



MINUTES

June 26, 2025

BOARD OF APPEALS HEARING

3:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Tom Rutherford called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers.

2. ROLL CALL (SILENT)

The following Hearing Panel members were present:

Joseph Bales
Tom Rutherford
Charles Sandoval

The following Staff members were present:

My-Tien T. Doan, Deputy City Attorney
Lynda Risucci, Board Secretary

3. IDENTIFICATION OF CHAIR

Chairperson Tom Rutherford for the June 26, 2025 hearing was Tom Rutherford.

4. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairperson Tom Rutherford led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

No one from the public offered any comments.

6. SWEAR IN

Chairperson Tom Rutherford administered the Oath to those in attendance who would be offering testimony at the hearing.

7. MATTERS TO BE HEARD

7.1. Administrative Citation No.: 22435:

Appellant: Yuping Wang, 4041 Rio Court, San Jose, CA 95134

- Roseville Municipal Code Section 9.10.030(A) - Operating Without Massage Permit
- Roseville Municipal Code Section 9.10.200 (E) - Certificate and Identification
- Roseville Municipal Code Section 9.10.200 (G)(3) - Employee Dress Code
- Roseville Municipal Code Section 9.10.220(H) – Records

The appellant Yuping Wang was not present at 3:00 p.m. The item was trailed to allow her fifteen (15) minutes from the commencement of the hearing to appear per the Administrative Hearing Procedures.

At 3:05 p.m, Appellant Yuping Wang appeared at the Board of Appeals Hearing with her interpreter, Fuze Han.

A. Staff Report:

Community Service Officer Erika Broussard offered testimony in regard to the Staff Report (Exhibit 7.1-A) and Notice of Violation (Exhibit 7.1-B) and answered panel questions.

Per RMC Section 2.50.060(D), the Staff Report was submitted to the City of Roseville Attorney's Office prior to the hearing and was provided to the Appellant and the panel members in advance of the hearing.

B. Appellant's Response:

Request for Hearing:

Appellant's Request for Hearing form (Exhibit 7.1-C) was received by the Roseville City Attorney's Office on April 08, 2025 and was provided to the panel in advance of the hearing for review.

Appellant Yuping Wang offered testimony through her interpreter, Fuze Han, in support of the appeal.

C. Rebuttals and Panel Questions:

Community Officer Erika Broussard offered rebuttal testimony and answered panel questions.

Appellant Yuping Wang offered rebuttal testimony and answered panel questions.

Community Officer Erika Broussard was recalled to the podium to answer further panel questions.

Deputy City Attorney My-Tien Doan offered clarification regarding Roseville Municipal Code Section 9.10.220(H), Records.

Appellant Yuping Wang and her interpreter, Fuze Han, were recalled to the podium to answer further panel questions.

D. Panel Discussion and Decision:

The panel discussed the evidence and testimony presented for Administrative Citation No.: 22435.

In regard to Roseville Municipal Code Section 9.10.200(G)(3) Employee Dress Code, a motion was made by panel member Charles Sandoval and seconded by Chairperson Tom Rutherford to:

☒ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE CITATION because the City/Complainant did not prove by a preponderance of the evidence:

☒ That the violation(s) occurred; and/or

☐ That the appellant is the responsible party.

The motion passed with the following vote:

AYES: Joseph Bales, Tom Rutherford, Charles Sandoval

NOES: None

In regard to Roseville Municipal Code Section 9.10.220(H), Records, a motion was made by panel member Charles Sandoval and seconded by panel member Joseph Bales to:

☒ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE CITATION because the City/Complainant did not prove by a preponderance of the evidence:

☒ That the violation(s) occurred; and/or

☐ That the appellant is the responsible party.

The motion passed with the following vote:

AYES: Joseph Bales, Tom Rutherford, Charles Sandoval

NOES: None

In regard to Roseville Municipal Code Section 9.10.030(A), Operating Without Massage Permit, a motion was made by panel member Charles Sandoval and seconded by Chairperson Tom Rutherford to:

☒ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE CITATION because the City/Complainant proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the violation(s) occurred and that the appellant is the responsible party.

The motion passed with the following vote:

AYES: Joseph Bales, Tom Rutherford, Charles Sandoval

NOES: None

In regard to Roseville Municipal Code Section 9.10.200(E), Certificate and Identification, a motion was made by panel member Joseph Bales and seconded by Chairperson Tom Rutherford to:

☒ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE CITATION but waive the fine in the interest of justice.

The motion passed with the following vote:

AYES: Joseph Bales, Tom Rutherford

NOES: Charles Sandoval

E. Panel Decision:

Regarding Roseville Municipal Code Section 9.10.200 (G)(3), Employee Dress Code, the panel decided to grant the appeal and dismiss the violation because the City/Complainant did not prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the violation occurred and that the appellant is the responsible party.

Regarding Roseville Municipal Code Section 9.10.220(H), Records, the panel decided to grant the appeal and dismiss the violation because the City/Complainant did not prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the violation occurred.

Regarding Roseville Municipal Code Section 9.10.030(A), Operating Without Massage Permit, the panel decided to deny the appeal and uphold the violation because the City/Complainant proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the violation occurred and that the appellant is the responsible party.

Regarding Roseville Municipal Code Section 9.10.200(E), Certificate and Identification, the panel decided to deny the appeal and uphold the violation but waive the fine in the interest of justice.

Chairperson Tom Rutherford signed the decision form (Exhibit 7.1-D), asked the Appellant to see staff for the paperwork, and informed the parties that they may file a petition for review with the Superior Court in Placer County within 20 days.

8. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by panel member Charles Sandoval and seconded by panel member Joseph Bales to adjourn the hearing.

AYES: Joseph Bales, Tom Rutherford, Charles Sandoval

NOES: None

Chairperson Tom Rutherford adjourned the June 26, 2025 hearing at 04:05 p.m.

Lynda Risucci
Board Secretary



Roseville Police Department
1051 Junction Blvd
Roseville, CA 95678

Troy Bergstrom, Chief of Police

**Administrative Citation Appeal Hearing
Staff Report**

Date of Hearing: Thursday, June 26, 2025 at 3:00 p.m.
Appellant: Yuping Wang, (Health Massage, 1950 Douglas Blvd, Ste A3)
Citation: 22435

Narrative:

On 02/06/2025, at approximately 1500 hours, Community Service Officer ("CSO") E. Broussard, Roseville Police Department Crime Suppression Unit (CSU) and EDD Associate Tax Auditor-Amy Pollard arrived at Health Massage (1950 Douglas Blvd, Ste A3) to conduct an unannounced massage compliance inspection. Prior to inspecting the massage business, CSO Broussard confirmed that there was a current Massage Business Permit issued to the establishment owner, Tony Dong (07-2041, Valid 3/14/2023-3/14/2025) for this specific massage business and address. Dong was the only individual reported and documented to be working at Health Massage, meaning no other persons were allowed to be operating a massage business or providing massage services at this location. Upon arrival, Dong was not located at the business, nor did he ever arrive during the inspection.

During the inspection, CSO Broussard contacted Yuping Wang within the business. A Language Line Mandarin Interpreter was used to communicate with Wang. A check of the California Massage Therapy Council (CAMTC) website indicates Wang has an active massage certificate #90990 (Issued 7/25/2024, Expires 7/25/2026). Wang informed Pollard and CSO Broussard that today (2/6/2025) was her first day of work. This is a violation of **RMC 9.10.030(A)**, as Wang was conducting, operating, and/or maintaining a massage business without having a valid massage business permit.

During the inspection, Wang produced her original CAMTC ID card and a photocopy of her CAMTC certificate was located in a frame on display in the front lobby. California State Law, CAMTC, and the RMC requires display of original CAMTC Certificate at each workplace. This information is outlined on the backside of the CAMTC certificate holders CAMTC ID card. Because Wang did not have her original CAMTC certificate posted at the location, this is a violation of **Violation RMC 9.10.200(E)**.

At the time of the inspection, Wang was wearing a shirt that significantly exposed the cleavage of her breasts. Because Wang acknowledged she was engaged in the practice of massage services that day, this is a violation of **RMC 9.10.200(G)(3)**.

A search of the front lobby and front customer check in desk yielded negative results for any client records or sign in sheets. As Wang was conducting, operating, and/or maintaining a massage business, she was required to maintain appropriate customer records. This is a violation of **RMC 9.10.220(H)**.

CSO Broussard issued citation #22435 for the violations noted above, specifically:

- RMC 9.10.030(A) RMC 9.10.200(E)
- RMC 9.10.200(G)(3) RMC 9.10.220(H)

Violation RMC 9.10.030(A) – Operating Without Massage Permit

It is unlawful for any person to own, conduct, operate or maintain a massage business within the city without having a valid massage business permit issued pursuant to this chapter. Massage business permits shall also be required of any permanent or semi-permanent seated massage or reflexology installation.

Violation RMC 9.10.200(E) – Certificate and Identification

The owner and/or manager shall ensure that the CAMTC certificate or exemption certificate for each on-duty massage professional is conspicuously displayed, visible from the entrance and/or reception and waiting area of the massage business, and that each massage professional has at his or her immediate disposal the CAMTC photo identification card or copy of the applicable exemption certificate at all times when working in the massage business. Such identification shall be provided upon request by a member of the public, the CAMTC, a member of law enforcement, or a city official.

Violation RMC 9.10.200(G)(3) – Employee Dress Code

All owners, managers, massage professionals, other employees and independent contractors of the massage business shall be fully clothed at all times while furnishing massage services. No such individual shall dress while engaged in the practice of massage for compensation in any of the following: A manner that exposes the individual's breasts, buttocks, or genitals.

Violation RMC 9.10.220(H) – Records

Every owner and/or manager shall keep a record of the dates and hours of each treatment or service, the name, address, and phone number of the client, the name of the massage professional administering such service and a description of the treatment or services rendered. These records shall be prepared prior to administering any massage or treatment and shall be retained for a period of two years after such treatment or service. These records shall be open to inspection upon demand by the police chief, the fire chief, the building official, any enforcement officer (as defined by Section 2.50.020 of the Roseville Municipal Code) or their authorized representatives or emergency personnel for emergency purposes.

Respectfully Submitted,

Erika Broussard
Community Service Officer II/Permit Coordinator

Attachment(s):
Photos








California State Law requires you to

- Inform CAMTC within 30 days regarding changes to your home address and workplace(s)
- Keep CAMTC ID Card in your possession when working
- Display original CAMTC Certificate at each workplace
- Request additional CAMTC Certificate(s) for each workplace
- Include your name and number as shown on your CAMTC ID in all advertising, including business cards and websites
- If you let your certification expire, you will lose all legal privileges afforded by California law to certified massage professionals

This ID Card and CAMTC Certificate(s) are the property of CAMTC



www.camtc.org info@camtc.org (916) 669-5336

CITY OF ROSEVILLE								22435	
NOTICE OF CITATION 2025- 8149									
Date		Time		Day of Week					
3/11/25		0900		Tues					
Name (First, Middle, Last)									
Yuping Wang									
Residence Address									
4041 Rio Ct San Jose CA 95134									
Business Address									
Health Massage 1950 Douglas Blvd, Ste A3 Roseville									
Driver's Lic. No.				State		Class		Date of Birth	
Y1943520				CA		C		1/29/77	
Sex	Hair	Eyes	Height	Weight	Decent	Age			
M	Blk	Blk	5'3"	110		48			
Description of Animal (If Applicable)									
Breed: Color: Age: Sex:									
Vehicle Make License #:									
Model: Year:									
Color:									
Location of Violation									
1950 Douglas Blvd, Ste A3									
Date / Time of Violation									
2/6/25 1500 hr									
Code / Ordinance					Description of Violation				
Rmc 9.10.220(H) Client Register									
Rmc 9.10.030(A) No Massage Permit Fail To Display									
Rmc 9.10.200(E) original CAMTC Certificate									
Rmc 9.10.200(G) Emp Dress Code									
☐ VIOLATIONS NOT COMMITTED IN MY PRESENCE, CERTIFIED ON INFORMATION AND BELIEF.									
I DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.									
Date:		Issuing Officer:							
3/11/25		Badge No. E Braussard 3070							
COMPLAINING PARTY									
X Signature: E Braussard									
I HEREBY ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THIS CITATION.									
X Signature: Complaint Cite									
YOU DO NOT NEED TO DO ANYTHING AT THIS TIME. YOU WILL RECEIVE NOTICE BY MAIL WITHIN 14 DAYS. CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE (916) 774-5325									
1 - City Attorney Copy			2 - Defendant Copy			3 - Issue Dept Copy			

Administrative Citation Appeal Form

Request For Hearing



Name Zheng Liu	Email andy.liu@aptumlaw.us	Phone 6504756289
Address 750 Alma Lane #8244	City Foster City	Zip 94404
Mailing Address (if different from above)	City	Zip
Citation Number 22435	Date of Citation march 16, 2025	

Reason for appeal?

(Include all information to support your appeal here. Continue on second page if needed.)
Please see attached.

Signature of Appellant

Date

Please mail or personally deliver this form within 30 days after the date of the citation notification letter to the Roseville City Attorney's office located at:

**City of Roseville
City Attorney's Office
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678
(916) 774-5325 • FAX (916) 773-7348**

Forms received later than 30 days after the date of the citation notification letter will not be accepted pursuant to Roseville Municipal Code § 2.50.060.

Reason for appeal continued...



City of Roseville City Attorney's Office
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678
attorney@roseville.ca.us

In re: Yuping Wang, Citation No.: 22435

Via Email

April 8, 2025

Dear Attorneys for the City of Roseville,

We represent Ms. Yuping Wang and write to appeal to citation no. 22435. Ms.

Wang is not liable as cited and the appeal should be granted and the citation set aside.

A. FACTS

Ms. Wang has been working as a licensed cosmetologist, rather than a massage therapist. In the second half of 2024, Ms. Wang's cosmetology work slowed down, and she began considering working as a massage therapist.

In late January 2025, Ms. Wang was referred by a friend to interview as a massage therapist at Health Massage located in Roseville. Ms. Wang decided to give this opportunity a try, because she was relocating out of the San Francisco Bay Area due to its exorbitant cost of living, and because some of Ms. Wang's friends work in the Sacramento area.

In the evening of March 5, 2025, Ms. Wang drove herself from her home in San Jose to the Health Massage in Roseville. Ms. Wang did not arrive in Roseville until around 10pm on March 5, 2025.

Due to the long-distance commute the day earlier, Ms. Wang did not report to the Health Massage for interview until around 10am the next day (March 6, 2025). The owner of Health Massage, however, was not immediately available to interview Ms. Wang but asked her to wait a little longer. The owner told Ms. Wang that she could have some of the food she kept in the refrigerator while waiting, because going out for lunch would take a lot of time as Ms. Wang was unfamiliar with the City of Roseville.

Ms. Wang wait until around 2pm, but the owner still had not returned for the prescheduled interview. Hungry, Ms. Wang decided to cook herself a late lunch, as the owner invited her to do.

Approximately 20 minutes later, while Ms. Wang was still cooking her lunch, some police officers from the City of Roseville arrived at the Health Massage for a pre-planned inspection. Because Ms. Wang had not been even interviewed, Ms. Wang was not wearing any Health Massage's uniform at the time the police officers arrived.

The police officers interviewed everyone who was present, including Ms. Wang. Ms. Wang felt nervous and intimidated by the presence of the police officer and tried to answer several questions that she did not quite understand. Ms. Wang tried to answer all the police officers' questions to the best she could

A few days later, the owner of the Health Massage told Ms. Wang that the business received a citation. Ms. Wang asked the owner to send her a copy of the citation so that she could report to CAMTC, but the owner refused.

On or about March 17, 2025, Ms. Wang received a civil administrative citation from the City of Roseville. The administrative citation alleges four violations of Roseville Municipal Code Sections: 9.10.030(A), 9.10.200(E), 9.10.200(G), 9.10.220 (H).

As explained below (*infra* at 5). Ms. Wang is not liable under any of the cited code section under explained below.

B. LEGAL STANDARD

Roseville Municipal Code is accessible at:

<https://ecode360.com/42757791#42757908>

Roseville Municipal Code Section	Full Text	Maximum Punishment Allowed
9.10.030(A)	It is unlawful for any person to own, conduct, operate or maintain a massage business within the city without having a valid massage business permit issued pursuant to this chapter. Massage business permits shall also be required of any permanent or semi-permanent seated massage or reflexology installation.	\$100.00 fine.

9.10.200(E)	The owner and/or manager shall ensure that the CAMTC certificate or exemption certificate for each on-duty massage professional is conspicuously displayed, visible from the entrance and/or reception and waiting area of the massage business, and that each massage professional has at his or her immediate disposal the CAMTC photo identification card or copy of the applicable exemption certificate at all times when working in the massage business. Such identification shall be provided upon request by a member of the public, the CAMTC, a member of law enforcement, or a city official.	S100.00 fine.
9.10.200(G)	All owners, managers, massage professionals, other employees and independent contractors of the massage business shall be fully clothed at all times while furnishing massage services. No such individual shall dress while engaged in the practice of massage for compensation in any of the following: <u>1.</u> Attire that is transparent, see-through, or substantially exposes the individual's undergarments. <u>2.</u> Swim attire, if not providing a water-based modality approved by the CAMTC. <u>3.</u> A manner that exposes the individual's breasts, buttocks, or genitals. <u>4.</u> A manner that constitutes a violation of Section 314 of the Penal Code, as may be amended. <u>5.</u> A manner that is otherwise deemed by the CAMTC to constitute unprofessional attire based on the custom and practice of the profession in California.	S100.00 fine.

9.10.220 (H)	Records. Every owner and/or manager shall keep a record of the dates and hours of each treatment or service, the name, address, and phone number of the client, the name of the massage professional administering such service and a description of the treatment or services rendered. These records shall be prepared prior to administering any massage or treatment and shall be retained for a period of two years after such treatment or service. These records shall be open to inspection upon demand by the police chief, the fire chief, the building official, any enforcement officer (as defined by Section <u>2.50.020</u> of the Roseville Municipal Code) or their authorized representatives or emergency personnel for emergency purposes.	\$100.00 fine.
--------------	---	----------------

C. DISCUSSION

Roseville Municipal Code Section	Description	Reasons Why Ms. Wang Is Not Liable
9.10.030(A)	Operating Without Massage Permit	Ms. Wang is neither an owner, nor an operator, nor an employee of the Health Massage permit. A job interviewee cannot be held liable for “operating” a massage business under this code section.
9.10.200(E)	Failure to Display Original CAMTC Certificate	This code section requires “[t]he owner and/or manager” to “ensure that the CAMTC certificate or exemption certificate for each on-duty massage professional is conspicuously displayed”; Ms. Wang is neither an owner or a manager at the Health massage; she was an interviewee. A job interviewee cannot be held liable for a business owner’s non-compliance with this code section. Because an interview has no power to manage or operate the massage business.

9.10.200(G)	Employee Dress Code	This code section requires “owners, managers, massage professionals, other employees and independent contractors of the massage business shall be fully clothed at all times while furnishing massage services.” A job interviewee cannot be held liable under this code Section, because she’s not an owner, a manage, or an employee. Further, during the entire police investigation, Ms. Wang was cooking her own lunch – rather than “furnishing massage services” – and she was thus not subject to the dress code requirement.
9.10.220 (H)	Client Register	This code section requires “owner and/or manager” to “keep a record of the dates and hours of each treatment or service, the name, address, and phone number of the client, the name of the massage professional administering such service and a description of the treatment or services rendered. ” A job interviewee cannot be held liable for a business owner’s non-compliance with this code section. Because an interview has no power to manage or operate the massage business.

As seen, all these code sections apply to a business owner or a manager, but not a job interviewee like Ms. Wang. As an interviewee, Ms. Wang had not power to control, manage or operate the Health Massage and thus cannot be held liable under these code sections.

D. CONCLUSION

A hardworking job interviewee stumbled into a difficult situation, Ms. Wang should not be punished for a stranger business owner’s failure to comply with the City of Roseville’s municipal code. Because these code sections impose obligations on a

business owner and a manager. Ms. Wang was neither and had not power to control, manage or operate the Health Massage in any way.

It is respectfully submitted that the appeal should be sustained and the citation set aside.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Zheng Liu". The signature is written in a cursive style, with the first name "Zheng" and the last name "Liu" clearly distinguishable.

Zheng Liu
1660 South Amphlett Blvd.
Suite 315
San Mateo, CA 94402
Andy.Liu@aptumlaw.us

Attorney for Yuping Wang

Exhibit A



City Attorney
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, California 95678

March 17, 2025

Yuping Wang
4041 Rio Court
San Jose, CA 95134

Re: Administrative Citation No.: 22435
Case No.: A25-00228
Location of Violation: Health Massage
1950 Douglas Boulevard, Suite A3
Roseville, CA

Dear Yuping Wang:

You have been charged with violating the following Roseville Municipal Code sections:

<u>RMC Section</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Fine Amount</u>
9.10.030(A)	Operating Without Massage Permit	\$100.00
9.10.200(E)	Failure to Display Original CAMTC Certificate	\$100.00
9.10.200 (G)	Employee Dress Code	\$100.00
9.10.220 (H)	Client Register	\$100.00

A copy of the citation is enclosed for your information. The total fine amount due is four hundred dollars (\$400). Please make your payment by April 16, 2025, to:

City of Roseville
City Attorney's Office
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

We accept checks or money orders made payable to the City of Roseville, or we can accept debit/credit card payments via telephone.

If you wish to contest the citation, you may do so by filing an appeal. To file an appeal electronically, please visit the City's website at www.roseville.ca.us and complete the Administrative Citation Appeal form. You can also complete the form and return by mail to the address listed above. All appeals must be completed and returned to the City Attorney's office within 30 days of the date of this notice.

For payment questions or questions regarding the appeal process, please contact the City Attorney's Office at (916) 774-5325.

Sincerely,

TRAVIS E. COCHRAN
Senior Deputy City Attorney

:lmr
Enclosures
cc: Police Officer



City Attorney
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, California 95678

CITATION APPEAL DECISION

Name of Appellant: Yuping Wang

Citation No.: 22435

FIRST VIOLATION

Roseville Municipal Code Section: 9.10.030(A) Operating Without Massage Permit

- ☒ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the violation(s) occurred and that the appellant is the responsible party.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant did not prove by a preponderance of the evidence:
 - ☐ That the violation(s) occurred; and/or
 - ☐ That the appellant is the responsible party.
- ☐ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION but waive the fine in the interest of justice.
- ☐ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION because the appellant failed to appear.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant failed to appear.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION at the request of the City/Complainant.

Name of Appellant: Yuping Wang

Citation Number: 22435

SECOND VIOLATION

Roseville Municipal Code Section: 9.10.200(E) – Certificate and Identification

- ☐ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the violation(s) occurred and that the appellant is the responsible party.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant did not prove by a preponderance of the evidence:
 - ☐ That the violation(s) occurred; and/or
 - ☐ That the appellant is the responsible party.
- ☒ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION but waive the fine in the interest of justice.
- ☐ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION because the appellant failed to appear.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant failed to appear.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION at the request of the City/Complainant.

Name of Appellant: Yuping Wang

Citation Number: 22435

THIRD VIOLATION

Roseville Municipal Code Section: 9.10.200(G)(3) – Employee Dress Code

- ☐ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the violation(s) occurred and that the appellant is the responsible party.
- ☒ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant did not prove by a preponderance of the evidence:
- ☒ That the violation(s) occurred; and/or
- ☒ That the appellant is the responsible party.
- ☐ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION but waive the fine in the interest of justice.
- ☐ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION because the appellant failed to appear.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant failed to appear.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION at the request of the City/Complainant.

Name of Appellant: Yuping Wang

Citation Number: 22435

FOURTH VIOLATION

Roseville Municipal Code Section: 9.10.220(H) - Records

- ☐ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the violation(s) occurred and that the appellant is the responsible party.
- ☒ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant did not prove by a preponderance of the evidence:
- ☒ That the violation(s) occurred; and/or
- ☐ That the appellant is the responsible party.
- ☐ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION but waive the fine in the interest of justice.
- ☐ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION because the appellant failed to appear.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant failed to appear.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION at the request of the City/Complainant.

Dated: 06/26/25

By: 

Hearing Panel Chairperson

Notice to Appellant: Under California Government Code Section 53069.4, any appeal of today's Hearing Panel decision must be filed with Placer County Superior Court within twenty (20) days of today's date.