

February 2019
Volume 22, Issue 126

Inside this issue:

<u><i>FTC and Sage Auto</i></u>	<u>1</u>
<u><i>D-tag Insurance</i></u>	<u>1</u>
<u><i>Upcoming Events</i></u>	<u>2</u>
<u><i>MVDB Field Changes</i></u>	<u>2</u>
<u><i>Governor Northam and Microsoft</i></u>	<u>3</u>
<u><i>FTC Misleading Advertising</i></u>	<u>4</u>
<u><i>2018 Auto Industry Employment</i></u>	<u>4</u>
<u><i>2018 Deloitte Automotive Consumer</i></u>	<u>5</u>
<u><i>DMV News</i></u>	<u>6</u>
<u><i>Board Actions</i></u>	<u>7</u>
<u><i>Dealer-Operator Class Schedule</i></u>	<u>11</u>
<u><i>What's Wrong With This Picture?</i></u>	<u>12</u>

CONTACT US

2201 W. BROAD ST.
SUITE 104
RICHMOND, VA
23220

dboard@mvdv.virginia.gov

www.mvdv.virginia.gov

William Childress,
Executive Director
Peggy Bailey,
Program Manager
Lisa Mack-Nelson,
Field Rep. Supervisor
804-367-1100

MOTOR VEHICLE DEALER BOARD



FTC and Sage Auto Group

The Federal Trade Commission is mailing 43,456 checks totaling more than \$3.5 million to consumers subjected to deceptive and unfair sales and financing tactics by the Sage Auto Group and its owners between 2014 and 2016. Affected consumers will receive their checks soon, with the average refund amount totaling \$81.76. In September 2016, the FTC charged nine Los Angeles-area auto dealerships and their owners with using a wide range of deceptive and unfair sales and financing practices. The FTC's action, filed in the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California, sought to end these practices and return money to consumers. The action against the Sage Auto Group defendants was the FTC's first to charge an auto dealer for "yo-yo" financing tactics: using deception or other unlawful pressure tactics to coerce consumers who have signed contracts into later accepting a different deal. The FTC also alleges that the defendants packed extra, unauthorized charges for "add-ons," or aftermarket products and services, into car deals financed by consumers. In addition to barring the allegedly illegal conduct, the March 2017 order settling the FTC's charges required the defendants to pay approximately \$3.6 million for return to affected consumers. Recipients should deposit or cash checks within 60 days, as indicated on the check. The FTC never requires consumers to pay money or provide account information to cash a refund check. Impacted consumers will receive a percentage of their total add-on costs for vehicles they bought.

D-tag Insurance

VA Code § 46.2-1547, and § 46.2- 1575 (18) requires that each dealer license plate issued to you have liability insurance. As part of our routine visits/inspections of dealerships, our field representatives verify through your insurer that all dealer plates are insured. We have discovered that many dealers are under insured. That is, the number of dealer plates insured is less than the number of dealer plates issued to the dealership. We urge you to verify with your insurance agent that the number of dealer plates noted/listed on your policy is the same as the number of plates issued to you by the Motor Vehicle Dealer Board. For example, if you have been issued 20 dealer plates, your insurance policy should state you have insurance for 20 dealer plates, or state all dealer plates are covered.

As a helpful tool during your dealership renewal period, the MVDB includes a Self-Inspection Checklist that helps dealer's better prepare to remain in compliance. Specifically, in box 1 of this checklist is a reminder to review

Cont'd on pg. 2



Upcoming EVENTS

BOARD MEETINGS

All Meetings are held at DMV Headquarters
2300 W. Broad Street, Room 702
Richmond, VA

Monday, March 11, 2019

Dealer Practices Committee Meeting

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Licensing Committee Meeting

Time: Immediately following Dealer Practices Committee

Advertising Committee Meeting

Time: Immediately following Licensing Committee

Transaction Recovery Fund Committee Meeting

Time: Immediately following Advertising Committee

Full Board Meeting

Time: 10:00 a.m. or 15-30 minutes immediately following Transaction Recovery Fund Committee meeting.

MVDB will be closed

◆ Monday, February 18, 2019

Happy Presidents' Day!



Cont'd from pg. 1

D-Tags

your insurance policy and certify that the number of dealer plates insured is equal to the number of dealer plates issued.

As your business needs change, the Board suggests that in addition to renewal times, you periodically perform an inventory of your dealer tags. This is especially important for dealers that have a large number of tags. Reporting lost or missing tags is important. You are responsible for these tags. You should also perform an inventory before you renew your dealer tags. We will send you a "bill" at the time of renewal that includes the registration fee for each dealer tag. Lastly, it is important to note that when dealers are requesting additional tags, replacement tags, or renewing tags, the MVDB-9 requires a dealer's signature that certifies EACH dealer tag is insured. Pictured below is a compliant D-tag inspection where the insurance policy matches the number of tags issued on the Audit sheet.

Dealer Plates - Count 6	
Plate#	Issue Date
APID000	8/31/2016
APID000	8/31/2016
APID000	8/31/2016
APID000	8/31/2016
APID000	8/31/2016
APID000	8/31/2016

Hours Of Operation		
Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday

MVDB Field Change

Please join us in welcoming our newest Field Representative. Michelle Jefferson joins the dealer board after working for the Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles for 7 years as a Customer Service Generalist. She also gained experience while working for the State of North Carolina conducting Health and Human Services investigations. She will be responsible for Charles City, Franklin (City), Gloucester, Hampton, Isle of Wight, James City, Mathews, Middlesex, New Kent, Newport News, Portsmouth, Southampton, Suffolk, Surry, Sussex, Williamsburg, and York County jurisdictions. Michelle may be reached at michelle.jefferson@mvdb.virginia.gov, or 757-755-7070.

Governor Northam and Microsoft

Governor Ralph Northam recently announced that Microsoft Corporation, one of the largest and most influential companies in the world, will inject significant capital investment to expand its enterprise data center in Mecklenburg County. The project is Microsoft's sixth expansion at the facility since 2010 and will allow the company to further enhance its ability to serve customers in the U.S. and across the globe. Virginia successfully competed against multiple states for this significant investment, which will create more than 100 new jobs.

"When Microsoft established its new enterprise data center in 2010, it represented the largest economic investment in southern Virginia history, and we have been thrilled to see the company continue expanding in the Commonwealth ever since," **said Governor Northam**. "Microsoft's sustained investment in Virginia has created hundreds of new jobs for our citizens and advanced our position as a leader in information technology. We thank Microsoft for its tremendous contribution to the economies of Mecklenburg County and to the Commonwealth as a whole." Microsoft has created nearly 1,800 jobs in Virginia, with approximately 300 jobs at Microsoft locations in Mecklenburg County.

"As demand for cloud and online services continues to grow, Microsoft is investing in Virginia as a strategic location to help us deliver for our customers," **said Noelle Walsh, corporate vice president, Cloud Operations + Innovation, Microsoft Corp.**

"Mecklenburg County has been a good home for Microsoft, and we're committed to supporting the community through local partnerships to help deliver economic, social, and environmental benefits such as expanding access to high-speed broadband services and supporting skills training for positions in the information technology industry. We've also invested to increase the amount of renewable energy available and help others access more renewable energy. In May 2018, Microsoft announced the purchase of 315-megawatts of energy from two new solar projects in the Commonwealth of Virginia, which represented the single largest corporate purchase of solar energy in the United States."

The Virginia Economic Development Partnership worked with Mecklenburg County and the General Assembly's Major Employment and Investment (MEI) Project Approval Commission to secure the project for Virginia. Governor Northam approved a \$1.5 million grant from the Commonwealth's Opportunity Fund to assist Mecklenburg County with the project. The company is also eligible for Data Center Sales and Use tax exemptions on qualifying computer equipment and enabling software.

"Mecklenburg County is pleased that Microsoft is continuing to grow their operation in our County with their sixth expansion announcement since 2010," **said Chairman of the Mecklenburg County Board of Supervisors Glenn Barbour**. "The continued expansion of the Boydton Data Center showcases our county and its assets to the world. We look forward to working with Microsoft to continue their growth of their cloud services and the opportunities it provides for our citizens and our economy."

Reminders...

ALL IDO's of independent dealerships must recertify their IDO qualification every three years by either taking an online course, classroom course, or by passing a DMV test. Click [HERE](#) for more information and [HERE](#) to determine your recertification deadline. Please note that dealers with [Franchise](#) endorsements are exempt from recertification. If you are unclear on your recertification deadline, or any other recertification questions, please contact Ann Majors at the MVDB. She may be reached at 804-367-1100 x 3016#, or email at ann.majors@mvdv.virginia.gov.

FTC Misleading Advertising

Endorsements are an important tool for advertisers and they can be persuasive to consumers. But the law says they also have to be truthful and not misleading. The FTC's *Guides Concerning the Use of Endorsements and Testimonials in Advertising* are guidelines designed to help advertisers of all stripes – TV, print, radio, blogs, word-of-mouth marketing – make sure that they meet this standard. For example, advertisers are advised that using unrepresentative testimonials may be misleading if they are not accompanied by information describing what consumers can generally expect from use of the product or service. In addition, the Endorsement Guides let endorsers know that they shouldn't talk about their experience with a product if they haven't tried it, or make claims about a product that would require proof they don't have. The Endorsement Guides also state that if there is a connection between the endorser and the marketer of a product that would affect how people evaluate the endorsement, it should be disclosed. The FTC may decide to investigate whether the practices are unfair or deceptive under the FTC Act.

Suppose you meet someone who tells you about a great new product. She tells you it performs wonderfully and offers fantastic new features that nobody else has. Would that recommendation factor into your decision to buy the product? Probably. Now suppose the person works for the company that sells the product – or has been paid by the company to tout the product. Would you want to know that when you're evaluating the endorser's glowing recommendation? You bet. That common-sense premise is at the heart of the Federal Trade Commission's (FTC) Endorsement Guides.

The Guides, at their core, reflect the basic truth-in-advertising principle that endorsements must be honest and not misleading. An endorsement must reflect the honest opinion of the endorser and can't be used to make a claim that the product's marketer couldn't legally make.

In addition, the Guides say, if there's a connection between an endorser and the marketer that consumers would not expect and it would affect how consumers evaluate the endorsement, that connection should be disclosed. For example, if an ad features an endorser who's a relative or employee of the marketer, the ad is misleading unless the connection is made clear. The same is usually true if the endorser has been paid or given something of value to tout the product. The reason is obvious: Knowing about the connection is important information for anyone evaluating the endorsement. Click [HERE](#) for the link of frequently asked questions (FAQ) regarding FTC Endorsement Guides.

2018 Auto Industry Employment

Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics Data series https://www.bls.gov/iag/tgs/iagauto.htm	One year ago: Dec. 2017	Dec. 2018	12-month change: Dec. 2017 - Dec. 2018
Employment Seasonally Adjusted	(all employees, in thousands)		
Manufacturing			
Motor vehicles and parts manufacturing	956.3	<u>969.4</u>	<u>13.1</u>
Retail Trade			
Motor vehicle and parts dealers	2,019.90	<u>2,047.6</u>	<u>27.7</u>
Automobile dealers	1,303.40	<u>1,317.3</u>	<u>13.9</u>

2018 Deloitte Automotive Consumer Study

Here is an excerpt from a Deloitte Insights and Automotive News collaboration about finding new roads as the automotive industry transforms:

Many automotive manufacturers and dealers in the United States are making significant investments in a variety of consumer-focused digital technologies, ranging from tablet-based product guides to virtual reality (VR)-enabled applications with an eye to increasing customer engagement on the showroom floor. The intent is to update and improve a sales process that has not changed for the better part of a century. But which digital investments will yield the most significant returns? This question is the more difficult because manufacturers and dealers differ in the outcomes they need from digital transformation at the retail level. Generally, manufacturers are looking to large digital investments to drive overall mobility strategies aimed at reshaping the way consumers engage with their brand. On the other hand, dealers are typically pursuing much more immediate digital solutions to drive operational efficiencies, reduce overhead, empower sales staff, and increase transparency while reducing friction in the sales process.

Results from the 2018 Deloitte Global Automotive Consumer Study indicate that, out of all sources of information, brand and dealer websites have the greatest impact on new car-buying decisions (tied with input from family, friends, and coworkers). The importance of identifying, intercepting, and influencing potential buyers

online is underscored by the fact that half of US auto buyers do not engage in any dealer cross-shopping after they first visit a showroom. Indeed, 30 percent buy a vehicle the very same day they step onto a dealer's lot. Being top of mind when people first head out to kick some tires can thus significantly increase the odds of a sale.

Study results confirm the long-standing notion that people dislike excessive paperwork and the overall length of time it takes to buy a car. Digital tools that streamline these processes, such as used vehicle valuation algorithms and remote document "e-signing" capabilities, can elevate the overall shopping experience. They may even increase the likelihood of a sale by reducing the amount of time customers are exposed to anxiety-inducing aspects of the purchase process. And they can also provide the necessary conditions for effectively transitioning the customer into a long-term service relationship.

It's unlikely that in-person sales will ever disappear entirely, as several important aspects of the showroom experience can be hard to "digitize." For example, our survey shows that nearly nine out of 10 shoppers prefer the immediate, tactile experience of physically interacting with a vehicle before buying it, while 70 percent of buyers indicate they prefer in-person interactions with dealership personnel.

And nearly two-thirds of buyers say they would rather conduct price negotiations in person to secure the best deal.

These preferences imply that most auto buyers have yet to envision a fully digital vehicle-purchasing experience—and may also help explain why the wave of online shopping that is taking over many retail subsectors has yet to fully disrupt the automotive retail industry.

For more articles from Deloitte Insights Express Lane Ahead, click [HERE](#)

Reminders...

If you are a Franchise dealer and renewing your license, please be sure to state all your franchise and service agreements on the [MVDB 10](#) renewal license form. On the second page of the [MVDB 10](#) renewal form, in box number 7 there is space to list all the line-makes of the vehicles you are authorized to sell in Virginia. (Do not list individual models of vehicles.) For example, a franchise dealer might list the manufacturer as Volvo, the address of Volvo, and the line-makes Volvo. Box number 7 has space for 4 line-makes, but if you have more than 4 franchise agreements, please list them on a separate page. In box number 8, list the name and address of individual awarded franchise(s) or sales agreement(s). For example the owner and the owner's home address that was the individual awarded the franchise or sales agreement. Again, if you need additional space, list the Franchise names and addresses on a separate sheet and include in your renewal.

DMV News

Dealer Mandate

As a reminder, effective January 1, 2020, all applications for title and registration of vehicles processed by an independent motor vehicle dealer, that sold at least 100 vehicles in the previous calendar year, must be processed on-line. Independent dealers that sold 100 or more vehicles, in the prior calendar year, please visit our website at <http://www.dmv.virginia.gov/commercial/#odealer/index.asp> to learn more about the on-line dealer program and to find contact information for the four authorized on-line program vendors. DMV requires that you select an on-line vendor by September 1, 2019.

Awareity Training

Last year DMV implemented an annual training requirement for every user who accesses DMV records. Most on-line dealer participants have completed the training, others have not logged in, and some still need access to take the training. Dealerships that are not on-line and only issue PoD temporary tags through Virginia Interactive (PoDs) have until March 1, 2019 to complete the training. The Awareity system will automatically generate reminder emails until the training is completed. The dates within the reminder emails are generic; the official completion date is March 1. If you need access to the training please filter your requests through your vendor, who will supply DMV with the necessary information and we will send you your credentials by email. Users who may have been sent credentials check your spam folder to ensure you have not received it. If not found, credentials can be resent, however please provide the same information as previously supplied unless there is truly a change. Providing accurate information helps ensure you receive access to complete the training in a timely manner, and records are not duplicated.

Reminders...

It has come to our attention that some dealers are charging a reconditioning fee in addition to the vehicle's advertised price. Virginia law (Code 46.2-1581(8)) states in part the "... advertised price or credit terms shall include all charges which the buyer must pay; except buyer selected options, state and local fees and taxes, and manufacturer's or distributor's freight or destination charges, and a processing fee, if any. If a processing fee or freight or destination charges are not included in the advertised price, the amount of any such processing fee and freight or destination charges must be clearly and conspicuously disclosed..." Board policy is that adding fees specifically not allowed by Virginia law to the advertised price is deceptive. The Board staff will be stepping up enforcement and utilizing an accelerated penalty process for violators. First time violators will receive a written warning and second time violators will receive a \$1,000.00 civil penalty (if appealed, granted an informal hearing). Third time violators will be granted an informal hearing and eventually appear before the Board. If you have any questions regarding "fees" that you can legally charge to a customer you should contact the MVDB, VADA, or VIADA.

Board Actions

Dealer Practices

Informal fact-finding conferences:

Dixie Motorsports, Inc. and Wendy L. Murray. On August 29, 2018, an informal fact-finding conference was conducted to address the alleged violations of failure to maintain posted business hours, and failure to comply to previous warnings. Based on the information provided at the conference, the Board assessed a civil penalty of \$750 and a satisfactory inspection. Ms. Murray may appeal to a Formal hearing.

Xceleration Auto Sales, LLC and Hatim N. Abed. On August 28, 2018, an informal fact-finding conference was conducted to address the alleged violations of failure to maintain liability insurance on each d-tag. Based on the information provided at the conference, the Board assessed a \$2,000 civil penalty. Mr. Abed may appeal to a Formal hearing.

Kingdom Kars Auto Sales, LLC and Michael B. Hathaway. On October 1, 2018, an informal fact-finding conference was conducted to address the alleged violations of failure to maintain dealer records, failure to maintain liability insurance on each d-tag, material misstatement, and failure to comply with previous warnings. Based on the information provided at the conference, the Board assessed a \$4,000 civil penalty and a satisfactory inspection. Mr. Hathaway may appeal to a Formal hearing.

17 Auto Sales & Repair, LLC and Derrick W. Washington. On October 2, 2018, an informal fact-finding conference was conducted to address the alleged PoD violations of deceptive acts and practices, and having been convicted of a crime involving the business of selling vehicles and issuing PoD tags. Based on the information provided at the conference, the Board assessed a \$500 civil penalty, a successful inspection, and to successfully complete the 2-day Dealer-Operator course. Mr. Washington may appeal to a Formal hearing.

Enterprise Automotive Financial, LLC and Jassam M. Sarhan. On October 24, 2018, an informal fact-finding conference was conducted to address the alleged violations of failure to maintain posted business hours, material misstatement, and failure to comply with previous warnings. Based on the information provided at the conference, the Board assessed a \$1,500, a satisfactory inspection and successful completion of the 2-day Dealer-Operator course. Mr. Sarhan may appeal to a Formal hearing.

C & C Motor Sales, Inc. and Richard L. Custer. On October 24, 2018, an informal fact-finding conference was conducted to address the alleged violations of failure to display dealer certificate, maintain dealer records, display processing fee, maintain posted business hours, provide proof of safety inspection prior to retail sale, records of use of d-tags, misuse of d-tags, and failure to comply with previous warnings. Based on the information provided at the conference, the Board assessed a \$1,250 civil penalty, a satisfactory inspection, and successful completion of the 2-day Dealer-Operator course. Mr. Custer may appeal to a Formal hearing.

Tony's Auto & Truck Sales and Grover A. Wilson. On October 30, 2018, an informal fact-finding conference was conducted to address the alleged violations of failure to maintain posted business hours, and failure to comply with previous warnings. Based on the information provided at the conference, the Dealer Practices committee assessed a \$750 civil penalty and a satisfactory inspection. The Board waived the civil penalty due and satisfactory inspection requirement because Mr. Wilson submitted proof that he closed the dealership the same day as the Board meeting.

Budget Auto Sales, Inc. and David W. Phillips. On October 31, 2018, an informal fact-finding conference was conducted to address the alleged violations of altering a license plate purporting to have been issued by the DMV, material misstatement, deceptive acts and practices, and having been convicted of any criminal act involving the business of selling vehicles. Based on the information provided at the conference, the Board assessed a civil penalty of \$500 and a successful completion of the 2-day Dealer-Operator course. Mr. Phillips may appeal to a Formal hearing.

Board Actions

D Motors, LLC and Dmitriy Chaplinskiy. On November 13, 2018, an informal fact-finding conference was conducted to address the alleged violations of failure to maintain liability insurance on each d-tag, and material misstatement. Based on the information provided at the conference, the Board assessed a civil penalty of \$10,000 and successful completion of the 2-day Dealer-Operator course. Mr. Chaplinskiy may appeal to a Formal hearing.

Tri-State Automotive, LLC and Jeremy D. White. On September 18, 2018, an informal fact-finding conference was conducted to address the alleged violations of failure to maintain posted business hours, material misstatement, and failure to comply with previous warnings. Based on the information provided at the conference, the Board assessed a civil penalty of \$750 and a satisfactory inspection to be conducted. Mr. White may appeal to a Formal hearing.

Ed and Ted Auto Sales and Ted V. Tapscott. On November 28, 2018, an informal fact-finding conference was conducted to address the alleged violations of failure to provide proof of safety inspection prior to retail sale, and comply with previous warnings. Based on the information provided at the conference, the Board assessed a civil penalty of \$1,000, a written warning for failing to comply with previous warnings, and successful completion the 2-day Dealer-Operator course. Mr. Tapscott may appeal to a Formal hearing.

Car Loft and Farooq Zahir. On December 27, 2018, an informal fact-finding conference was conducted to address the alleged violations of failure to maintain liability insurance on each d-tag. Based on the information provided at the conference, the Board assessed a civil penalty of \$500, and a satisfactory inspection. Mr. Zahir may appeal to a Formal hearing.

Formal Hearing:

F & K Auto, LLC and Alford T. Robertson. Historical Overview leading up to the formal hearing: On July 26, 2018, an informal fact-finding conference was conducted to address the alleged violations of failure to maintain posted business hours, and comply with previous warnings. Based on the information provided at the conference, the hearing officer recommended assessing a civil penalty of \$2,000 and a satisfactory inspection. The Board adopted a resolution agreeing with the hearing officer's recommendation of assessing a civil penalty of \$2,000 and a satisfactory inspection. On October 11, 2018, Mr. Robertson appealed for a formal hearing. On November 13, 2018, a formal hearing was conducted to address the above alleged violations. Based on the information provided at the hearing, the Board assessed a civil penalty of \$1,000 and a satisfactory inspection. Mr. Robertson may appeal to Circuit Court.

All In One Auto Group, LLC and Zia Tabatabai. Historical Overview leading up to the formal hearing: On August 29, 2018 an informal fact-finding conference was conducted to address the alleged violations of having been convicted of any criminal act involving the business of selling motor vehicles. Based on the information provided at the hearing, the hearing officer recommended assessing a civil penalty of \$750 and a satisfactory inspection within 90 days. At the September 10, 2018 Committee and Full Board Meetings, The Board adopted a resolution agreeing with the hearing officer's recommendation of assessing a civil penalty of \$750 and a satisfactory inspection within 90 days. On October 10, 2018, Mr. Tabatabai appealed the Board's decision. On November 27, 2018 a formal hearing was conducted to address the above mentioned violations. Based on the information provided at the hearing, the Board assessed a civil penalty of \$750 and a satisfactory inspection. Mr. Tabatabai may appeal to Circuit Court.

Board Actions

Administrative Actions:

Henrico Motor Group, LLC and Mahmood H. Mohammad. Paid a \$750 civil penalty for failure to maintain posted business hours.

Nexcar Inc. and Joseph and Jacob Morris. Paid a \$750 civil penalty for failure to maintain posted business hours.

Marina Motors, Inc. and Mounir Jaadouni. Paid a \$1,000 civil penalty for failure to maintain dealer records, and proof of safety inspection prior to retail sale.

East Main Rides LLC and Edward Atkins. Paid a \$250 civil penalty for unlicensed salesperson.

Page Chevrolet, Inc. and Walter Page. Paid a \$1,750 civil penalty for unlicensed salespersons.

Johnson Automotives and Jermaine Johnson. Paid a \$1,500 civil penalty for failure to maintain dealer records, and liability insurance on each d-tag.

Wholesale Cars Inc, and Ralfe Finn. Paid a \$250 civil penalty for failure to maintain dealer records.

J & M Used Auto Sales and Marinda Vess-Pritchard. Dealership is suspended for not paying a \$1,000 civil penalty for failure to maintain liability insurance on each d-tag.

Car Plus, Incorporated and Samir Samadov. Paid a \$250 civil penalty for failure to maintain dealer records and unlicensed salesperson.

J.B. Auto Parts II and James Brown Sr. Paid a \$1,000 civil penalty for failure to maintain dealer records, and liability insurance on each d-tag.

Star Auto Sales and Ziad Aboulhosn. Paid a \$1,250 civil penalty for failure to maintain dealer records, and proof of safety inspection prior to retail sale.

Euroclassics Porsche and Mark Cooke. Paid a \$250 civil penalty for failure to maintain dealer records, and proof of safety inspection prior to retail sale.

3 Boys Motors Inc. and Felix Urbina. Paid a \$4,000 civil penalty for failure to maintain liability insurance on each d-tag.

Skyview Auto Sales and Joseph Owen 3rd. Failed to pay a \$4,000 civil penalty and was sent to debt set-off for failure to maintain liability insurance on each d-tag.

Auto Kingdom of Virginia LLC and Everett L. Bolling, Jr. Paid a \$250 civil penalty for failure to maintain dealer records, proof of safety inspection, and a non-compliant dealership sign.

3 D Automotive, LLC and Avis Young. Paid a \$750 civil penalty for failure to maintain posted business hours.

King George Auto Group, Inc. and Anita Lal. Failed to pay a \$750 civil penalty and was sent to debt set-off for failure to maintain posted business hours.

Haley Ford and James D. Pridgen, Jr. Paid a \$500 civil penalty for failure to maintain dealer records, and provide proof of safety inspection prior to retail sale.

DMV Automotive LLC and Youssef El Quadifi. Paid a \$750 civil penalty for failure to maintain posted business hours.

Hyman Bros. Mitsubishi and Haywood B. Hyman Jr. Paid a \$250 civil penalty for failure to maintain dealer records, and proof of safety inspection prior to retail sale.

Board Actions

Advertising

Carzlot Inc. and Blondi Bermema. Paid a \$250 civil penalty for Craigslist advertising in the owner section and not the dealer, listing a telephone number which is not the dealership number, and not disclosing the processing fee.

Automember/Motomember and Vasily Mulyar. Paid a \$250 civil penalty for an advertisement placed on Craigslist under the owner category instead of the dealer category, which is considered to be misleading. Also, the advertisement failed to disclose the processing fee.

Meek Motors, LLC and Davin Webster Meek. Paid a \$250 civil penalty for an advertisement placed on Craigslist under the owner category instead of the dealer category, which is considered to be misleading. Also, the advertisement states \$1,000 down without providing proper disclosure to complete the Truth in Lending Act, and the advertisement failed to disclose the processing fee.

Pinkerton Chevrolet – Lynchburg, Inc. and Jeffrey L. Wilson. Paid a \$250 civil penalty for misleading advertising. Their website gives the impression they sell GMC at the Salem location, when they only have the GMC franchise agreement in Lynchburg.

Ecocars LLC and Abdelkrim Elmouhib. Paid a \$250 civil penalty for an advertisement placed on Craigslist under the owner category instead of the dealer category which is considered to be misleading. Also, advertisement failed to disclose the dealer name or vadr and failed to disclose the processing fee.

For prior issues of Dealer Talk click [HERE](#)



To ensure MVDB can communicate promptly with Dealers, and that you receive all the MVDB correspondence; the Board recommends all dealerships and dealer-operators do the following:

- An “official” email address is registered with MVDB. If you need to submit or update your email address please send to dboardreply@mvdb.virginia.gov. **Please include your Dealer Certificate number for processing.**
- Review often the dealership email and contact information to ensure it “matches” MVDB records by requesting an Audit Sheet for your dealership. Please email your Audit Sheet request to your Field Representative or dboardreply@mvdb.virginia.gov.
- At the time of dealer license renewal, accurately indicate on the MVDB 10 (Section 4) the dealership email and the dealer-operator’s email address.

In addition, watch for Board notices, announcements, and other educational information emailed to you through Constant Contact, our email marketing tool. Here are a few other tips:

- Make sure the Board is listed as a “trusted site” in your email.
- Check your spam or junk box for any emails from the Board.
- Place the MVDB in your email address/contacts.
- If you have storage limits on your hosting email provider, please make sure you stay below your limits.

MVDB staff makes every effort to promptly and accurately record dealer contact information; therefore if there are any questions, please contact the Board at 804-367-1100.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO PROSPECTIVE DEALERS

The path to a Dealer-Operator license begins with a required two-day course of study each month at various community colleges in Virginia with the curriculum and instruction provided by VIADA. The course takes the attendee from establishing the dealership under local zoning and Dealer Board requirements, through the sales process with its multitude of forms, laws and regulations, into a sampling of opening and operating expenses, and ending with a discussion on ethics. The course is also open to all existing dealers and their employees.

THE FOLLOWING COURSES ARE REGISTERED THROUGH VIADA,

CALL 1-800-394-1960 to register or visit viada.org

Date	Location
<u>February 12-13</u>	<u>Paul D. Camp Community College, 100 N. College Drive, Franklin, VA 23851</u>
<u>February 26-27</u>	<u>Virginia Western Community College, 57 South Centre, Daleville, VA 24803</u>
<u>March 12-13</u>	<u>Reynolds Community College, 1651 E. Parham Rd, Henrico, VA 23228</u>
<u>March 26-27</u>	<u>Thomas Nelson Community College, 600 Butler Farm Rd, Hampton VA 23666</u>
<u>April 9-10</u>	<u>Blue Ridge Community College, 1 College Ln, Weyers Cave, VA 24486</u>
<u>April 23-24</u>	<u>Comfort Suites Manassas Battlefield Park, 7350 Williamson Blvd, Manassas, VA 20109</u>
<u>May 7-8</u>	<u>Lord Fairfax Community College, Warrenton (6480 College St, Warrenton, VA 20817)</u>
<u>May 21-22</u>	<u>Piedmont VA Community College, Charlottesville (501 College Dr, Charlottesville, VA 22902)</u>
<u>June 4-5</u>	<u>Germanna Community College, Fredericksburg (10000 Germanna Point Dr, Fredericksburg, VA 22408)</u>

MOTOR VEHICLE DEALER BOARD

MVDB

2201 W. Broad Street Suite 104

Richmond, VA 23220

Phone: 804-367-1100

Fax: 804-367-1053

E-mail: dboard@mvdb.virginia.gov

Editor: Ann Majors

Visit us on the Web!

www.mvdb.virginia.gov

DISCLAIMER: We make every effort to ensure information in Dealer Talk is accurate, but it is not a substitute for legal advice.



MVDB Mission Statement

The Motor Vehicle Dealer Board will administer sections of the Commonwealth's Motor Vehicle Dealer Laws and regulations as charged; promote the best interest of both the automotive consumer and dealer community; while providing a high level of customer service.

What's Wrong With This Picture?



§46.2-1550 states in part....

"It shall be unlawful for any dealer to cause or permit dealer's license plates to be used on (4) Vehicles used in conjunction with any other business."