

**STATE OF OHIO**  
**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Division of Financial Institutions**  
**Consumer Finance**

In the matter of:	)	Case No. 06-0153-LOD
	)	
<b>LAWRENCE C. GABA</b>	)	<b>DIVISION ORDER</b>
173 North Cassingham Road	)	<b>Denial of Loan Officer License Application</b>
Bexley, Ohio 43209	)	&
	)	<b>Notice of Appellate Rights</b>

---

WHEREAS, the Ohio Department of Commerce, by and through the Superintendent of the Division of Financial Institutions ("Division"), is charged with the responsibility of administering and enforcing the Ohio Mortgage Broker Act, as amended by Ohio Senate Bill 76 and codified in Ohio Revised Code ("R.C.") Chapter 1322, the Division finds that this order is necessary and appropriate, in the interest of the public, and is consistent with the purposes of the Ohio Mortgage Broker Act; and

WHEREAS, Lawrence C. Gaba ("Respondent") applied to the Division for a loan officer license pursuant to R.C. Chapter 1322; and

WHEREAS, on February 8, 2006, the Division issued Respondent a Notice which informed him that the Division had conducted an investigation of Respondent and, as a result thereof, alleged that:

1. On or around February 28, 1992, the Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline of the Supreme Court of Ohio found that Respondent, as an Ohio licensed attorney, had violated the following Disciplinary Rules: DR 1-102(A)(4) (engaging in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation); 6-101(A)(3) (neglect of a legal matter); 7-101(A)(1) (failure to seek lawful objectives by all proper means); and 7-101(A)(2) (failure to fulfill employment); and 7-101(A)(3) (causing client damage or prejudice to a client). The Board of Commissioners recommended that Respondent be given an indefinite suspension from the practice of law in Ohio.
2. On or around June 17, 1992, the Supreme Court of Ohio in *Columbus Bar Association v. Gaba* (1992), 64 Ohio St. 3d 35, agreed that respondent violated the above cited Disciplinary Rules and respondent was indefinitely suspended from the practice of law in Ohio.
3. On or around December 3, 1993 the Board of Commissioners of the Clients' Security Fund for the Supreme Court of Ohio found that Respondent engaged in dishonest conduct consisting of theft of escrow funds in the amount of \$2,668.92. *In Re Application of Elgee Electric Company v. Gaba*, CSF Claim No. 93-855.

4. On or around December 3, 2002 the Supreme Court of Ohio in *In Re Resignation of Gaba*, 97 Ohio St. 3d 1224, accepted Respondent's resignation as an attorney with the designation disciplinary action pending. It was further ordered that respondent's certificate of admission to the bar of Ohio be cancelled and that his name be stricken from the roll of attorneys of this court.
5. On or around April 8, 2003, the Supreme Court of Ohio in *Columbus Bar Assn. v. Gaba*, 98 Ohio St.3d 1521, 2003-Ohio-1775, found Respondent in contempt of its June 17, 1992 Order indefinitely suspending Respondent from the practice of law in Ohio. The Court sentenced Respondent to 30 days in jail with said sentence suspended on the condition that Respondent not practice law in the state of Ohio.
6. Respondent's character and general fitness do not command the confidence of the public and warrant the belief that the business will be operated honestly and fairly in compliance with the purposes of the Ohio Mortgage Broker Act, as required by R.C. 1322.041(A)(5).

WHEREAS, the Notice informed Respondent of the Division's intent to deny Respondent's loan officer license application and of the opportunity for a hearing regarding the denial if requested within thirty days from the mailing of the Notice. The Notice further cautioned Respondent that "[i]f the Ohio Division of Financial Institutions d[id] not receive a written request for a hearing in its offices within thirty (30) days of the time of the mailing of th[e] Notice, the Superintendent w[ould] issue an order denying Respondent a loan officer license[;]"

WHEREAS, the Notice was mailed to Respondent, via certified mail and service was perfected;

WHEREAS, Respondent failed to request a hearing and thereby failed to defend against the Division's allegations;

WHEREAS, the Division finds that the allegations contained in the Notice are true and that Respondent should be denied a license to act as a loan officer;

Respondent, Lawrence C. Gaba, is hereby denied a loan officer license.

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

Respondent is hereby notified that this Order may be appealed, pursuant to R.C. 119.12, 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 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 11<sup>th</sup> day of July 2006.

---

**ROBERT M. GRIESER**

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