by any other health care licensing agency in
24 the State of California.

25 7. Respondent shall pay the Board its costs of investigation and enforcement in the
26 amount of \$7645.75 prior to issuance of a new or reinstated license.

27 //

28 //

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

ACCEPTANCE

I have carefully read the Stipulated Surrender of License and Order. I understand the stipulation and the effect it will have on my Hearing Aid Dispenser. I enter into this Stipulated Surrender of License and Order voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently, and agree to be bound by the Decision and Order of the Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensers Board.

DATED:

11-26-12


RANDY JESTER
Respondent

ENDORSEMENT


The foregoing Stipulated Surrender of License and Order is hereby respectfully submitted for consideration by the Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensers Board of the Department of Consumer Affairs.

Dated:

11/27/12

Respectfully submitted,

KAMALA D. HARRIS
Attorney General of California
ROBERT MCKIM BELL
Supervising Deputy Attorney General


WENDY WIDLUS
Deputy Attorney General
Attorneys for Complainant

LA2011504192
60892711.docx

Exhibit A

Accusation No. 1C-2010-122

1 KAMALA D. HARRIS
Attorney General of California
2 ROBERT MCKIM BELL
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
3 WENDY WIDLUS
Deputy Attorney General
4 State Bar No. 82958
California Department of Justice
5 300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702
Los Angeles, California 90013
6 Telephone: (213) 897-2867
Facsimile: (213) 897-9395
7 E-mail: Wendy.Widlus@doj.ca.gov
Attorneys for Complainant
8

FILED - STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology
& Hearing Aid Dispensers Board
Sacramento, California on March 29, 2012

By *Gyenne Crawford*

9
10 **BEFORE THE**
SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY AND AUDIOLOGY AND HEARING AID
DISPENSERS BOARD
11 **DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS**
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

12 RANDY JESTER
13 Menifee Hearing Aid
14 26010 McCall Boulevard, #G
15 Sun City, CA 92586
16 Hearing Aid Dispenser License No. HA 1572,
17 Respondent.
18

Case No. 1C-2010-122

ACCUSATION

19 Complainant alleges:

20 **PARTIES**

21 1. Annemarie Del Mugnaio (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official
22 capacity as the Executive Officer of the Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing
23 Aid Dispensers Board (Board), formerly known as the Hearing Aid Dispensers Bureau,
24 Department of Consumer Affairs.

25 2. On or about January 15, 1983, the Board issued Hearing Aid Dispenser License
26 number HA 1572 to Randy Jester (Respondent). That license was in full force and effect at all
27 times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on May 31, 2012.
28

1 JURISDICTION

2 3. This Accusation is brought before the Board under the authority of the following
3 laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.

4 4. Section 2538.11 of the Code provides, in pertinent part,

5 “(a) ‘Practice of fitting or selling hearing aids,’ as used in this chapter, means those
6 practices used for the purpose of selection and adaptation of hearing aids, including direct
7 observation of the ear, testing of hearing in connection with the fitting and selling of hearing aids,
8 taking of ear mold impressions, fitting or sale of hearing aids, and any other necessary postfitting
9 counseling. The practice of selling hearing aids does not include the act of concluding the
10 transaction by a retail clerk.”

11 5. Section 2533 of the Code provides that the board may deny, issue subject to terms
12 and conditions, suspend or revoke a license, or impose conditions of probation upon a licensee,
13 for any of the following causes:

14 The board may refuse to issue, or issue subject to terms and conditions, a license on the
15 grounds specified in Section 480, or may suspend, revoke, or impose terms and conditions upon
16 the license of any licensee for any of the following:

17 “(a) Conviction of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties
18 of a speech-language pathologist or audiologist or hearing aid dispenser, as the case may be. The
19 record of the conviction shall be conclusive evidence thereof.

20 “(b) Securing a license by fraud or deceit.

21 “(c) (1) The use or administering to himself or herself, of any controlled substance;

22 “(c) (2) the use of any of the dangerous drugs specified in Section 4022, or of alcoholic
23 beverages, to the extent, or in a manner as to be dangerous or injurious to the licensee, to any
24 other person, or to the public, or to the extent that the use impairs the ability of the licensee to
25 practice speech-language pathology or audiology safely;

26 “(c) (3) more than one misdemeanor or any felony involving the use, consumption, or
27 self-administration of any of the substances referred to in this section; or
28

1 “(c) (4) any combination of paragraph (1), (2), or (3). The record of the conviction shall
2 be conclusive evidence of unprofessional conduct.

3 “(d) Advertising in violation of Section 17500. Advertising an academic degree that was
4 not validly awarded or earned under the laws of this state or the applicable jurisdiction in which it
5 was issued is deemed to constitute a violation of Section 17500.

6 “(e) Committing a dishonest or fraudulent act that is substantially related to the
7 qualifications, functions, or duties of a licensee.

8 “(f) Incompetence, gross negligence, or repeated negligent acts.

9 “(g) Other acts that have endangered or are likely to endanger the health, welfare, and
10 safety of the public.

11 “(h) Use by a hearing aid dispenser of the term "doctor" or "physician" or "clinic" or
12 "audiologist," or any derivation thereof, except as authorized by law.

13 “(i) The use, or causing the use, of any advertising or promotional literature in a manner
14 that has the capacity or tendency to mislead or deceive purchasers or prospective purchasers.

15 “(j) Any cause that would be grounds for denial of an application for a license.

16 “(k) Violation of Section 1689.6 or 1793.02 of the Civil Code.”

17 6. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may request the
18 administrative law judge to direct a licensee found to have committed a violation or violations of
19 the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and
20 enforcement of the case.

21 7. Section 490.5 of the Code states: "A board may suspend a license pursuant to Section
22 17520 of the Family Code if a licensee is not in compliance with a child support order or
23 judgment."

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

1 **FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE**

2 **(Fraud and Misrepresentation in the Fitting or Selling of a Hearing Aid – Client B.H.)**

3 **[Bus. & Prof. Code section 2533 (e)]**

4 8. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 2533 (e) of the Code in that he
5 committed fraud¹ and misrepresentation in the fitting and selling of a hearing aid to client B.H.

6 The circumstances are as follows:

7 9. On or about November 13, 2008, Ms. B H.² went to Respondent's office to have her
8 current pair of hearing aids, "Sonic Innovations," tuned and adjusted. The "Sonic Innovations"
9 cost Ms. B H. \$4,900 to purchase.

10 10. Instead of adjusting the "Sonic Innovations" hearing aids as requested, Respondent
11 told Ms. B H. the hearing aids were inadequate and persuaded Ms. B H. to purchase a separate
12 hearing aid from him. Respondent told Ms. B H. that he would sell her a new pair of "Audina
13 CIC" hearing aids which would be more appropriate for her hearing loss.

14 11. Ms. B H. provided Respondent with her hearing aid, worth \$4,900 in trade plus gave
15 Respondent an additional cash payment of \$2,600 to purchase the "Audina CIC" hearing aids
16 from him, a total expenditure of \$7,500.

17 12. Ms. B H. used the "Audina CIC" hearing aid for several months, and was never
18 satisfied with the performance of the hearing aid. While using the "Audina CIC" hearing aids she
19 was unable to hear well enough to use the phone. In April of 2009, Ms. B H. went to
20 Respondent's office to tell Respondent she was not happy with the "Audina CIC" hearing aids
21 she purchased from him and found Respondent had closed his business.

22
23 ¹ Fraud is defined in California Civil Code section 1572 as follows, "Actual fraud, within the meaning of
24 this Chapter, consists in any of the following acts, committed by a party to the contract, or with his connivance, with
25 intent to deceive another party thereto, or to induce him to enter into the contract: (1) The suggestion, as a fact, of
26 that which is not true, by one who does not believe it to be true; (2) The positive assertion, in a manner not warranted
by the information of the person making it, of that which is not true, though he believes it to be true; (3) The
suppression of that which is true, by one having knowledge or belief of the fact; (4) A promise made without any
intention of performing it; or, (5) Any other act fitted to deceive."

27 ² The names of the patients are abbreviated to protect their privacy rights. The patient names will be
28 provided to Respondent upon a written request for discovery.

1 13. Ms. B H. repeatedly attempted to reach Respondent at the phone number he had
2 posted at his now defunct office location, but the phone was never in service. After several
3 months of attempting to locate Respondent, Ms. B H. finally found a working phone number for
4 him over the Internet. When Ms. B H. finally spoke to Respondent, he told her he had moved to a
5 new city, but that he would be in her area and would stop by and discuss the matter with her.
6 Respondent also offered to sell Ms. B H. another pair of hearing aids. Respondent never called or
7 visited Ms. B H. as he stated he would during their phone call.

8 14. After repeatedly attempting unsuccessfully to reach Respondent, Ms. B H. went to
9 another hearing aid dispenser and purchased a new set of hearing aids.

10 15. The applicable standard of care in this matter is clear. When a patient comes into a
11 hearing aid dispenser's office with a set of hearing aids which are appropriate for the hearing loss
12 the patient has and asks the dispenser for an adjustment, it is the hearing aid dispenser's
13 responsibility to take one of the following actions for the patient:

14 A. Work with the hearing aids the patient is wearing and attempt to do whatever
15 can be done to adjust the aids to the patient's satisfaction.

16 B. If the dispenser cannot adjust the hearing aids to the patient's satisfaction, the
17 dispenser should refer the patient back to the office where the aids were originally purchased for
18 further adjustments.

19 16. It is a violation of the standard of care in this situation for a hearing aid dispenser to
20 sell the patient new hearing aids when the current hearing aids are appropriate for their hearing
21 loss. In his dealings with patient Ms. B H., as alleged above, the Respondent made material
22 misrepresentations of fact, failed to disclose other important facts and made promises without the
23 intention of performing. The sale of new hearing aids in this situation is for the profit of the
24 hearing aid dispenser and therefore an act of fraud on the Respondent's part.

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

1 SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

2 (Fraud and Misrepresentation in the Fitting or Selling of a Hearing Aid – Client G.H.)

3 [Bus. & Prof. Code section 2533 (e)]

4 17. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 2533 (e) of the Code in that
5 he committed fraud and misrepresentation in the fitting and selling of a hearing aid. The
6 circumstances are as follows:

7 18. On or about December 24, 2007, patient Ms. G H. went with her son, Mr. T H., to
8 Respondent's office and purchased a set of hearing aids. Respondent informed them he did not
9 accept "Visa" for payment. Consequently, Ms. G H. and her son, Mr. T H., each withdrew
10 money from their credit cards to pay Respondent \$3,500.00, the full cost for the hearing aids on
11 that day.

12 Mr. T H. told Respondent when he paid Respondent \$3,500.00, the full cost for the hearing
13 aids, that the credit card company charged a high rate of interest (28%) for these two withdrawals
14 so he would appreciate Respondent advising him as quickly as possible when the insurance
15 company paid Respondent. Respondent assured Ms. G H. and Mr. T H. that he would reimburse
16 them as soon as Ms. G H.'s insurance company paid him.

17 19. Ms. G H.'s insurance company paid Respondent \$5,995 immediately. Nonetheless,
18 Respondent did not notify Ms. G H. or her son, Mr. T H., about this reimbursement as he said he
19 would. Moreover, during the many occasions when the patient and her son contacted
20 Respondent about receiving repayment Respondent told them he could not pay them for a variety
21 of reasons.

22 20. On September 6, 2010, having still not received payment from Respondent, who by
23 then had moved away to a different city, the patient filed a complaint with the Board. On May
24 12, 2011, the Department of Consumer Affairs Division of Investigation assigned Investigator for
25 this matter, Ms. Tracey Kanno, mailed a letter to Respondent asking that Respondent contact her
26 about this complaint.

27 21. On May 16, 2011, Respondent contacted Mr. T H. and agreed to pay him \$5,995 as
28 follows: an immediate check in the amount of \$3,500, with the balance to be sent thereafter in

1 monthly payments until he reimbursed the patient for the full amount the insurance company had
2 paid Respondent.

3 22. In his dealings with patient Ms. G H., as alleged above, the Respondent made
4 material misrepresentations of fact, failed to disclose other important facts, and made promises
5 without the intention of performing. By refusing to return his patient's money immediately and
6 only returning the insurance company payment to the patient after being contacted by the Board's
7 investigator, under the circumstances alleged above, Respondent committed fraud.

8 DISCIPLINE CONSIDERATIONS

9 23. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent,
10 Complainant alleges the following disciplinary history: that on or about October 31, 2005, in
11 proceedings entitled *In the Matter of the Accusation Against Randy Jester* before the Speech-
12 Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing Aid Dispensers Board, Case Number D1-2001-
13 29, Respondent admitted all allegations.

14 As a result of his complete admission in the disciplinary matter alleged above, Respondent
15 was placed on one (1) year's probation which conditions included payment of restitution to the
16 patient, as well as cost recovery for the Board. That decision is now final and is incorporated by
17 reference as if fully set forth.

18 PRAYER

19 **WHEREFORE**, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged,
20 and that following the hearing, the Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing Aid
21 Dispensers Board issue a decision:

- 22 1. Revoking or suspending Hearing Aid Dispenser License number HA 1572, issued to
23 Randy Jester;
- 24 2. Ordering him to pay the Board the reasonable costs of the investigation and
25 enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 125.3;
- 26 3. If placed on probation, ordering him to pay to the Board the costs of probation
27 monitoring; and
28

4. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

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

DATED: March 29, 2012

Annemarie Del Mugnaio

ANNEMARIE DEL MUGNAIO
Executive Officer
Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology and Hearing
Aid Dispensers Board
Department of Consumer Affairs
State of California
Complainant

LA2011504192
Ace post client review.docx