DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, LICENSING AND REGULATION *

*

v. *

* CASE NO.: SPMG-10-0014

JOANNE LAROSA
All That Glitters *
8640 Ridgelys Choice Drive
#201A *
Baltimore, Maryland 21236,

*

Respondent

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

CONSENT ORDER

This matter comes before the Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation ("Department") based on a complaint filed by the Frederick County Sheriff's Office. Based on that complaint, the Department determined that administrative charges against Joanne Larosa ("Respondent") were appropriate and that an administrative hearing on those charges should be held. A hearing was scheduled for February 18, 2010; however, the Department and the Respondent reached an agreement to resolve this matter by Consent Order. The Department and the Respondent consent to the entry of this Order as final resolution of Case No. SPMG-10-0014.

IT IS STIPULATED BY THAT PARTIES that:

1. The Respondent is currently licensed (No. 2228) 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/has been All That Glitters.

3. From July 31 through August 2, 2009, the Respondent's company held an event at a Hampton Inn in Frederick County, Maryland, at which she and/or employees of All That Glitters acquired secondhand precious metal objects.

4. The Respondent and/or employees completed required daily return, or transaction, forms and provided them to law enforcement agencies.

5. Forms were completed improperly and/or incorrectly, as follows:

> a. The daily return form for Transaction No. 2 failed to note whether the seller had glasses and whether she had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features.
>
> b. The daily return form for Transaction No. 5 failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features.
>
> c. The daily return form for Transaction No. 7 failed to note whether the seller had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features.
>
> d. The daily return form for Transaction No. 8 failed to note whether the seller had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features and included an incorrect (total).dealer price.
>
> e. The daily return form for Transaction No 10 failed to note whether the seller had glasses and whether she had tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features.
>
> f. The daily return form for Transaction Nos. 16 and 19 failed to note whether the sellers had other distinguishing features.
>
> g. The daily return form for Transaction No. 20 failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features. In addition, the dealer price amounts were included after the transaction had been completed.

h. The daily return form for Transaction Nos. 22, 23, 24, and 27 failed to note whether the sellers had other distinguishing features.

i. The daily return form for Transaction Nos. 31, 39, and 42 failed to note whether the seller had other distinguishing features and included incorrect (total) dealer prices.

j. The daily return form for Transaction Nos. 37, 40, and 47 failed to note whether the sellers had other distinguishing features.

k. The daily return forms referenced above, as well as the daily return form for Transaction No. 45, failed to include the name of the licensee, or dealer.

l. All daily return forms referenced above, as well as the form for Transaction No. 45, failed to include the location of the transactions.

6. The Respondent knew, or should have known, of requirements concerning completion of daily return forms.

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

8. The Respondent enters this Consent Order freely, knowingly, and voluntarily, and having had the opportunity to seek the advice of counsel.

9. 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.

BASED ON THESE STIPULATIONS, IT IS, THIS 26 day of Feb, 2010, BY THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, LICENSING AND REGULATION,

ORDERED that Respondent Joanne Larosa violated Maryland Annotated Code, Business Regulation Article, §§12-301(a) and 12-302(a), and it is further

ORDERED that the Respondent is assessed a total civil penalty of $300.00 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.

JOANNE LAROSA

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

2.20.10
Date