

BEFORE THE INSURANCE COMMISSIONER
OF THE STATE OF UTAH

IN RE THE APPLICATION OF:

DIENISHA LANAIE WRIGHT

4021 South 700 East # 500
Salt Lake City, Utah 84107

License Pending

ORDER ON HEARING

(Formal Hearing)

DOCKET No. 2014-028-LC

Enf. Case No. 3450

Mark E. Kleinfeld,
Presiding Officer

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

THIS MATTER concerning whether the Applicant should be issued a Resident Producer Individual license came on to be heard before the Commissioner of the Utah State Insurance Department (“*Department*”) on Monday, March 24, 2014 at 1:30 o’clock P. M. Mountain Time, with Mark E. Kleinfeld, Administrative Law Judge, serving as designated Presiding Officer.

Said hearing being held at the Department’s offices, Utah State Office Building, Room 3112, Salt Lake City, Utah 84114, having been convened at the designated time of 1:30 (1:42) P. M., March 24, 2014 and adjourned at 2:41 P. M. on said same day.

Appearances:

Gary D. Josephson, Assistant Attorney General, State of Utah, Heber Wells State Office Building, Salt Lake City, Utah 84114.

Dienisha Lanaie Wright, Applicant, *pro se*.

By the Presiding Officer:

Pursuant to an March 5, 2014 "*Notice of Conversion to Formal Proceeding and Notice of Hearing*" a hearing was conducted on March 24, 2014 in the above-entitled proceeding. The Applicant was present at that time.

The hearing was convened and conducted as a **formal hearing** in accordance with Utah Code Ann. Sections 63G-4-204, 63G-4-205, 63G-4-206, 63G-4-207 and 63G-4-208 and Administrative Rule R590-160-6.

ISSUE, BURDEN and "STANDARD OF PROOF"

1. The basic issue(s) in this case is (are):
 - a. Was Applicant's application for a Resident Producer Individual license improperly denied?
 - b. Has the Applicant presented sufficient evidence to show that the Department's denial was not justified on the record?
 - c. Has the Applicant presented sufficient evidence that would justify the reversal of such denial? (**SEE** also Paragraph 2 under *DISCUSSION-ANALYSIS*.)
2. The "*burden of proof*" or "*burden of going forward*" in this case as to the above issue(s) is on the Applicant.
3. As per Utah Administrative Code Rule, R590-160-5(10) as to the above and foregoing "issue(s)" or "question(s)" to be answered the "*standard of proof*" as to issues of fact is to be proven by a "*preponderance of the evidence*".

The Department presented a brief opening statement. The Applicant first reserved then waived an opening statement.

Thereafter, evidence was offered and received.

SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE

Witnesses:

For the Applicant:

Dienisha Lanaie Wright, Applicant.

For the Department:

Randall Overstreet, Director, Producer Licensing Division, Utah Insurance Department, State Office Building, Room 3110, Salt Lake City, Utah 84114.

Both of whom were sworn and testified.

Exhibits:

The Department offered the following exhibits:

1. **State's Exhibit No.s 1 through 8**, consisting of six (6) civil judgment(s) in asundry Utah courts and two (2) misdemeanor convictions, one (1) Class "C" misdemeanor for Disorderly Conduct (September 10, 2008 via bail forfeiture) in the Clearfield (Utah) Justice Court and one (1) Class "A", amended to Class "B" misdemeanor for Theft (March 31, 2010 via "Guilty" plea) in the 2nd District Court, Ogden, Weber County, State of Utah. (SEE FILE).

(No objection being made which was accepted and entered.)

The Applicant offered the following exhibits:

None.

Additionally the Presiding Officer took judicial notice of the files and records of the Department particularly the Applicant's January 28, 2014 application; the Department's January 30, 2014 denial letter and Applicant's apparent request for hearing (although not formally presented).

Argument followed.

The Presiding Officer being fully advised in the premises and taking administrative notice of the files and records of the Department, now enters his *Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order*, on behalf of the Department:

FINDINGS OF FACT

I, find by a preponderance of the evidence, the following facts:

Preliminary-Procedural Facts (Paragraphs 1-7)

1. The Utah Insurance Department (“Department”) is a governmental entity of the State of Utah. The Department as per Utah Code Ann. Section 31A-2-101 is empowered to administer the *Insurance Code*, Title 31A, Utah Code Ann., 1953, as amended.

2. The Applicant, Dienisha Lanaie Wright:

a. is a resident of the State of Utah and maintains a present residence of

242 7th Avenue, Ogden, Utah 84404; and

b. has not previously been nor is presently licensed as a Resident Producer by the Department to conduct or be engaged in any capacity in the insurance business in the State of Utah.

3. The Applicant on or about January 28, 2014 her filed application with the Department for issuance of a “*Resident Producer Individual License*”. (SEE Administrative file.)

4. The Department on or about January 30, 2014 in writing denied Applicant's application for “one or more of the following reasons:

UCA 31A-23a-107 – failure to meet the character requirements for licensing.

UCA 31A-23a-111(5)(b)(iv) – failure to pay final judgment rendered against you in this state.

UCA 31A-23a-111(5)(b)(i) – unqualified for a license.

5. That included in said denial were instructions informing Applicant of the right to an “*informal hearing*” if a timely request is made in writing within fifteen (15) days.

6. The Applicant apparently timely filed her “*request for hearing*” with the Department. (SEE Administrative file.)

7. That based on the preliminary facts as set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 6, immediately above, through means of a March 5, 2014 “*Notice of Conversion to Formal Proceedings and Notice of Hearing*”, *sua sponte*, mailed to the Applicant at her referenced address this present formal hearing was set for March 24, 2014 at 1:30 P. M. Mountain Time.

Operative Facts
(Paragraphs 8 -9)

8. The Applicant is a resident of the State of Utah.

9. The Applicant:

- a. was convicted or plead guilty to disorderly conduct (2008) and theft (2010); and
- b. has six (6) outstanding civil judgments.

DISCUSSION-ANALYSIS
(Paragraphs 1-7)

1.a. Both the Applicant and the Department in large measure while advocating **clearly** different characterizations or interpretations and import of the above referenced operative facts in substance concurred as to the basic *chronology* and **core** facts.

b. The record now being complete sets forth competent and credible evidence for the entry of the following analysis.

2. The question(s) presented is:

a. “Whether the Applicant has presented sufficient evidence to show that the Department’s January 30, 2014 letter of denial of the Applicant’s January 28, 2014 application for licensure as a “*Resident Producer Individual*” was not justified on the record?”;

b. “Whether the Applicant has presented sufficient evidence that would justify the reversal of such January 28, 2014 denial?”; and

c. “Whether as per U. A. C. Rule, R590-160-5(10) as to each of the above and foregoing “issues” or “questions” the Applicant has so shown such evidence by a “*preponderance of the evidence*” sufficient to carry Applicant’s burden of proof?”

3. Primary Applicable Pertinent Statutes, Administrative Rules and Precedent are as follows (although others may be otherwise specifically cited within the body of this “Order on Hearing”):

Section 31A-23a-107, Utah Code Ann., reads as follows:

“31A-23a-107. Character requirements.

Each applicant for a license under this chapter shall show to the commissioner that:

(1) the applicant has the intent in good faith, to engage in the type of business that the license applied for would permit;

(2) if a natural person, the applicant is competent and trustworthy; or, if the applicant is an agency, all the partners, directors, or principal officers or persons having comparable powers are trustworthy, and that it will transact business in such a way that all acts that may only be performed by a licensed producer, limited line producer, customer service representative, consultant, managing general agent, or reinsurance intermediary are performed exclusively by natural persons who are licensed under this chapter to transact that type of business and designated on the agency’s license;

(3) the applicant intends to comply with Section 31A-23a-502; and

(4) if a natural person, the applicant is at least 18 years of age.”

4. a. The record of the Applicant shows that while she has apparently met her obligations to the criminal courts for her misdemeanor violations such appears to have been accomplished begrudgingly and only after issuance of numerous bench warrants.

b. Additionally she having six (6) outstanding civil judgments ranging from 2007 to as recently September 2012 in amounts varying from \$508.04 (September 12, 2012) to \$3,578.43 (April 4, 2007). Also as in the criminal process issuance of bench warrants were necessary for the Applicant to comply with orders of the Court and the rule of law.

c. i. Quite frankly such bespeaks of her lack of character and competence. That Applicant attempted to minimize her past behavior further aggravates the circumstances.

ii. Applicant tenders "*I have turned my life around*". And while the Presiding Officer does not dispute the sincerity of such a plea it is the lack of a realistic track record that is somewhat lacking. Applicant's second of her two (2) criminal convictions was March 31, 2010. Less than four (4) years before her application was filed. Applicant's last of six (6) still outstanding civil judgments was entered on September 12, 2012. Not quite barely sixteen (16) months before her January 28, 2014 application. Customarily at a minimal a five (5) year period between last criminal conviction and full satisfaction of civil judgment obligations is the starting point. In both instances Applicant falls substantially short.

5. a. Without belaboring Applicant's history it is a basic pre-requisite to work in any capacity in any profession or occupation or business venture, especially the insurance business ----- *the ability to tell the truth and be honest* that is at issue

b. The characteristic of trustworthiness is **the** prime character qualification of Section 31A-23a-107, U. C. A., for all other characteristics requisite to engage in the insurance industry for the protection of the public interest of necessity flow from it.

6. The Department in licensing the Applicant or any individual in comparable circumstances to the Applicant would be breaching its responsibilities to the public.

7. a. The Presiding Officer while having heard the witnesses and reviewed the documentary evidence cannot peer into the heart, mind and conscience of any witness to assist him or her in making the most appropriate decision. The Presiding Officer can only look at and weigh the **present** evidence before him.

b. Here in the **present** instance the burden is/was on the Applicant to:

i. **Present** sufficient evidence to show that the Department's denial was not justified on the record; and

ii. **Present** sufficient evidence that would justify the reversal of such denial.

c. This the Applicant has failed to do.

d. The Applicant's January 28, 2014 application was properly denied based on the record before the Department.

BASED ON THE ABOVE AND FOREGOING FINDINGS OF FACT and discussion-analysis the Presiding Officer enters the following:

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Applicant does not meet the character qualifications for licensing outlined in Section 31A-23a-107, UCA, 1953, as amended.

2. The issuance of a “*Resident Producer Individual*” license would be in contravention of the intent and purpose of Section 31A-23a-107, UCA , which based on “Conclusions of Law” No.s 1 and 2, immediately above, the Department in the practice of good public policy and the protection of the public welfare cannot at this time do.

3. The Department’s “*letter of denial*” under date of January 30, 2014 should be affirmed.

4. The Applicant's January 28, 2014 application for licensure as a “*Resident Producer Individual*” should be denied.

AND BASED ON THE ABOVE AND FOREGOING CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

the Presiding Officer enters the following:

ORDER


WHEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The Department’s “*letter of denial*” under date of January 30, 2014 is **affirmed**;
and

2. The Applicant’s January 28, 2014 application for licensure as a “*Resident Producer Individual*” is **denied**.

DATED and ENTERED this 27 day of June, 2014.

**TODD E. KISER,
INSURANCE COMMISSIONER**



MARK E. KLEINFELD
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE and
PRESIDING OFFICER

Utah Insurance Department
State Office Building, Room 3110
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114
Telephone: (801) 537-9246
Facsimile: (801) 538-3829
Email: MKleinfeld@utah.gov

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY REVIEW

Administrative Agency Review of this Order may be obtained by filing a Petition for Review with the Commissioner of the Utah Insurance Department within thirty (30) days of the date of entry of said Order consistent with Utah Code Ann. Section 63G-4-301 and Administrative Rule R590-160-8.

Failure to seek agency review shall be considered a failure to exhaust administrative remedies.

(R590-160-8 and Section 63G-4-401)

JUDICIAL REVIEW

As an “**Formal Hearing**” after agency review judicial review of this Order may be obtained by filing a petition for such review consistent with Utah Code Ann. Section 63G-4-403.

ADMINH.Wright.I/A.dec.06-xx-14

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING


The undersigned certifies on this date, a true and correct copy of the forgoing ORDER ON HEARING was both e-mailed and regularly mailed, postage prepaid, to the following:

Dienisha Wright

4021 South 700 East # 500
Salt Lake City, Utah 84107

E-mail: DIENISHAP@GMAIL.COM

DATED this 27th day of June, 2014



LINDA HARDY
UTAH INSURANCE DEPARTMENT
STATE OFFICE BUILDING, ROOM 3110
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84114-6901