

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
LICENSING AND REGULATION

*

*

v.

*

*

CASE NO.: SPMG-09-0010

LAURENCE C. SANDERS
Pasadena Jewelers, Inc.
31 Magothy Beach Road
102
Pasadena, Maryland 21122,

*

*

*

Respondent

* * * * *

CONSENT ORDER

This matter comes before the Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation (“Department”) based on a complaint filed by the Anne Arundel County Police Department. Based on that complaint, the Department determined that administrative charges against Laurence C. Sanders (“Respondent”) were appropriate and that an administrative hearing on those charges should be held. A hearing was scheduled for September 29-30, 2009 at the Office of Administrative Hearings, but the Department and the Respondent reached an agreement to resolve the matter by Consent Order. The Department and the Respondent consent to the entry of this Order as final resolution of the regulatory charges in Case No. SPMG-09-0010.

IT IS STIPULATED BY THAT PARTIES that:

1. The Respondent is currently licensed (No. 2234) as a secondhand precious metal object dealer (“dealer”), as defined in Section 12-101(b) of the Business Regulation Article of the Maryland Annotated Code.

2. The name of the company through which the Respondent acquires secondhand precious metal objects is Pasadena Jewelers, Inc.

3. Between approximately September 1, 2008 and November 10, 2008, the Respondent acquired secondhand precious metal objects ("object" or "objects").

4. The Respondent completed daily return, or transaction, forms for objects acquired during that period.

5. The following daily return, or transaction, forms were completed incorrectly:

A. Transaction No. 1021 failed to include the licensee's name and failed to note whether the seller used glasses and had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features.

B. Transaction No. 1057 failed to include the licensee's name; failed to include the seller's race; and failed to note whether the seller wore glasses and had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features.

C. Transaction Nos. 1059, 1061, and 1093 failed to include the licensee's name and failed to note whether the seller had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features

D. Transaction No. 1062 failed to include the licensee's name; failed to include the seller's telephone number; and failed to note whether the seller had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features.

E. Transaction Nos. 1063, 1066, 1067, 1068, 1070, 1073, 1075, 1076, 1077, 1079, 1080, 1081, 1084, 1086, 1087, 1089, 1090, an 1091 failed to include the licensee's name; failed to include the times of the transactions; and failed to note whether the sellers had distinguishing features. In addition, Transaction Nos. 1080 and 1089 failed to note whether the sellers were known to the dealer.

F. Transaction Nos. 1064 and 1071 failed to include the licensee's name and the time of the transaction.

G. Transaction No. 1072 failed to include the licensee's name and failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features.

H. Transaction Nos. 1078 failed to include the licensee's name; failed to include the time of the transaction; failed to note whether the photographic identification was used; and failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and was known to the dealer.

J. Transaction No. 1082 failed to include the licensee's name and address; failed to include the time of the transaction; and failed to note whether the seller used glasses and had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features.

K. Transaction Nos. 1083 and 1085 failed to include the licensee's name; failed to include the times of the transactions; and failed to note whether the sellers had other distinguishing features or were known to the dealer.

L. Transaction No. 1094 failed to include the licensee's name; failed to include the time of the transaction; and failed to note whether the seller had a beard, mustache, tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features.

M. Transaction Nos. 1095, 1096, and 1097 failed to include the licensee's name and failed to note whether the sellers used glasses and had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features.

N. Transaction No. 1098 failed to include the licensee's name; failed to include the time of the transaction; and failed to note whether the seller had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features.

O. Transaction No. 1099 failed to include the licensee's name and failed to note whether the seller used glasses and had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features.

P. Transaction Nos. 1102 and 1104 failed to include the licensee's name and failed to note whether the sellers had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features.

Q. Transaction No. 1047, dated October 24, 2008, failed to include the licensee's name and failed to note whether the seller used glasses and had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features.

R. Transaction No. 1055, dated October 28, 2008, failed to include the licensee's name; failed to include the time of the transaction; and failed to note whether the seller had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features.

S. Transaction No. 1056, dated October 28, 2008, failed to include the licensee's name and failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features.

T. Transaction No. 1058, dated October 28, 2008, failed to include the licensee's name and failed to note whether the seller had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features.

U. Transaction No. 1065, dated October 29, 2008, failed to include the licensee's name and the time of the transaction.

V. Transaction No. 1069, 1074, and 1088, dated October 29, 2008, failed to include the licensee's name; failed to include the time of the transactions; and failed to note whether the sellers had other distinguishing features.

6. Between the period of approximately November 12 and December 10, 2008, the Respondent acquired objects.

7. The Respondent submitted daily return, or transaction, forms for objects acquired during that period to the primary law enforcement unit.

8. The following daily return, or transaction, forms were completed incorrectly:

A. Transaction No. 1151, dated November 12, 2008, failed to include the licensee's name; failed to note whether the seller used glasses and had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features; as to the first object listed, failed to note that it included a pendant; and, as to the second and third objects listed, failed to include the dealer's price for each object.

B. Transaction No. 1152, dated November 12, 2008, failed to include the licensee's name; failed to include the seller's telephone number; failed to note whether the seller used glasses and had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features; as to the first object listed, failed to note that the object included one red stone and four clear stones; and, as to the second object listed, failed to note that the object included one blue stone and six clear stones.

C. Transaction No. 1153, dated November 12, 2008, failed to include the licensee's name; as to the first object listed, failed to include the watch's serial number; as to the fifth object listed, failed to note that the object was a necklace; and, as to the seventh object listed, failed to note that the object was a pendant with four red and four white stones.

D. Transaction No. 1154, dated November 12, 2008, failed to include the licensee's name.

E. Transaction No. 1155, dated November 13, 2008, failed to include the licensee's name; failed to note whether the seller used glasses and had other distinguishing features; and failed to note whether the seller was known to the dealer.

F. Transaction No. 1156, dated November 13, 2008, failed to include the licensee's name; failed to note whether the seller had a beard or mustache and whether the seller had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features; and, as to the third object listed, failed to note that the object included one clear and one purple stone.

G. Transaction No. 1157, dated November 14, 2008, failed to include the licensee's name; failed to include the seller's complete address; and failed to note whether the seller used glasses and had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features.

H. Transaction No. 1158, dated November 14, 2008, failed to include the licensee's name; failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features; and failed to include the weights of the objects.

- I. Transaction No. 1159, dated November 14, 2008, failed to include the licensee's name; failed to note whether the seller used glasses and had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features; and, as to the first object listed, failed to note that it included an engraving and an orange stone.
- J. Transaction No. 1160, dated November 15, 2008, failed to include the licensee's name and failed to note whether the seller used glasses and had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features.
- K. Transaction No. 1161, dated November 15, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features; and, as to the first object listed, failed to note that the object was yellow gold.
- L. Transaction No. 1162, dated November 16, 2008, failed to include the seller's telephone number; failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features; as to the third object listed, failed to note that the object included two green stones and one pink stone; and, as to the sixth object listed, failed to specify that the object was a ring with no stone.
- M. Transaction No. 1163, dated November 16, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and failed to include the weight of the seventeenth object listed.
- N. Transaction No. 1164, dated, November 16, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and, as to the third object listed, failed to note that the object was a ring.
- O. Transaction No. 1165, dated November 16, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features.
- P. Transaction No. 1166, dated November 16, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and, as to the fourth object listed, failed to specify the colors and the number of stones.

Q. Transaction No. 1167, dated November 16, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and, as to the fifth object listed, failed to note that it included one glass stone.

R. Transaction No. 1168, dated November 16, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and, as to the second object listed, failed to note that the object included three stones.

S. Transaction No. 1169, dated November 16, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features.

T. Transaction No. 1170, dated November 16, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and, as to the second object listed, failed to note that the object included two blue stones and five clear stones.

U. Transaction No. 1171, dated November 16, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and, as to the fifth object listed, failed to note the number and color of stones.

V. Transaction No. 1172, dated November 16, 2008, failed to include the seller's complete address and failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features.

W. Transaction no. 1173, dated November 17, 2008, failed to include the licensee's name and failed to note whether the seller used glasses and whether the seller had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features.

X. Transaction Nos. 1174, 1175, and 1176, dated November 17, 2008, failed to note whether the sellers had other distinguishing features.

Y. Transaction No. 1177, dated November 17, 2008, failed to include the seller's date of birth; failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features; and, as to the third object listed, failed to include the color of the gold.

- Z. Transaction No. 1178, dated November 18, 2008, failed to include the licensee's name and failed to note whether the seller had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features.
- AA. Transaction Nos. 1179 and 1180, dated November 17, 2008, failed to note whether the sellers had other distinguishing features.
- BB. Transaction No. 1181, dated November 17, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features.
- CC. Transaction No. 1182, dated November 18, 2008, failed to include the licensee's name and failed to note whether the seller used glasses and whether the seller had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features.
- DD. Transaction No. 1183, dated November 18, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and, as to the second and third objects listed, failed to note the color of the gold.
- EE. Transaction No. 1184, dated November 18, 2008, failed to include the licensee's name; failed to note whether the seller used glasses and whether the seller had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features; and, as to the fourth object listed, failed to adequately describe the ring and its engraving.
- FF. Transaction No. 1185, dated November 19, 2008, failed to include the licensee's name and failed to note whether the seller used glasses and whether the seller had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features.
- GG. Transaction No. 1186, dated November 19, 2008, failed to include the licensee's name and failed to note whether the seller had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features.
- HH. Transaction No. 1187, dated November 18, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features.
- II. Transaction No. 1188, dated November 18, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and, as to the fifth object listed, failed to note that the object was a ring.

JJ. Transaction No. 1189, dated November 18, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features.

KK. Transaction No. 1190, dated November 18, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and, as to the seventh object listed, failed to note that the object was a ring.

LL. Transaction No. 1191, dated November 18, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing feature and, as to the third object listed, failed to note that the object was a ring.

MM. Transaction No. 1192, dated November 18, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and, as to the sixth and seventh objects listed, failed to note that the objects were pendants.

NN. Transaction No. 1193, dated November 18, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features.

OO. Transaction No. 1194, dated November 20, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features; as to the first object listed, failed to note that the object was a ring; and, as to the second object listed, failed to note the color of the gold or stone.

PP. Transaction No. 1195, dated November 20, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and, as to the first object listed, failed to note the type and the color of the stone.

QQ. Transaction No. 1196, dated November 20, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and failed to note the color of the seller's eyes.

9. Between approximately November 21 and December 22, 2008, the Respondent acquired objects and completed daily return, or transaction, forms for objects acquired during that period.

10. The following forms were completed incorrectly:

A. Transaction No. 1198, dated November 21, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features; failed to adequately describe the seller's eye color; as to the second object listed, failed to note that the object was a white gold set with two pink stones and two clear stones; as to the fourth object listed, failed to note that the stones were missing; and, as to the fifth object, failed to note that the object was a ring.

B. Transaction No. 1199, dated November 21, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features.

C. Transaction No. 1200, dated November 21, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and, as to the fourth object listed, failed to specify that the object was a ring.

D. Transaction No. 1201, dated November 22, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features.

E. Transaction No. 1202, dated November 23, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and, as to the second object listed, failed to specify that the object was a ring.

F. Transaction No. 1203, dated November 23, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features.

G. Transaction No. 1204, dated November 23, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features; as to the first object listed, failed to note that the object was yellow gold; as to the third object listed, failed to note the object's engraving; and, as to the fourth object listed, failed to note that the object was a pendant.

H. Transaction No. 1205, dated November 23, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features.

I. Transaction No. 1206, dated November 23, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and, as to the second object listed, failed to describe the object as loop earrings.

J. Transaction No. 1207, dated November 23, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features, and, as to the first object listed, failed to note the class ring's year.

K. Transaction No. 1208, dated November 23, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and, as the fifth object listed, failed to specify that the object was a ring.

L. Transaction No. 1209, dated November 23, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features.

M. Transaction No. 1210, dated November 23, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and, as to the second object listed, failed to note that the object had an engraving.

N. Transaction No. 1211, dated November 23, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features.

O. Transaction No. 1212, dated November 23, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and, as to the fifth object listed, failed to note that the object was a ring containing a pearl with one stone missing.

P. Transaction No. 1213, dated November 23, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features; failed to include the seller's date of birth; and, as to the third object listed, failed to note that the object was a class ring with an engraving "LMK."

Q. Transaction No. 1214, dated November 23, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features; as to the first object listed, failed to note that the object was a 1975 class ring with "LFH" engraved and included an incorrect weight for the object; as to the second object listed, failed to specify that the object was a tennis bracelet with multiple

stones and included an incorrect weight for the object; and, as to the third object, included an incorrect weight. In addition, the dealer's bag containing the three objects listed on the reporting form included other objects which were not listed on the form.

R. Transaction No. 1215, dated November 23, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and failed to include the time of the transaction.

S. Transaction No. 1216, dated November 24, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and, as to the first object listed, failed to specify that the object was a 1987 Friendly High School ring with an engraving and a green stone.

T. Transaction No. 1217, dated November 23, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features; failed to include the time of the transaction; as to the first object listed, failed to specify that the object was a ring with no stone; and, as to the fourth object, included an incorrect weight. In addition, the seller sold approximately seven other objects which were not listed on this report form. Further, the dealer's bag containing the objects listed on the reporting form included other objects not listed on the form.

U. Transaction Nos. 1218, 1219, and 1220, dated November 23, 2008, failed to note whether the sellers had other distinguishing features.

V. Transaction No. 1221, dated November 23, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features; as to the first and fifth objects listed, those objects were missing during a police inspection; as to the second object listed, failed to specify that the object was a tennis bracelet with numerous white stones and included an incorrect weight for the object; and, as to the fourth object listed, failed to specify that the object was a cross pendant and included an incorrect weight for the object. In addition, the dealer's bag containing the objects listed on the reporting form included other objects not listed on the form. Further, the seller sold several other objects which were not included on the form.

W. Transaction Nos. 1222, 1223, and 1224, dated November 23, 2008, failed to note whether the sellers had other distinguishing features.

X. Transaction No. 1225, dated November 23, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features; failed to include the time of the transaction; and, as to the first object listed, failed to specify that the object was a ring.

Y. Transaction Nos. 1226, 1227, and 1228, dated November 23, 2008, failed to note whether the sellers had other distinguishing features. In addition, Transaction No. 1227 failed to include the time of the transaction.

Z. Transaction No. 1229, dated November 24, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features.

AA. Transaction No. 1230, dated November 24, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features.

BB. Transaction Nos. 1231 and 1232, dated November 25, 2008, failed to note whether the sellers had other distinguishing features.

CC. Transaction No. 1233, dated November 25, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features; as to the first object listed, failed to specify that the object was a yellow gold set with a stone missing from the center but containing several stones around the center; and, as to the fourth object, included an incorrect weight for the object. In addition, the seller sold several other objects which were not included on the reporting form.

DD. Transaction No. 1234, dated November 26, 2008, failed to note or other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

EE. Transaction No. 1235, dated November 29, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

FF. Transaction, No. 1241, dated December 2, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

GG. Transaction Nos. 1243, 1244, and 1245, dated December 4, 2008, failed to note whether the sellers had other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

HH. Transaction No. 1246, dated December 5, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features; failed to include the licensee's name; and failed to adequately specify the number of stones in the fourth object listed.

II. Transaction No. 1247, dated December 5, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and failed to include licensee's name.

JJ. Transaction No. 1248, dated December 5, 2008, failed to include the licensee's name; failed to note whether the seller had a beard, mustache, scars, tattoos, or other distinguishing features; and failed to include the seller's telephone number.

KK. Transaction Nos. 1249, 1250, and 1251, dated December 5, 2008, failed to note whether the sellers had other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

LL. Transaction No. 1252, dated December 5, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

MM. Transaction Nos. 1253, 1254, 1255, 1256, 1257, 1258, and 1259, dated December 5, 2008, failed to note whether the sellers had other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

NN. Transaction No. 1260, dated December 5, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

OO. Transaction Nos. 1261, 1262, 1263, 1264, 1265, 1266, 1267, and 1268, dated December 7, 2008, failed to note whether the sellers had other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

PP. Transaction No. 1269, dated December 7, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features; failed to include the licensee's name; as to the first object listed, included an incorrect weight for the object; as to the second object listed, failed to specify that the objects included one dolphin ring, one butterfly ring, one yellow double heart ring, one ring engraved with "C," 1 Bear ring, and two yellow and pink heart rings; and, as to the fourth object listed, failed to specify that the object was a charm bracelet with five charms (Mom Heart, Bingo card, Taurus, Anchor Cross, and Love Heart) and included an incorrect weight for the object.

QQ. Transaction Nos. 1270, 1271, 1272, 1273, 1274, 1275, 1276, 1277, 1278, 1279, and 1280, dated December 7, 2008, failed to note whether the sellers had other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

RR. Transaction No. 1281, dated December 7, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features; failed to include the licensee's name; as to the second and fourth objects listed, failed to specify that the objects included only nine rings, including one woman's wedding band, one initial ring with white stones, two rings with white stones, one ring with "B" engraved, one nugget ring, one heart initial ring "R," a yellow and pink rose ring, and one love ring with white stones; and, as to the fifth object, included an incorrect weight for the object. In addition, during an inspection by the police, the third object listed was missing from the bag containing the objects in this transition.

SS. Transaction No. 1282 and 1283, dated December 7, 2008, failed to note whether the sellers had other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

TT. Transaction No. 1284 and 1285, dated December 8, 2008, failed to note whether the sellers had other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

UU. Transaction no. 1286 and 1287 dated December 9, 2009, failed to note whether the sellers had other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

VV. Transaction No. 1288, dated December 10, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

WW. Transaction No. 1289, dated December 10, 2008, failed to note whether the seller other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

XX. Transaction No. 1290, dated December 10, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

YY. Transaction No. 1291, dated December 10, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

ZZ. Transaction No. 1292, dated December 11, 2008, failed to include the time of the transaction; failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features; and failed to include the licensee's name.

AAA. Transaction Nos. 1293, 1294, 1295, 1296, and 1297, dated December 10, 2008, failed to note whether the sellers had other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

BBB. Transaction No. 1298, dated December 10, 2008, failed to include the color of the seller's hair; failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features; and failed to include the licensee's name.

CCC. Transaction No. 1299, dated December 10, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had scars, tattoos, or other

distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

DDD. Transaction No. 1300, dated December 10, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

EEE. Transaction No. 1301, dated December 10, 2008, failed to include the licensee's name.

FFF. Transaction No. 1302, dated December 10, 2008, failed to include the seller's complete address; failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features; and failed to include the licensee's name.

GGG. Transaction Nos. 1303 and 1304, dated December 10, 2008, failed to note whether the sellers had other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

HHH. Transaction Nos. 1305 and 1306, dated December 11, 2008, failed to note whether the sellers had other distinguishing features and failed to note the licensee's name.

III. Transaction No. 1307, dated December 12, 2008, failed to include an additional bracelet that had been acquired; failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features; failed to include the licensee's name; and, as to the twelfth object, included an incorrect weight for the object.

JJJ. Transaction Nos. No. 1308, 1309, and 1310, dated December 12, 2008, failed to note whether the sellers had other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

KKK. Transaction No. 1311, dated December 13, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features; failed to include the licensee's name; as to the fifth object listed, failed to specify that the object was a charm holder with four charms ("K," "Dog Head," "Rose," and "Heart"); and, as to the sixth object listed, failed to specify that the object was six single hoop earrings.

LLL. Transaction No. 1312, dated December 14, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

MMM. Transaction No. 1315, dated December 16, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

NNN. Transaction No. 1317, dated December 17, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

OOO. Transaction No. 1318, dated December 18, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features; failed to include the licensee's name; and, as to the eighth, twelfth, and thirteenth objects listed, failed to specify that the objects were yellow.

PPP. Transaction No. 1320, dated December 22, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

QQQ. Transaction No. 1322, dated December 22, 2008, failed to note whether the seller had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features and failed to include the licensee's name.

11. Members of the Anne Arundel County Police Department visited the Respondent shop on or about December 8, 2008 to inspect transactions because of reporting violations.

12. At a hearing, the police would testify that they observed that the Respondent held bags which contained objects below a table and that he did not provide the police access to all the objects in the bags, while the Respondent would testify that he provided all objects specifically requested by the police.

13. The Respondent knew, or should have known, that the reporting forms had to be completed fully and accurately and in accordance with applicable statutory provisions.

14. By entering this Consent Order, the Respondent expressly waives his right to any hearing or further proceedings to which he may be entitled in this matter and any rights to appeal from the Consent Order.

15. The Respondent enters this Consent Order freely, knowingly, and voluntarily, and with the advice of counsel.

16. The Respondent agrees to comply with the requirements of Section 12-101 *et seq.* of the Business Regulation Article, Maryland Annotated Code, and the Code of Maryland Regulations 09.25.01.01 *et seq.* in future transactions.

17. The Respondent and the Department agree to schedule a meeting, to be held as soon as practicable, at which the Respondent, his counsel, Dennis Gring of the Department, counsel on behalf of the Department, and a member of the Anne Arundel County Police Department will discuss future compliance with secondhand precious metal object laws.

BASED ON THESE STIPULATIONS, IT IS, THIS 29 day of Sept, 2009, BY THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, LICENSING AND REGULATION,

ORDERED that Respondent Laurence C. Sanders has violated Maryland Annotated Code, Business Regulation Article, §§12-202(d), 12-301(a), 12-302(a), 12-304(c), and 12-305(d), and it is further

ORDERED that the Respondent's license as a dealer is suspended for ten calendar days, effective and including October 1, 2009, and it is further

ORDERED, that, during the period of suspension, the Respondent may not acquire, in any manner, including purchase, pawn or consignment, any secondhand precious metal objects and may not sell or trade with the public any secondhand precious metal objects. However, the Respondent

may, during the suspension period, allow members of the public to redeem pawned secondhand precious metals objects where those items were taken in pawn prior to the suspension. The term "members of the public" as it is used herein shall not include a licensed dealer within the meaning of §12-101 *et seq.*, of the Business Regulation Article, and it is further

ORDERED that the Respondent is assessed a total civil penalty of \$4,500.00 for those violations, which amount is payable to the Department within 30 days of the date this Consent Order is executed by the Department, and it is further

ORDERED that, if payment of the civil penalty is not made within that 30-day period, the Respondent's license as a "dealer" shall be automatically suspended until that payment is made, and it is further

ORDERED that the Department's records and publications shall reflect the discipline imposed

on the Respondent

RESPONDENT'S SIGNATURE
APPEARS ON ORIGINAL ORDER

DEPUTY SECRETARY'S SIGNATURE
APPEARS ON ORIGINAL ORDER

LEONARD J. HOWIE III
DEPUTY SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, LICENSING
& REGULATION

9/28/09

Date