

Jamaar M. Boyd-Weatherby, Hearing Officer
JONES MAYER
3777 N. Harbor Blvd
Fullerton, CA 92835
Telephone: (714) 446-1400

**BEFORE THE ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING OFFICER
FOR THE CITY OF HEMET**

IN RE:

MARIA JIMENEZ,
430 N. PALM AVE, #102,
HEMET, CA 92543,

SUBJECT PROPERTY,

APPEAL OF ORDER TO ABATE
SUBSTANDARD MH-UNIT UNDER
HEMET MUNICIPAL CODE.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE
HEARING OFFICER

Hearing Officer: Jamaar M. Boyd-Weatherby
Date: August 13, 2025
Time: 9:00 a.m.

1. This matter involves a Notice of Substandard MH-Unit, Order to Abate Substandard MH-Unit, and Notice of Intention to Abate Substandard MH-Unit for 430 N. Palm Avenue, #102 (“Subject Property”) in the City of Hemet in violation of California Code of Regulations (hereinafter “CCR”) Title 25 and Hemet Municipal Code (a locally adopted version of the California Building Code). Jamaar M. Boyd-Weatherby (“Hearing Officer”), sitting as the Hearing Officer, heard this matter on August 13, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. (the “Hearing”). The Hearing Officer is a licensed attorney in the State of California and serves as Hearing Officer under contract with the City of Hemet.

2. The City is a municipal corporation existing under the laws of the State of California. The City was represented at the Hearing by Officer Alex Reynoso and Sarah Kelly, Code Compliance Manager.

3. Maria Jimenez (“Subject Property Owner of Record”) appeared in opposition to the Notice of Substandard MH-Unit, Order to Abate Substandard MH-Unit, and Notice of Intention to Abate Substandard MH-Unit, and to appeal the initial entry by the City of Hemet Police Department, alleging the code compliance inspections were conducted without a warrant.

4. There were no verbal or written submissions for public comment from members of the public.

5. The Hearing Officer considered the testimony of all witnesses at the hearing, and all documents made part of the administrative record. The mere fact that a witness's testimony or document may not be specifically referred to below does not and shall not be construed to mean that said testimony or document was not considered.

6. Pursuant to the Administrative Procedures and practices for the City of Hemet, the hearing was digitally recorded.

7. The documents presented to the Hearing Officer during the hearing are the administrative record of the hearing.

ISSUES

8. The property owner, Maria Jimenez, is appealing the initial entry, alleging the inspections were conducted without a warrant.

9. Electrical wiring has been installed and/or altered at the subject property without required approvals and/or permits [CCR Title 25, Section 1606(d)];

10. The plumbing system at the subject property has been installed, altered, improved, or repaired without all requisite approvals and/or permits. Sewer addition shall be permitted, inspected and finally removed [CCR Title 25, Section 1606(e)]; and

11. Faulty weather protection shall include, but not be limited to deteriorated or ineffective waterproofing of exterior walls, roof, or floors, including broken windows or doors [CCR Title 25, Section 1606(g)]; and,

12. No person shall erect, construct, reconstruct, install, replace, relocate, or alter any building, structure, accessory building or structure, or building component; any electrical, mechanical, or plumbing equipment; ...without first obtaining a written construction permit from the enforcement agency.

13. Accumulations of junk, trash, debris, household furniture, equipment and other miscellaneous personal property have been placed and/or stored on exterior portions of the subject property. Household furniture that is not designed for exterior use (e.g., couches, tables, lamps, cooking appliances, bookshelves, vacuum cleaner), clothing, blankets, canned food, lumber, and other miscellaneous items are being kept and/or stored in exterior portions of the property. [CCR Title 25, Sections 1606(j) and 1606(j); HMC §§30–32(.1)(a)(12)(19)].

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

14. Pursuant to the provisions of Title 25 of the CCR, as adopted by the Hemet Municipal Code, and the Hemet Municipal Code section 30–32(.1)(a)(12)(19), the issue to be determined by the Hearing Officer is whether to abate 430 N. Palm Avenue, #102 pursuant to the July 29, 2025 Notice of Violation.

15. The Applicant filed a request to appeal the decision to abate this Property within 10 days of the June 12, 2025, Notice of Violation.

16. The property owner, Maria Jimenez, is appealing the initial entry, alleging the inspections were conducted without a warrant.

17. City of Hemet Police Department Officer Alex Reynoso (hereinafter “Officer Reynoso”) testified on behalf of the City. He testified that he has served with the City of Hemet Police Department for nine (9) years and currently holds the position of Field Supervisor for the A.E.R.O Team, which addresses quality-of-life concerns within the community. He has authorized access to probation and parole records. On June 11, 2025, while on duty, Officer Reynoso conducted a probation compliance check at 430 N. Palm Avenue, Unit #102. The property is a manufactured home. During the probation compliance check, he observed multiple safety hazards indicating ongoing, unpermitted construction work, specifically the addition of a master bathroom. Officer Reynoso testified that inside the residence, exposed electrical wiring was present in both the master bedroom and kitchen. Underneath the home, near the area of the new bathroom, Officer Reynoso observed standing water and large PVC pipes protruding from the ground, with a strong sewage-like odor. The master bedroom itself also emitted a similar odor. At the time of Officer Reynoso’s arrival, the home was occupied. Officer Reynoso opined that the construction appeared to be carried out by non-professionals, likely family members or friends of the residents. The exposed wiring posed a significant fire risk, especially in a densely built community where emergency vehicle access is limited. Due to these unsafe conditions, Officer Reynoso evacuated all occupants. Following the evacuation, he requested a Code Compliance Officer to conduct a full safety evaluation of the property. Officer Reynoso was asked by Maria Jimenez (hereinafter “Ms. Jimenez”), why he was present inside her house. In response to her inquiry, Officer Reynoso testified that he had had prior contact with an individual identified as Brandon Ocampo Luna (hereinafter “Brandon”) during a traffic enforcement stop approximately one week earlier. At that time, Brandon was operating a BMW registered to 430 N. Palm Avenue, Unit # 102, and stated that he resided at that address. Officer Reynoso further stated that on June 11, 2025, during a follow-up contact at the same location, he again encountered Brandon, along with two additional individuals identified as “Jesus Leon” and “Miguel Pedra.” All three individuals confirmed they were residing at the residence (430 N. Palm Avenue, Unit # 102), and that Brandon lived there as well. A records check performed by Officer Reynoso confirmed that Brandon was actively on parole with search conditions.

18. City of Hemet Code Compliance Manager Sarah Kelly (hereinafter “Ms. Kelly”) testified on behalf of the City. She testified that she is responsible for all field operations and investigations related to Code Compliance (the same as Code Enforcement). On June 11, 2025,

Code Compliance responded to a request from the City of Hemet Police Department regarding hazardous conditions at 430 N. Palm Avenue, Unit #102. Three Code Compliance Officers were dispatched after being notified of potential immediate safety risks. Upon arrival, Code Compliance Officers observed the following conditions inside and outside the manufactured home: (1) extension cords running throughout the home, (2) exposed electrical wiring and missing outlet/switch covers, (3) ongoing unpermitted construction such as demolished and rebuilt floors and walls, (4) stagnant water in the kitchen sink indicating a clog, (5) improperly sized window installations, with one window broken and missing glass, (6) an unpermitted interior wall creating a new room, (7) absence of smoke detectors in the bedrooms, hallway, and living room, (8) a bed placed in the living room, (9) washer and dryer obstructing a main passageway, with clothing blocking access, and (10) accumulation of junk and debris on the exterior of the lot. Due to the combined hazards, particularly the exposed wiring and construction debris, Code Compliance Officers determined there was an imminent fire risk and threat to occupant safety. A red tag (unsafe to occupy) was issued that day pursuant to authority granted under the Hemet Municipal Code. A temporary notice was posted immediately as the official red tag was signed by the City of Hemet Building Official and later posted and mailed to the physical address. Ms. Kelly further testified that on June 12, 2025, a formal Notice of Violation was issued to the property owner, outlining the observed code violations and providing a timeframe for compliance. There were no citations issued, as Ms. Jimenez initiated the permit process promptly by contacting the City's Building and Safety Department and HUD (Housing and Urban Development), which oversees permitting for mobile homes. A special inspection was later conducted by the City's Building Official due to a stated housing hardship. Based on interim improvements, conditional occupancy was approved while the permitting process continued. Ms. Kelly confirmed that the construction observed on June 11, 2025, was unpermitted. The red tag remained in effect, however, as repairs were completed in the interim, and subsequent inspections showed sufficient progress to allow occupancy. It was unclear to Ms. Kelly how repairs progressed despite the red tag, though documentation submitted through HUD and conditional approval from the Building Official may have allowed Ms. Jimenez limited access. Several signed entry permission forms were included in the packet submitted by the City which Ms. Kelly testified would have enabled Ms. Jimenez to enter the property for repair purposes.

19. Maria Jimenez testified on behalf of herself and 430 N. Palm Avenue, #102. Ms. Jimenez testified that on June 11, 2025, while at work, she was notified by her cousin that police had entered her home without a warrant. The Officers stated they were looking for Brandon and proceeded to arrest him despite having no warrant. Brandon was staying in the living room with Ms. Jimenez's permission to avoid commuting back and forth to Orange County while he completed construction within her home. Brandon did not live at the property, and she was unaware that he was on parole or subject to search terms, though she understood what those were. She subsequently filed complaints with both the City of Hemet Police Department and the City of Hemet for unlawful entry—by police and by code compliance. Following the incident, she was informed she had two hours to collect her belongings before being evicted due to unpermitted construction. However, she maintained that no permits were required for the work being done. She had consulted Daniel, the manager at the permitting location, who confirmed no permit was necessary for the construction she was completing. When she later attempted to obtain a permit as a precaution, Daniel expressed confusion about the red-tagging and issued her a general remodeling permit on June 19, 2025. Ms. Jimenez testified that the electrical outlet plug covers

were removed as part of routine painting and were going to be put back once the painting had dried. Plywood was being removed and replaced due to a sewage leak that had taken over three months for her management company to repair. She testified that there were no structural alterations, plumbing, or electrical work being done and that all exposed areas within her residence were temporary. She testified that the windows had been temporarily removed to accommodate a window-mounted AC-unit, which she was in the process of replacing. Ms. Jimenez testified that she subsequently filed a formal complaint with Code Compliance and the City of Hemet Police Department, citing a violation of her Fourth Amendment rights, as Officers entered her home without a warrant. She maintains that no permits were needed, and she was denied the chance to clarify her actions. Ms. Jimenez testified that her household laundry was visible due to five adults living in the home, which was expected during routine use. She testified that the remodeling focused on her bathroom, and some construction materials—such as plywood and drywall—were temporarily outside but intended to be brought back inside upon completion of construction. Ms. Jimenez testified that the extension cords were used for power tools during the construction work. She testified that she complied with instructions given to her and was told permits were unnecessary. She testified that after her property was red tagged, she resorted to sleeping in her car and was offered limited resources such as a homeless shelter. Ms. Jimenez testified that a city inspector visited but admitted he was not qualified to inspect mobile homes and did not know why he had been sent. She testified that he conducted a walkthrough, found no violations, and did not complete the inspection paperwork. Ms. Jimenez testified that during his visit, he called a city representative (Javier Nolasco) to clarify the City’s concerns about her property. She testified that Mr. Nolasco inquired about exposed wiring within her residence, which had already been fixed. Ms. Jimenez testified that she was then advised to contact Code Compliance and was provided with the inspector’s contact information. She testified that she incurred unnecessary expenses as a result of this situation, despite not engaging in any unlawful activity. In rebuttal to Officer Reynoso’s testimony about Brandon Ocampo, Ms. Jimenez responded that she had filed approximately three formal complaints, including one with the Attorney General, alleging ongoing harassment by Officer Reynoso. Since her complaints, Ms. Jimenez testified that Brandon has been repeatedly pulled over, surveilled, and arrested multiple times. Ms. Jimenez testified that Brandon, who is performing construction work on her property, continues to return periodically to complete construction tasks or visit her family. She testified that Brandon is a longtime family friend and comes and goes freely, sometimes staying at the location for a few days before returning to Orange County.

20. Credibility determinations were made in favor of the Applicant and the City.

21. Under California statutory law, every inmate eligible for release on parole “is subject to search or seizure by a ... parole officer or *other peace officer* at any time of the day or night, with or without a search warrant or with or without cause.” Pen. Code, § 3067, subd. (b)(3). Upon release, the parolee is notified that “[y]ou and your residence and any property under your control may be searched without a warrant at any time by any agent of the Department of Corrections [and Rehabilitation] or any law enforcement officer.” Cal. Code Regs., tit. 15, § 2511, subd. (b)4; see also Cal. Code Regs., tit. 15, § 2356 [requiring the department staff to notify the prisoner of the conditions of parole before release.] There is no dispute that Brandon Ocampo Luna was on parole on June 11, 2025, and subject to the standard search clause.

22. “It is settled that where probation officers or law enforcement officials are justified in conducting a warrantless search of a probationer’s residence, they may search a residence reasonably believed to be the probationer’s.” *People v. Downey* (2011) 198 Cal.App.4th 652, 658. Moreover, “an officer executing an arrest warrant or conducting a probation or parole search may enter a dwelling if he or she has only a “reasonable belief,” falling short of probable cause to believe, the suspect lives there and is present at the time.” *Id.* at 662. In contrast, “a search of a particular residence cannot be ‘reasonably related’ to a probationary purpose when the officers involved do not even know of a probationer who is sufficiently connected to the residence.” *People v. Robles* (2000) 23 Cal.4th 789, 795. Applying this standard, the entry into Ms. Jimenez’s mobile home was lawful based on the following: (1) Officer Reynoso testified that during a traffic stop approximately one week before June 11, 2025, Mr. Luna was driving a BMW registered to 430 N. Palm Avenue, Unit # 102, and stated he lived at that address, (2) on June 11, 2025, Officer Reynoso returned to that address and encountered Mr. Luna, as well as individuals who identified themselves as “Jesus Leon” and “Miguel Pedra,” whom confirmed they resided there, as well as Mr. Luna, and (3) a records check performed by Officer Reynoso confirmed that Mr. Luna was on active parole with search conditions.

23. Pursuant to California Code, Health and Safety Code Section 18029(a), “[i]t is unlawful for any person to alter or convert, or cause to be altered or converted, the structural, fire safety, plumbing, heat-producing, or electrical systems and installations or equipment of a manufactured home, mobile home, multifamily manufactured home, special purpose commercial modular, or commercial modular that bears a department insignia of approval or federal label when the manufactured home, mobile home, multifamily manufactured home, special purpose commercial modular, or commercial modular is used, occupied, sold, or offered for sale within this state, unless its performance as altered or converted is in compliance with this chapter and applicable regulations adopted by the department. The department may adopt regulations providing requirements for alterations and conversions described in this section.” Based on the evidence, the construction observed on June 11, 2025, at 420 N. Palm Avenue, Unit #102, was unpermitted. Sarah Kelly testified that Code Compliance Officers identified several violations within Ms. Jimenez’s manufactured home, indicating alterations to structural, fire safety, plumbing, and electrical systems. These included: (1) exposed electrical wiring and missing outlet/switch covers, (2) unpermitted construction, such as demolished and rebuilt floors and walls, (3) improperly sized window installations, including one broken window, (4) an unpermitted interior wall creating a new room, and (5) lack of smoke detectors in the bedrooms, hallway, and living room. Officer Reynoso also observed standing water and large PVC pipes protruding from the ground, with a strong sewage-like odor, beneath the home and near a newly constructed bathroom area. The City submitted exhibits corroborating these violations.

24. Pursuant to the California Code of Regulations, Title 25, Chapter 2, Section 1018, “no person shall erect, construct, reconstruct, install, replace, relocate, or alter any building, structure, accessory building or structure, or building component; any electrical, mechanical, or plumbing equipment; any fuel gas equipment and installations, or fire protection equipment; or the installation of, within, a park, or a lot without first obtaining a written construction permit from the enforcement agency.” Consistent with the analysis in paragraph 23 *supra*, Code Compliance Officers identified several violations within Ms. Jimenez’s manufactured home, indicating construction, reconstruction, installation, replacement and alterations to structural, fire protection,

plumbing, and electrical systems. Observed violations included: (1) exposed electrical wiring and missing outlet/switch covers, (2) unpermitted demolition and reconstruction of floors and walls, (3) improperly sized window installations, including one broken window, (4) an unpermitted interior wall creating a new room, and (5) absence of smoke detectors in the bedrooms, hallway, and living room. Officer Reynoso further observed standing water and large PVC pipes protruding from the ground beneath the home, with a strong sewage-like odor near the area of a newly constructed bathroom area. The City submitted exhibits corroborating these violations.

25. Pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 25, Section 1606(d), the City established that “the electrical wiring had been installed and/or altered at the subject property without required approvals and/or permits.” Per the evidence, Sarah Kelly testified that exposed electrical wiring and missing outlet/switch covers were observed. Ms. Jimenez stated that the electrical outlet plug covers had been removed for routine painting and would be reinstalled once the paint dried. Additionally, the City produced exhibits that corroborate the alleged violations.

26. Pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 25, Section 1606(e), the City established that, “the plumbing system at the subject property has been installed, altered, improved, or repaired without all requisite approvals and/or permits. Sewer addition shall be permitted, inspected and finalized removed.” Based on the evidence, Officer Reynoso testified that beneath the home near the newly constructed bathroom, he observed standing water, large PVC pipes protruding from the ground, and a strong sewage odor. A sewage odor was also present in the master bedroom. This testimony suggests that the plumbing system at 420 N. Palm Avenue, # 102 was altered from its original installation without the required permits or approvals. Additionally, the City produced exhibits that corroborate the alleged violations.

27. Pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 25, Section 1606(g), the City established a violation due to, “[f]aulty weather protection shall include, but not be limited to deteriorated or ineffective waterproofing of exterior walls, roof, or floors, including broken windows or doors.” According to the testimony, Code Compliance Officers observed unpermitted construction, including demolished and rebuilt floors and walls, improperly sized window installations, and one broken window missing glass. Maria Jimenez testified that the remodeling was focused on her bathroom, and that construction materials such as plywood and drywall were temporarily stored outside, pending completion of the work. Additionally, the City produced exhibits that corroborate the alleged violations.

28. Lastly, pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 25, Sections 1606(j) and Hemet Municipal Code sections 30–32(.1)(a)(12)(19), the City established there was an “[a]ccumulation of junk, trash, debris, household furniture, equipment and other miscellaneous personal property have been placed and/or stored on exterior portions of the subject property. Household furniture that is not designed for exterior use (e.g., couches, tables, lamps, cooking appliances, bookshelves, vacuum cleaner), clothing, blankets, canned food, lumber, and other miscellaneous items are being kept and/or stored in exterior portions of the property.” According to the evidence, Code Compliance Officers observed an accumulation of junk and debris on the exterior of the lot. Maria Jimenez testified that construction materials, including plywood and drywall, were temporarily stored outside during bathroom remodeling and were to be returned

indoors upon completion. Additionally, the City produced exhibits that corroborate the alleged violations.

DECISION AND ORDER

29. The City presented sufficient evidence showing that the initial entry by the City of Hemet Police Department as a precursor to the Code Compliance inspection, was valid.

30. The City presented sufficient evidence showing violations of the following:

- (1) CCR Title 25, Section 1606(d);
- (2) CCR Title 25, Section 1606(e);
- (3) CCR Title 25, Section 1606(g);
- (4) CCR Title 25, Chapter 2, Section 1018;
- (5) CCR Title 25, Sections 1606(j); and
- (6) HMC §§30–32(.1)(a)(12)(19).

31. The Hearing Officer hereby DENIES Ms. Maria Jimenez’s appeal of the initial entry and allegation that the inspections were conducted without a warrant. In addition, there was sufficient evidence to UPHOLD the observed violations listed on the Notice of Violation.

32. Any person aggrieved by an administrative decision of a Hearing Officer may obtain review of the administrative decision by filing a petition for review with the Riverside County Superior Court in accordance with the timelines and provisions as set forth in California Government Code Section 53069.4. There may be other time limits which also affect the ability to seek judicial review.

Dated: August 24, 2025



Jamaar M. Boyd-Weatherby
Hearing Examiner