## STATE OF OHIO DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## Division of Financial Institutions

Consumer F	inan	Cf
------------	------	----

In the matter of:	) Case No. 03-LO-D-99-100
	)
JAMES TUMSER	) <u>DIVISION ORDER</u>
3563 Hopper Hill Road	)
Cincinnati, Ohio 45255	) Denial of Loan Officer License Application
	) · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

## **DIVISION ORDER**

On June 27, 2003, James Tumser ("Respondent") submitted a loan officer license application to the Division of Financial Institutions ("Division"). On October 1, 2003, the Division issued Respondent a notice of the Division's intent to deny Respondent's application, and notified Respondent of his right to a hearing on the matter. Respondent requested a hearing, and pursuant thereto, an administrative hearing was held in accordance with Ohio Revised Code Chapter 119 on December 2, 2003.

The hearing officer filed his written report and recommendation with the Division on February 5, 2004, recommending that the Division deny Respondent's application. A copy of the report and recommendation and a letter explaining Respondent's right to submit written objections to the report was mailed to Respondent via certified mail. Respondent did not file objections.

Upon consideration of the hearing officer's Report and Recommendation, Respondent's objections thereto, and all evidence admitted at the hearing, the Division hereby modifies certain paragraphs in the Hearing Officer's Report and Recommendation as follows. Paragraphs of the Report and Recommendation not specifically addressed below are approved.

Paragraph 4 on page 5 of the Report and Recommendation reads:

Because the Respondent has been convicted of a misdemeanor offense, the burden of proof shifted to the Respondent to show by a preponderance of the evidence that there is no basis in fact for believing that he will commit another criminal offense involving theft, receiving stolen property, embezzlement, forgery, fraud, passing bad checks, money laundering or drug trafficking or any criminal offense, involving money or securities. The failure to disclose the criminal convictions also caused the burden of proof to shift to the Respondent to show by a preponderance of the evidence that his character and fitness command the confidence of the public to warrant the belief that the business will be operated honestly and fairly in compliance with the purpose of the Ohio Mortgage Broker Act.

In accord with R.C.  $\S\S1322.031(A)(2)$  and 1322.041(A)(3), the Division modifies Paragraph 4 on page 5 to read:

Because Respondent had been convicted of theft, the burden of proof shifted to Respondent to show, by a preponderance of the evidence, that

Respondent's activities and employment record since the conviction show that he is honest, truthful, and of good reputation, and that there is no basis in fact for believing that he will commit another drug trafficking or theft-type offense.

The Division approves the Hearing Examiner's recommendation to deny Respondent's loan officer license application. Tumser's June 27, 2003 license application is hereby denied.

## NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Respondent is hereby notified that pursuant to R.C. 119.12, this order may be appealed by filing a notice of appeal with the Ohio Division of Financial Institutions setting forth the order appealed from and the grounds for the appeal. A copy of such notice of appeal must, pursuant to R.C. 119.12, must also be filed with the court of common pleas of the county in which the place of business of the Respondent is located, or the county in which the Respondent is a resident. A notice of appeal must be filed within fifteen (15) days after the date of mailing of this order.



Signed and sealed this It day of www 2004.

ROBERT M. GRIESER

Deputy Superintendent for Consumer Finance Division of Financial Institutions Ohio Department of Commerce