

BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA HORSE RACING BOARD

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of:

FITNESS FOR LICENSURE

JOSE LUIS NARANJO
Appellant

Case No. SAC 19-0026

DECISION

The attached Proposed Decision is hereby adopted by the California Horse Racing Board as its Decision in the above-entitled matter.

The Decision shall become effective on August 26, 2019.

IT IS SO ORDERED ON August 22, 2019.

CALIFORNIA HORSE RACING BOARD
Chuck Winner, Chairman



Rick Baedeker
Executive Director

1 California Horse Racing Board.

2 The proceedings were recorded by Certified Court Reporter Wendy V. Frazier, CSR #:
3 8035.

4
5 **I. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

6
7 The issue presented at this hearing, was an appeal by Mr. Naranjo after he was denied a
8 galloper's license, which he applied for on or about July 19, 2018.

9
10 **LIST OF EXHIBITS**

11
12 **CALIFORNIA HORSE RACING BOARD EXHIBITS:**

13 CHRB Exhibit 1: Color Photograph

14 CHRB Exhibit 2: Color Photograph

15 CHRB Exhibit 3: Color Photograph

16 CHRB Exhibit 4: Color Photograph

17 CHRB Exhibit 5: Color Photograph

18 CHRB Exhibit 6: Color Photograph

19 CHRB Exhibit 7: Color Photograph

20 CHRB Exhibit 8: Color Photograph

21 CHRB Exhibit 9: Color Photograph

22 CHRB Exhibit 10: Color Photograph

23 CHRB Exhibit 11: Color Photograph

24 CHRB Exhibit 12: Color Photograph

25 CHRB Exhibit 13: Color Photograph

26 CHRB Exhibit 14: Color Photograph

27
28
Law Office of Richard P. Margarita
P.O. Box 1257, Sloughhouse, CA 95683
(916) 972-0365
Richardmargarita@sbcglobal.net

- 1 CHRB Exhibit 15: Color Photograph
2 CHRB Exhibit 16: Color Photograph
3 CHRB Exhibit 17: Color Photograph
4 CHRB Exhibit 18: Color Photograph
5 CHRB Exhibit 19: Color Photograph
6 CHRB Exhibit 20: Color Photograph
7 CHRB Exhibit 21: Color Photograph
8 CHRB Exhibit 22: Color Photograph
9 CHRB Exhibit 23: Color Photograph
10 CHRB Exhibit 24: Color Photograph
11 CHRB Exhibit 25: Color Photograph
12 CHRB Exhibit 26: Color Photograph
13 CHRB Exhibit 27: Notice of Refusal of License
14
15

16 **APPELLANT'S EXHIBITS:**

- 17 Appellant Exhibit A: Color Photograph
18 Appellant Exhibit B: Color Photograph
19 Appellant Exhibit C: Color Photograph
20 Appellant Exhibit D: Color Photograph
21

22 All of the above listed exhibits were admitted into evidence for the Appellant and the California
23 Horse Racing Board.
24

25 **FACTUAL FINDINGS**

26 **I.**

27 On or about August 31, 2015, then San Joaquin County Animal Service Officer Cathy Long
28

1 received a report of animal neglect of horses at 12598 East Whitehouse Road, Stockton, California.

2
3 **II.**

4 On or about August 31, 2015, then San Joaquin County Animal Service Officer Cathy Long,
5 responded to 12598 East Whitehouse Road, Stockton, California and attempted to contact the owner
6 of the horses, Appellant Naranjo, with negative results.

7 **III.**

8 When San Joaquin County Animal Service Officer Cathy Long, responded to 12598 East
9 Whitehouse Road, Stockton, California on August 31, 2015, she determined that Appellant Naranjo
10 lived behind the house at that location and kept his animals at this location.

11 **IV.**

12 When San Joaquin County Animal Service Officer Cathy Long, responded to 12598 East
13 Whitehouse Road, Stockton, California on August 31, 2015, there was one horse in Stall Number
14 Two, that appeared to be deceased, based on the bloating of the dead animal, for a period over
15 twenty-four hours.

16 **V.**

17 On July 19, 2018, Appellant Naranjo applied for a gallop license with the California Horse
18 Racing Board.

19 **VI.**

20
21 On or about July 19, 2018, Appellant Naranjo's application for a galloper's license with the
22 California Horse Racing Board was denied.

23 **VII.**

24 Appellant Naranjo has filed a timely appeal.

25 **VIII.**

26 The California Horse Racing Board, by and through their counsel, Mr. Brodnik, filed a written
27 closing argument in a timely manner.

1 **IX.**

2 Appellant Naranjo did not file any closing argument.

3
4 **APPLICABLE LAWS AND REGULATIONS**

5 The California Horse Racing Board is governed by the procedures in California Business
6 and Professions Code, Section 19400 et.seq., which is known as the Horse Racing Law.
7 Additionally, California Regulations, Title 4, Sections 1400 to 2063, provide rules and regulations
8 to the California Horse Racing Board. Provisions of Title 4 will hereinafter be referred to as "Rule"
9 with a corresponding number of that rule for reference purposes.

10
11 California Horse Racing Board Rule number 1489 (Title 4, C.C.R. 1489), which is entitled,
12 "Grounds for Denial or Refusal to License states as follows:

13 (a) The Board, in addition to any other valid reason, may refuse to issue a license or
14 deny a license to any person:

15 (1) Who has been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment in a California
16 state prison or a federal prison, or who has been convicted of a crime involving moral
17 turpitude.

18 (2) Who has been convicted of a crime in another jurisdiction which if committed in
19 this state would be a felony.

20 (3) Who has made any material misrepresentation or false statement to the Board or
21 its agents in his or her application for license or otherwise, or who fails to answer any
22 material question on an application for a license.

23 (4) Who is unqualified to engage in the activities for which a license is required.

24 (5) Who fails to disclose the true ownership or interest in any or all horses as
25 required by any application.

26 (6) Who is subject to exclusion or ejection from the racing inclosure or is within the
27 classes of persons prohibited from participating in pari-mutuel wagering.

28 (7) Who has committed an act involving moral turpitude, or intemperate acts which
have exposed others to danger, or acts in connection with horse racing and/or a
legalized gaming business which were fraudulent or in violation of a trust or duty.

1 (8) Who has unlawfully engaged in or who has been convicted of possession, use or
2 sale of any narcotic, dangerous drug, or marijuana.

3 (9) Who is not permitted by any law to engage in the occupation for which the
4 license is sought.

5 (10) Who has violated, or who aids, abets or conspires with any person to violate any
6 provision of the rules or the Horse Racing Law.

7 (b) When considering the denial, suspension or revocation of a license under
8 subparagraphs (a)(1), (a)(2), (a)(7), and (a)(8) of this section, pursuant to section 481
9 of the Business and Professions Code, a crime or act shall be considered to be
10 substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a person applying for
11 or holding a license under the Horse Racing Law, if to a substantial degree the crime
12 or act evidences a present or potential unfitness to perform the functions authorized
13 by his or license or in a manner consistent with the public health, safety, or welfare.

14 California Code of Regulations, Title 4, Section 1489.2, which is entitled, "Criteria to
15 Evaluate Rehabilitation of a Person When Considering Denial, Suspension or Revocation of an
16 Occupational License" states as follows:

17 (a) When considering the denial of a license under Business and Professions Code
18 section 480, or the suspension or revocation of licensure under Business and
19 Professions Code section 490, on the grounds that the person has committed an act or
20 been convicted of a crime, the California Horse Racing Board will evaluate the
21 rehabilitation of such person and his or her eligibility for licensure, and shall consider
22 the following criteria:

23 (1) The nature and severity of the act(s) and/or offense(s), including its relation to
24 horse racing or pari-mutuel wagering and the protection of the public.

25 (2) The total criminal record, including evidence of any act(s) and/or offense(s)
26 committed subsequent to the act(s) or offense(s) under consideration as grounds for
27 denial, suspension or revocation which also could be considered grounds for denial,
28 suspension, or revocation under Business and Professions Code sections 480 or 490.

(3) The time that has elapsed since commission of the act(s) or offense(s).

(4) The extent to which the person seeking licensure or the licensee has complied
with any terms of parole, probation, restitution or any other sanctions lawfully
imposed against the person or licensee.

(5) The credibility of the person seeking licensure or the licensee, and his or her
acceptance of responsibility and remorse for the conduct.

(6) Evidence, if any, of rehabilitation submitted by the person seeking licensure or by
the licensee.

1 Title 4 C.C.R. Section 1902.5 states that:

2 No person under the jurisdiction of the Board shall alone, or in concert with
3 another person, permit or cause an animal under his control or care to suffer
4 any form of cruelty, mistreatment, neglect or abuse. Nor shall such person
5 abandon; injure; maim; kill; administer a noxious or harmful substance to; or
6 deprive an animal of necessary care, sustenance, shelter or veterinary care.

7 Evidence Code Section 780 states:

8 Except as otherwise provided by statute, the court or jury may consider in
9 determining the credibility of a witness any matter that has any tendency in
10 reason to prove or disprove the truthfulness of his testimony at the hearing,
11 including but not limited to any of the following:

12 (a) His demeanor while testifying and the manner in which he testifies.

13 (b) The character of his testimony.

14 (c) The extent of his capacity to perceive, to recollect, or to communicate
15 any matter about which he testifies.

16 (d) The extent of his opportunity to perceive any matter about which he
17 testifies.

18 (e) His character for honesty or veracity or their opposites.

19 (f) The existence or nonexistence of a bias, interest, or other motive.

20 (g) A statement previously made by him that is consistent with his testimony
21 at the hearing.

22 (h) A statement made by him that is inconsistent with any part of his
23 testimony at the hearing.

24 (i) The existence or nonexistence of any fact testified to by him.

25 (j) His attitude toward the action in which he testifies or toward the giving
26 of testimony.

27 (k) His admission of untruthfulness.

1 **DISCUSSION OF ISSUES**

2
3 **I. APPLICABLE BURDEN OF PROOF**

4 The Appellant had the burden of proof to refute, by a preponderance of evidence
5 standard, that the decision/ruling issued by the CHRB, denying him a galloper's
6 license, was improper, and therefore, subject to reversal.

7 The Appellant presented no evidence that could be construed as refuting, by a
8 preponderance of evidence standard, that the decision/ruling issued by the California Horse
9 Racing Board was improper or unjustified. Appellant Naranjo is unsuitable for licensure by
10 the CHRB.

11
12 **I. APPELLANT NARANJO'S CONDUCT VIOLATED TITLE 4, C.C.R.**
13 **SECTION 1902.5**

14 **A. TESTIMONY OF SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY (CITY OF LATHROP) ANIMAL**
15 **SERVICE OFFICER CATHY LONG**

16 On August 31, 2015 at approximately 3:30 p.m., then San Joaquin County Animal Service
17 Officer Cathy Long responded to 12598 East Whitehouse Road, Stockton, California, as a result of a
18 report of horse neglect at that location. This is the property where Appellant Naranjo kept his horses
19 and a pony. She determined that Appellant Naranjo lived behind the house at that location. She
20 attempted to contact him with negative results. (RT pp. 13:10-25).

21 Ms. Long testified that she was an Animal Service Officer for San Joaquin County in August
22 2015, and is currently employed as an Animal Service Officer for the City of Lathrop. She has
23 attended the NACA Conference for Animal Cruelty, Animal Service Training. She has had horses
24 her entire life and used to race barrels professionally, and, also roped. She grew up on a ranch. (RT
25 pp. 11:3-9).

1 Ms. Long testified that she has had training in the body composition scoring of horses which
2 reflects the health of a horse. The body composition scoring is from one (1) to nine (9). She stated
3 that a horse would pass if it had at least a rating of four. (RT pp. 11:14-25; 12:4-15).

4 Ms. Long testified that during her inspection of the barn areas on August 31, 2015 at 12598
5 East Whitehouse Road, Stockton, California, she could smell a foul odor coming from barn two.
6 She opened the barn and in plain view was a substance coming out of stall two, which smelled like
7 death. (RT pp. 14:5-12; 17:2-14).

8 Ms. Long testified she saw bodily fluid of some kind coming out from underneath the stall
9 and she found a deceased horse in stall number two. (RT pp. 17:21-25).

10 Ms. Long testified that she believed the horse had been deceased for more than one day
11 because it was very bloated, there was fluid coming out of its mouth, and there was manure. She
12 believed the horse had been dead for more than twenty-four (24) hours because of the bloating. (RT
13 pp. 20:23-25; 21:1-20).

14 Ms. Long testified that in Stall Six there was a bay gelding. This horse was very thin, the
15 body conditioning score of this horse she ranked as a two (2), and had very long, overgrown hooves.
16 (RT pp. 23:20; 25:8-10).

17 Ms. Long testified that there was a horse that she observed inside Stall Seven (7), which was
18 a bay mare. This horse had very overgrown hooves, was very emaciated, and she also gave this
19 horse a body conditioning score of a two (2). (RT pp. 25:21-22; 26:21-24).

20 Ms. Long testified that the horse's coat that was in Stall Seven (7) was in very poor
21 condition and had not been groomed in a long period of time as there were big knots in the mane.
22 (RT pp. 28:13-18). She considered that the horse in Stall Seven (7) had a body composition score of
23 a two (2). (RT pp. 29:1-4) Ms. Long also testified that the horse in Stall Seven (7) had protruding
24 bones from the horse's skin, the tailbone was very pronounced, and when she pulled the tail aside,
25 there was no kind of meaty flesh in between. The hip bones and ribs were very pronounced. The
26 eye sockets above the eyes were sunken in and the overall health of the horse was poor. (RT pp.
27 29:3-16).

1 Ms. Long testified that she believed that the horses that she had viewed at the ranch where
2 Mr. Naranjo owned the horses appeared to be very malnourished. (RT pp. 30:5-7).

3 Ms. Long testified that most of the horses had hooves that were overgrown. She stated that
4 overgrown hooves can cripple a horse and it is a sign of neglect. It makes it harder for the horses to
5 walk, it keeps them off balance, and can cause a lot of lameness issues and problems. (RT pp. 31:1-
6 16).

7 Ms. Long testified that there was a bay mare in Stall Eight (8) that was emaciated. She gave
8 that horse a body conditioning score of a two (2). This horse had protruding bones and swelling on
9 the left hind hock and ankle. The ribs were also protruding. (RT pp. 32:21-25; 33:7-13).

10 Ms. Long also testified that the bay mare in Stall Eight(8) had very pronounced ribs and the
11 eyes and the sockets were caved in, which also reflected a sign of malnutrition. (RT pp. 34:5-9) .

12 Ms. Long also testified that Exhibit 14 reflected the swelling in the fetlock area of the horse,
13 which is the area between the hoof to the ankle, which is a joint. She testified that inflammation in
14 the joint reflects some type of injury. (RT pp. 34:20-25; 35:1-12).

15 Ms. Long testified that in Stall Nine (9) she observed a red sorrel mare that had two front
16 socks and a right hind quarter sock and a blaze. She described the body conditioning of this horse
17 as a two (2). She described this horse as emaciated and needed her hooves trimmed. She
18 considered this horse to be emaciated because it had a narrowing in the chest, there was no kind of
19 body flesh, and the indentation in the sockets above the eyes were pronounced, as were the ribs.
20 The withers were very pronounced. The hip bones were also very pronounced. (RT pp. 37:15-25;
21 38:1-7).

22 Ms. Long testified that there were a few pens on the backside of Barn Two that were
23 composed of pipe fencing with cables. There was a stallion in the back, as well as a pony. She
24 characterized the stallion as having a body conditioning score of two (2) and was very emaciated.
25 The horse's hooves were very overgrown and it appeared like he had not been groomed. (RT pp.
26 40:14-25). She also described this horse as emaciated, as she could see his tailbone, backbone, and
27
28

1 hip bones, which were all pronounced. (RT pp. 41:14-19). She described this horse as suffering
2 from malnutrition and having a body conditioning score of two (2). (RT pp. 42:12-17).

3 Ms. Long described the inside of the stalls as filthy, dirty, and there were downed fence
4 boards and loose cables, all easy for horses to get hurt where their legs could go through and cause
5 severe damage. (RT pp. 42:21-25; 43:1-4).

6 Ms. Long testified that there was a pony to the right of the stallion. The pony had hooves
7 that were very overgrown, but he was not emaciated. This pony was in the pipe pen outside. (RT
8 pp. 45:1-5).

9 Ms. Long described that the horses were eating whatever was on the ground and they were
10 very emaciated. (RT pp.49:23-25:50:1-5).

11 Ms. Long testified that when she walked into the barn, there was no feed in the stall, the only
12 horse that had feed was the deceased horse. The rest of the horses did not have any feed. She did
13 not locate any hay anywhere within the barn. (RT pp. 53:19-25; 54:1-3).

14 Ms. Long testified that there was water at the ranch. (RT pp. 54:7-8).

15 Ms. Long testified that while she was at the property on August 31, 2015, Mr. Naranjo never
16 responded to the scene. (RT pp. 54:11-12).

17 Ms. Long testified that when Mr. Naranjo subsequently contacted her and told her that a
18 couple of his horses that had died, and he told her that he thought they had colic, but then he told her
19 that believed they died from the herpes virus. (RT pp. 57:8-10).

20 Ms. Long testified that she told Mr. Naranjo on August 31, 2015, subsequent to her
21 inspection of Appellant Naranjo's horses at 12598 East Whitehouse Road, Stockton, California,
22 that he needed to seek veterinarian care for his horses within 24 hours. She further testified that
23 subsequent to August 31, 2015, she made several attempts to contact Mr. Naranjo but his telephone
24 number was disconnected. (RT pp. 57:8-25).

25 Ms. Long testified that she determined that even though she told Mr. Naranjo on August 31,
26 2015 to have veterinarian care treat his horses within 24 hours of that date, he did not get such
27 veterinarian care within 24 hours of that date. (RT pp. 58:1-12).

1 Ms. Long testified that on September 16, 2015, she went back to the location at 12598 East
2 White House Road, Stockton, California. She went there with a veterinarian named Dr. Kevin
3 Hyde. (RT pp. 58:17-25).

4 Ms. Long testified that she and Dr. Hyde met with Mr. Naranjo at this location on September
5 16, 2015. She testified that Mr. Naranjo agreed that his horses were in poor condition. Dr. Hyde
6 also examined these horses. Dr. Hyde scored all of the horses a two (2), except for the bay stallion
7 which he scored a three (3) out of a nine (9). (RT pp. 60:2-25).

8 Ms. Long testified that the horses that she observed at the aforementioned location on
9 September 16, 2015, did not appear to have been regularly groomed since August 31, 2015. (RT pp.
10 61:10-17). She also considered they were again suffering from neglect.

11 Ms. Long testified that the horses still appeared to be starving on September 16, 2015. (RT
12 pp. 62:13).

13 Ms. Long testified that the horse in stall fifteen (15) was emaciated with a body composition
14 score of two and very thin. (RT pp. 46:11-17). She described this horse as being very emaciated,
15 with very pronounced ribs, hip bones and backbone. (RT pp. 47:16-20).

16
17 **B. TESTIMONY OF CALIFORNIA HORSE RACING BOARD INVESTIGATOR**
18 **MIKE ALFORD**

19 California Horse Racing Board Investigator Mike Alford testified at the hearing. He has
20 been a CHRB Investigator for the past year. Prior to that, he was a law enforcement officer in the
21 State of California for over thirty-seven (37) years in the San Jose/Santa Clara, California, area.

22 Mr. Alford testified he became aware of an animal neglect case arising out of San Joaquin
23 County in which Mr. Naranjo had made an application with the CHRB for a galloper's license.

24 Mr. Alford testified he became aware of the animal neglect case in San Joaquin County
25 when reviewing Mr. Naranjo's license application. As a result of his review of the animal neglect
26 case in San Joaquin County, he formed the opinion that Mr. Naranjo should be denied a galloper's
27 license. (RT pp. 73:1-16). Mr. Alford denied Appellant Naranjo's issuance of a galloper's license.

1 did a lot of things for me. And I paid him just for the medicine. He wouldn't charge me. I have
2 had horses for him..." (RT pp. 91:20-25; 92:1-2).

3 Upon further questioning, Appellant Naranjo refused to disclose the name of this
4 veterinarian and stated, "I can't tell you that. I'm not going to disclose that." (RT pp. 92:3-12).

5 Appellant Mr. Naranjo also stated, "Like I said, that's my fault for not calling a vet. The vet
6 that came down there, I told him that...that, you know, we thought that the horses had the herpes
7 virus. And he didn't...he told me that he...he might not have doubted it, but he was like...you
8 know, I told him the horses were just starting to eat and everything. I went from them losing a lot of
9 weight, from uh...from having shakes. And like I says, that mare died just from one day to the
10 next." (RT pp. 93:3-12).

11 Appellant Naranjo admitted during his testimony that he was responsible for feeding the
12 horses. (RT pp. 94:4-7).

13 Appellant Naranjo testified that he was responsible for the care of the horses, including all
14 the horses depicted in Exhibits 1 through 26. He also agreed that proper care of the horses is to
15 ensure that their hooves are trimmed. (RT pp. 95:12-14).

16 Appellant Naranjo stated, "I take responsibility for everything." (RT pp. 97:6).

17 Appellant Naranjo further testified, "I take responsibility for everything that's happening."
18 (RT pp. 100:18-19).

19 Appellant Naranjo testified, "I just told you, I had a friend that was a vet that went to my
20 house, and we figured that it was the herpes virus...you know what, I can't...like I told you, I'm not
21 going to put him in a situation that he told me not to. Because he didn't bill me like that. I didn't
22 have paperwork. What do you want me to tell you? You know what, it's my fault. I take
23 responsibility. It's not that I neglected them. It's not that I didn't call nobody. He took care of my
24 horses. He was a licensed vet, and I'm not going to get him in trouble." (RT pp. 101:5-17).

25 When confronted with the fact that he refused to disclose the name/identity of this alleged
26 licensed veterinarian, and that instead this person in fact could be the guy next door who was not a
27 licensed vet because it could not be verified, Appellant Naranjo agreed. (RT 100:22-25; 102:1-4).

1 Appellant Naranjo testified it was a mistake he made when he didn't get the veterinarian to
2 take care of the animals and stated, "I didn't get a proper...I could have had him do everything. But
3 like I said, since he got in trouble with the CHRB, then he didn't...I didn't...he told me not to get
4 him involved with it. And I was like fine." (RT pp. 104:8-12).

5
6 **CONCLUSION/PROPOSED DECISION**

7 The timely filed closing argument by the California Horse Racing Board has been reviewed
8 and considered by this Hearing Officer. Appellant Naranjo did not file any such closing argument
9 and/or closing brief with this Hearing Officer.

10 The evidence at the fitness hearing appeal demonstrated substantial animal neglect,
11 mistreatment, and abuse by Appellant Naranjo. The evidence was overwhelming, based on the
12 testimony of Animal Service Officer Long, CHRB Alford, and Appellant Naranjo's own
13 statements, that he has caused horses under his control or care to suffer mistreatment, neglect, and
14 abuse. He is not qualified to be issued a galloper's license, based on such abuse, mistreatment, and
15 neglect of his own horses, pursuant to Title 4, C.C.R. Section 1489.2 (a)(1).

16 Furthermore, Appellant Naranjo consciously deprived his animals the necessary care,
17 sustenance, and veterinary care, that was desperately needed, in violation of Title 4, C.C.R. Section
18 1902.5.

19 Additionally, although Appellant Naranjo, at times minimally demonstrated remorse for his
20 neglect and abuse of these animals, overall, he lacked any genuine, significant and substantial
21 remorse. He provided lame excuses; his answers to questions posed by counsel for the CHRB and
22 this Hearing Officer often deflected any true, honest response. Overall, based on his refusal to name
23 the alleged veterinarian, and deflection and diversion in his responses to simple questions, often
24 painting himself as a "Victim", his credibility was wholly deficient and suspect.

25 Additionally, he did not demonstrate or introduce into evidence, any form of rehabilitation.
26 His complete refusal to disclose the name of the "so-called" veterinarian that he had inspect his
27 horses, evidenced an egregious callousness towards his horses, based on the nature and severity of

1 the abuse and neglect of his own horses, one of which was found deceased, and had been deceased
2 for over twenty four (24) hours, all pursuant to Title 4, C.C.R. Section 1489.2 (2).

3 Pursuant to Title 4, C.C.R. Section 1489.2, it is this Hearing Officer's opinion that
4 Appellant Naranjo has not met his burden of proof by a preponderance of evidence standard
5 that he is fit to be issued a gallopers license by the California Horse Racing Board.

6
7 Furthermore, Appellant Naranjo did not produce a scintilla of evidence that he has
8 been rehabilitated, or modified the method and manner in which he cared for his horses
9 subsequent to the August 31, 2015 inspection by then San Joaquin County Animal Service
10 Officer Cathy Long at 12598 East Whitehouse Road, Stockton, California.

11
12 Therefore, it is this Hearing Officer's opinion that the best interest of racing and the state
13 will not be better served if the initial decision by the CHRB, deeming Appellant Naranjo unfit for
14 licensure, is overturned. Simply put, Appellant Naranjo is unfit to possess any California Horse
15 Racing Board license.

16 Therefore, based on the aforementioned facts and circumstances, it is this Hearing
17 Officer's proposed ruling that the CHRB's denial of Appellant Naranjo's application for a
18 gallopers license be AFFIRMED.

19
20 DATED: 7/11/19

21
22 
23 RICHARD P. MARGARITA, ESQ.
24 Hearing Officer

25
26
27
28
Law Office of Richard P. Margarita
P.O. Box 1257, Sloughhouse, CA 95683
(916) 972-0365
Richardmargarita@sbcglobal.net