

Nicole Elliott
Director

October 27, 2025

VIA EMAIL ONLY

High Grade Enterprises Vanessa Loera & Jasen Diaz, Owners highgradeassociates@gmail.com Alice C. Lin, Esq. Lin Legal Services alice@linlegalservices.com

Re: High Grade Enterprises - Case No. DCC25-0000371-INV

Order Adopting Stipulated Settlement and Order as Final Decision

Dear Mses. Lin and Loera, and Mr. Diaz:

Pursuant to section 11415.60 of the Government Code, attached please find a copy of the Department of Cannabis Control's Order Adopting Stipulated Settlement and Order as the Final Decision in the above-referenced matter involving High Grade Enterprises.

The Department's Order and Final Decision will be effective today, October 27, 2025. Pursuant to this Final Decision and its stipulated settlement, High Grade Enterprises has waived any right to reconsideration or appeal in this matter and to receive a copy of the Decision and Order via certified, registered, or first-class mail.

Sincerely.

Marc LeForestier General Counsel

Enclosure

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF CANNABIS CONTROL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
9		
10		
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:) CASE NO. DCC25-0000371-INV
12	HIGH GRADE ENTERPRISES; VANESSA LOERA, OWNER;)) \ ORDER ADOPTING STIPULATED
13	JASEN DIAZ, OWNER	SETTLEMENT AND ORDER AS FINAL DECISION
14	722 Julie Ann Way, Suite 2 Oakland, CA 94621)
15	Cannabis Microbusiness License))
16	No. C12-0000362-LIC))
17	Respondent.	
18		
19	Pursuant to Government Code section 11415.60, the Department of Cannabis Control	
20	hereby adopts the attached Stipulated Settlement and Order as its Final Decision in this matter.	
21	This Order and Final Decision shall become effective on October 27, 2025.	
22	IT IS SO ORDERED, October 27, 2025.	
23		
24	More La Forestian	
25		
26	Marc LeForestier General Counsel	
27	FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF CANNABIS CONTROL	
28	ORDER ADOPTING STIPULATED SETTLEMENT AND ORDER AS FINAL DECISION	
	ONDER ADUPTING STIPULA	TIED SELLLEMENT AND OKDER AS FINAL DECISION

CASE NO. DCC25-0000371-INV; HIGH GRADE ENTERPRISES

1	ROB BONTA			
2	Attorney General of California HARINDER K. KAPUR			
3	Senior Assistant Attorney General State Bar No. 198769			
4	600 West Broadway, Suite 1800 San Diego, CA 92101			
5	Telephone: (619) 738-9407 Facsimile: (916) 732-7920			
6	E-mail: Harinder.Kapur@doj.ca.gov			
7	Attorneys for Complainant			
8	BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF CANNABIS CONTROL			
	STATE OF CA	ALIFORNIA		
9 10	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. DCC25-0000371-INV		
11	HIGH GRADE ENTERPRISES; VANESSA	STIPULATED REVOCATION OF		
12	LOERA AND JASEN DIAZ, OWNERS 722 Julie Ann Way, Ste. 2	LICENSE AND ORDER		
13	Oakland, CA 94621			
14	Cannabis Microbusiness License No.			
15	C12-0000362-LIC			
16	Respondent.			
17				
18	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGR	EED by and between the parties to the above-		
19	entitled proceedings that the following matters are	e true:		
20	PART	<u> TIES</u>		
21	Evelyn Schaeffer (Complainant) is the	e Deputy Director of the Compliance Division		
22	of the Department of Cannabis Control (Department). She brought this action solely in her			
23	official capacity and is represented in this matter by Rob Bonta, Attorney General of the State of			
24	California, by Harinder K. Kapur, Senior Assistant Attorney General.			
25	2. High Grade Enterprises (Respondent) and Vanessa Loera and Jasen Diaz,			
26	Respondent's Owners, are represented in this proceeding by attorney Alice Lin, Lin Legal			
27	Services, 2261 Market St, Suite 312, San Francisco, CA 94114. Respondent is acting in this			
28				

proceeding through Vanessa Loera, Owner, and she has been designated and authorized by High Grade Enterprises to enter into this agreement on behalf of Respondent.

3. On or about June 16, 2021, the Department issued Cannabis Microbusiness License No. C12-0000362-LIC to Respondent. The Cannabis Microbusiness License will expire on June 16, 2025, unless renewed.

JURISDICTION

4. Accusation No. DCC25-0000371-INV was filed before the Department and is currently pending against Respondent. The Accusation and all other statutorily required documents were properly served on Respondent on May 16, 2025. Respondent timely filed its Notice of Defense contesting the Accusation. A true and correct copy of Accusation No. DCC25-0000371-INV is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference.

ADVISEMENT AND WAIVERS

- 5. Respondent has carefully read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the charges and allegations in Accusation No. DCC25-0000371-INV. Respondent has also carefully read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the effects of this Stipulated Revocation of License and Order.
- 6. Respondent is fully aware of its legal rights in this matter, including the right to a hearing on the charges and allegations in the Accusation; the right to confront and cross-examine the witnesses against them; the right to present evidence and to testify on its own behalf; the right to the issuance of subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents; the right to reconsideration and court review of an adverse decision; and all other rights accorded by the California Administrative Procedure Act and other applicable laws.
- 7. Respondent is fully aware of its legal rights to receive a copy of the Decision and Order via certified, registered, or first-class mail. Respondent agrees to receive a copy of the Decision and Order in this matter via email at the following email addresses:
- Highgradeassociates@gmail.com and alice@linlegalservices.com.
- 8. Respondent voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently waives and gives up each and every right set forth above.

CULPABILITY

- 9. Respondent understands and agrees that the charges and allegations in Accusation No. DCC25-0000371-INV, if proven at a hearing, constitute cause for imposing discipline upon its Cannabis Microbusiness License No. C12-0000362-LIC.
- 10. For the purpose of resolving the Accusation without the expense and uncertainty of further proceedings, Respondent agrees that, at a hearing, Complainant could establish a factual basis for the charges in the Accusation, and that Respondent hereby gives up its right to contest those charges.
- 11. Respondent understands that by signing this stipulation Respondent enables the Department to issue an order revoking Respondent's Cannabis Microbusiness License No. C12-0000362-LIC without further process.

CONTINGENCY

- 12. This stipulation shall be subject to approval by the Department. Respondent understands and agrees that counsel for Complainant and the staff of the Department may communicate directly with the Department regarding this stipulation and settlement, without notice to or participation by Respondent or its counsel. By signing the stipulation, Respondent understands and agrees that it may not withdraw its agreement or seek to rescind the stipulation prior to the time the Department considers and acts upon it. If the Department fails to adopt this stipulation as its Decision and Order, the Stipulated Revocation of License and Order shall be of no force or effect, except for this paragraph, it shall be inadmissible in any legal action between the parties, and the Department shall not be disqualified from further action by having considered this matter.
- 13. The parties understand and agree that Portable Document Format (PDF) and facsimile copies of this Stipulated Revocation of License and Order, including PDF and facsimile signatures thereto, shall have the same force and effect as the originals.
- 14. This Stipulated Settlement for Revocation of License and Order may be signed in any number of counterparts, each of which is an original and all of which taken together form one single document.

- 15. This Stipulated Settlement for Revocation of License and Order is intended by the parties to be an integrated writing representing the complete, final, and exclusive embodiment of their agreement. It supersedes any and all prior or contemporaneous agreements, understandings, discussions, negotiations, and commitments (written or oral). This Stipulated Settlement for Revocation of License and Order may not be altered, amended, modified, supplemented, or otherwise changed except by a writing executed by an authorized representative of each of the parties.
- 16. In consideration of the foregoing admissions and stipulations, the parties agree that the Department may, without further notice or formal proceeding, issue and enter the following Order:

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Cannabis Microbusiness License No. C12-0000362-LIC, issued to Respondent High Grade Enterprises (Respondent) with Vanessa Loera and Jasen Diaz, Owners, is revoked.

- 1. The revocation of Respondent's Cannabis Microbusiness License shall constitute the imposition of discipline against Respondent. This stipulation constitutes a record of the discipline and shall become a part of Respondent's license history with the Department.
- Respondent shall lose all rights and privileges as a Cannabis Microbusiness in California as of the effective date of the Department's Decision and Order.
- The revocation of Respondent's Cannabis Microbusiness License No. C12-0000362-LIC shall constitute the full and final imposition of discipline against Respondent and its owners operating under this license number.
- 4. If Respondent ever applies for licensure or petitions for reinstatement in the State of California, the Department shall treat it as a new application for licensure. Respondent must comply with all the laws, regulations and procedures for licensure in effect at the time the application or petition is filed, and all of the charges and allegations contained in Accusation No. DCC25-0000371-INV shall be deemed to be true, correct and admitted by Respondent when the Department determines whether to grant or deny the application or petition.

1	5. Respondent shall pay the Department its costs of investigation and enforcement in the	
2	amount of \$8,957.25 prior to issuance of a new or reinstated license.	
3	<u>ACCEPTANCE</u>	
4	I have carefully read the above Stipulated Revocation of License and Order and have fully	
5	discussed it with my attorney. I understand the stipulation and the effect it will have on my	
6	Cannabis Microbusiness License. I enter into this Stipulated Revocation of License and Order	
7	voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently, and agree to be bound by the Decision and Order of the	
8	Department of Cannabis Control.	
9		
10	DATED: 10 / 08 / 2025	
11 12	HIGH GRADE ENTERPRISES; VANESSA LOERA AND JASEN DIAZ, OWNERS Respondent	
13		
14	Those and fully discussed with Desmandant High Conde Entermises and Vances	
15	I have read and fully discussed with Respondent High Grade Enterprises and Vanessa	
16	Loera and Jasen Diaz, Owners, the terms and conditions and other matters contained in the above	
17	Stipulated Revocation of License and Order. I approve its form and content.	
18	DATED:	
19	ALICE LIN	
20	Lin Legal Services Attorney for Respondent	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	5	



Title Stipulated Settlement - PLZ SIGN

File name Stipulated_Revoca...Enterprises_1.pdf

Document ID 86d9b90b8552dd93a96cad4367c430932640da2b

Audit trail date format MM / DD / YYYY

Status • Signed

Document History

SENT

O7 / 30 / 2025 Sent for signature to Vanessa Loera

17:25:54 UTC (highgradeassociates@gmail.com) from

alice@linlegalservices.com

IP: 198.27.220.159

O8 / 02 / 2025 Viewed by Vanessa Loera (highgradeassociates@gmail.com)

VIEWED 17:38:03 UTC IP: 162.205.182.130

10 / 08 / 2025 Signed by Vanessa Loera (highgradeassociates@gmail.com)

SIGNED 21:33:02 UTC IP: 50.189.71.49

7 10 / 08 / 2025 The document has been completed.

COMPLETED 21:33:02 UTC

ENDORSEMENT The foregoing Stipulated Revocation of License and Order is hereby respectfully submitted for consideration by the Department of Cannabis Control. DATED: October 13, 2025 Respectfully submitted, ROB BONTA Attorney General of California Harinder Kapur HARINDER K. KAPUR Senior Assistant Attorney General Attorneys for Complainant SD2025801553

Exhibit A

Accusation No. DCC25-0000371-INV

1 2	ROB BONTA Attorney General of California HARINDER K. KAPUR Senior Assistant Attorney General		
3	State Bar No. 198769 600 West Broadway, Suite 1800		
4	San Diego, CA 92101 P.O. Box 85266 San Diego, CA 92186-5266 Telephone: (619) 738-9407 Facsimile: (916) 732-7920 E-mail: Harinder.Kapur@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Complainant		
5			
6 7			
8			
9	BEFOR	E THE	
10	DEPARTMENT OF CANNABIS CONTROL STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
11		1	
12	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. DCC25-0000371-INV	
13	HIGH GRADE ENTERPRISES; VANESSA LOERA AND JASEN DIAZ,	ACCUSATION	
14 15	OWNERS 722 Julie Ann Way, Ste. 2 Oakland, CA 94621		
16	Cannabis - Microbusiness License No. C12-0000362-LIC		
17	Respondent.		
18 19			
20	PAR'	ΓΙΕS	
21	PARTIES 1. Evelyn Schaeffer (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity		
22	as the Deputy Director of the Compliance Division of the Department of Cannabis Control		
23	(Department).		
24	2. On or about June 16, 2021, the Depar	tment issued Cannabis - Microbusiness License	
25	No. C12-0000362-LIC to High Grade Enterprises (Respondent), with Vanessa Loera (Owner		
26	Loera) and Jasen Diaz (Owner Diaz) as Owners. The Cannabis- Microbusiness License will		
27	expire on June 16, 2025, unless renewed.		
28	///		
		1	

PROCEDURAL HISTORY 1 2 3. The Department issued an Emergency Decision and Order (EDO), pursuant to 3 California Code of Regulations, title 4, section 17815 that was served on Respondent on May 7, 4 2025, and was effective the same day at 5:00 p.m. The EDO suspended Respondent's licenses 5 and ordered Respondent to cease all commercial cannabis activity. The time to initiate 6 adjudicative proceedings is within 10 days after the issuance or effective date of the EDO, or in 7 this case by or on May 17, 2025. 8 **JURISDICTION** 9 4. This Accusation is brought before the Director of the Department (Director), under 10 the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions 11 Code unless otherwise indicated. 12 5. Section 26010 of the Code states: 13 There is in the Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency, the Department of Cannabis Control under the supervision and control of a director. The 14 director shall administer and enforce the provisions of this division related to the department. 15 6. Section 26010.5, subdivision (d), of the Code states: 16 The department has the power, duty, purpose, responsibility, and jurisdiction to 17 regulate commercial cannabis activity as provided in this division. 18 7. Section 26012, subdivision (a), of the Code states: 19 It being a matter of statewide concern, except as otherwise authorized in this division, the department shall have the sole authority to create, issue, deny, renew, 20 discipline, condition, suspend, or revoke licenses for commercial cannabis activity. 21 8. Section 26013, subdivision (a), of the Code states: 22 The department shall make and prescribe reasonable rules and regulations as may be necessary to implement, administer, and enforce its duties under this division 23 in accordance with Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 11340) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code. Those rules and regulations shall be 24 consistent with the purposes and intent of the Control, Regulate and Tax Adult Use of Marijuana Act. 25 26 /// 27

shall be conducted during standard business hours of the licensed facility or at any

1	the following additional information on the shipping manifest:	
2		
3		
4	(c) Upon pick-up or receipt of cannabis and cannabis products for transport, storage, or inventory, a licensee shall ensure that the cannabis or cannabis products	
5	received are as described in the shipping manifest. The licensee shall record acceptance or receipt, and acknowledgment of the cannabis or cannabis products in	
6	the track and trace system.	
7	(d) If there are any discrepancies between type or quantity of cannabis or cannabis products specified in the shipping manifest and the type or quantity received by the licensee, the licensee shall reject the shipment.	
8		
9	22. Title 4 of the California Code of Regulations, section 15051, states:	
10	(a) The license shall review the information recorded in the track and trace system at least once every 30 calendar days to ensure its accuracy, including, at a minimum:	
12	(1) Reconciling on-hand inventory of cannabis and cannabis product with the records in the track and trace system; and	
13	(2) Reviewing the licensee's authorized users and removing any users who are no longer authorized to enter information into the track and trace system.	
14 15 16	(b) If a licensee finds a discrepancy between the on-hand inventory and the track and trace system, the licensee shall conduct an audit and notify the Department in writing if the discrepancy is significant as defined in section 15034.	
17	COST RECOVERY	
18	23. Section 26031.1 of the Code states:	
19		
20	(a) Except as otherwise provided by law, in an order issued in resolution of a disciplinary proceeding before the department, the administrative law judge, upon request, may direct a licensee found to have committed a violation to pay a sum not to	
21	exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case.	
22	(b) A certified copy of the actual costs, or a good faith estimate of costs where actual costs are not available, signed by the department or its designated	
23	representative shall be prima facie evidence of reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution of the case. The costs shall include the amount of investigative and	
24	enforcement costs up to the date of the hearing, including, but not limited to, charges imposed by the Attorney General.	
25	(c) The administrative law judge shall make a proposed finding of the amount	
26	of reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution of the case when requested pursuant to subdivision (a). The finding of the administrative law judge with regard to	
27	costs shall not be reviewable by the department to increase the cost award. The department may reduce or eliminate the cost award, or remand to the administrative	
28	law judge if the proposed decision fails to make a finding on costs requested pursuant to subdivision (a).	

- (d) If an order for recovery of costs is made and timely payment is not made as directed in the department's decision, the department may enforce the order for repayment in any appropriate court. This right of enforcement shall be in addition to any other rights the department may have as to any licensee to pay costs.
- (e) In any action for recovery of costs, proof of the department's decision shall be conclusive proof of the validity of the order of payment and the terms for payment.
- (f)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the department shall not renew or reinstate the license of any licensee who has failed to pay all of the costs ordered under this section.
- (2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the department may, in its discretion, conditionally renew or reinstate for a maximum of one year the license of any licensee who demonstrates financial hardship and who enters into a formal agreement with the department to reimburse the department within that one-year period for the unpaid costs.
- (g) All costs recovered under this section shall be considered a reimbursement for costs incurred and shall be deposited into the Cannabis Control Fund to be available upon appropriation by the Legislature.
- (h) Nothing in this section shall preclude the department from including the recovery of the costs of investigation and enforcement of a case in any stipulated settlement.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 24. On or about February 18, 2025, the Department received information that Respondent was diverting cannabis.
- 25. On or about On April 17, 2025, Department Special Investigator (SI) Bob Topping (Topping) reviewed Respondent's California Cannabis Track and Trace System (CCTT)¹ account. Respondent's CCTT account showed that approximately 90,984 pounds of cannabis/cannabis product had been received between January 1, 2025, through April 16, 2025, and Respondent had sent out approximately 73,105 pounds of cannabis/cannabis product during the same time period. The most recent transfers of cannabis and cannabis product had been received by Respondent on April 16, 2025, between the hours of 1752 hours and 1818 hours.
- 26. On April 17, 2025, at approximately 1030 hours, SI Topping accompanied by other Department Staff went to Respondent's licensed premises to conduct an unannounced regulatory compliance inspection. There was no one at the licensed premises so SI Topping called Owner

¹ CCTT is a software program which uses unique identifiers for reporting the movement of cannabis and cannabis products through the licensed cannabis distribution chain.

Loera at the phone number on file with the Department. Owner Loera indicated that she was Respondent's only employee and was out of town. When asked when she had travelled out of town, Owner Loera did not provide a date but indicated that it had been a few days ago. SI Topping asked Owner Loera if there was someone else who could provide the Department access to inspect Respondent's licensed premises, and Owner Loera stated she would call a few people and call SI Topping back.

- 27. On April 17, 2025, at approximately 1110 hours, SI Topping again spoke with Owner Loera who indicated that she was unable to locate anyone who could provide the Department with access to the licensed premises. SI Topping discussed Respondent's CCTT account showing the Respondent had received cannabis/cannabis products from 21 individual transfer manifests on April 16, 2025. When asked who had accepted cannabis/cannabis products in Owner Loera's absence, she indicated she had accepted the cannabis/cannabis products on April 16, 2025, prior to traveling out of town on the night of April 16, 2025.
- 28. On April 17, 2025, a Notice to Comply was sent to Owner Loera and Owner Diaz requesting access to the licensed premises and Respondents business records, including copies of all sales invoices, receipts, manifests and ledgers from April 1 to April 17, 2025; copies of all inventory reconciliation and adjustment records from January 1 to April 17, 2025; copies of video surveillance footage for all cameras on the licensed premises for the period of April 10 to April 17, 2025; and copies of video surveillance footage for all cameras on premises for January 18, 2025. Respondent was asked to respond to the Notice to Comply and provide the requested records by no later than close of business on April 18, 2025.
- 29. On April 18, 2025, SI Topping received a signed copy of the Notice to Comply, but did not receive the requested records.
- 30. On April 22, 2025, SI Topper reviewed the Respondent's CCTT account and identified approximately 20 incoming transfers of cannabis/cannabis product scheduled to be delivered to Respondent that same day. In addition, Respondent's CCTT account identified L.G. as an authorized user of the CCTT account and a manager for Respondent.

///

- 31. On April 22, 2025, SI Topper, Supervising Special Investigator (SSI) Aric Engkabo (Engkabo) and SI Denis Rakitskiy (Rakitskiy) conducted an inspection of Respondent's licensed premises. Owner Loera provided access to Respondent's licensed premises where multiple bags and plastic totes containing cannabis flower/trim, as well as two large buckets and several glass containers filled with cannabis distillate were located. The individual bags and plastic totes containing cannabis flower/trim and the individual glass containers filled with cannabis distillate were not labeled with CCTT Unique Identifiers (UID), and there was no way to determine whether the cannabis originated from a licensed source.
- 32. SI Topper identified photocopies of only two UID's present in the licensed premises, 1A406030003165B000010027 (cannabis flower/trim) and 1A406030003165B000010018 (cannabis distillate). None of the cannabis products were individually labeled with UID tags, but instead, there were only photocopies of UID tags which were taped to storage racks where the bags, plastic totes, and glass containers of cannabis flower/trim and distillate were stored.
- 33. Per Respondent's CCTT account, there should have been at least 160 packages of cannabis/cannabis products present at the licensed premises. The cannabis flower/trim with the UID ending in 10027 should have been 1,947.4786 pounds according to Respondent's CCTT account. SSI Engkabo, and SIs Rakitskiy and Topper weighed all of the cannabis flower/trim present, and it weighed approximately 1,136.34 pounds. The cannabis distillate with the UID ending in 10018 should have weighed 47,100 grams (approximately 103.84 pounds) according to Respondent's CCTT account. All of the cannabis distillate present, weighed 60,708.8 grams (approximately 133.84 pounds) which included the container weights. In total, the cannabis flower, trim, and distillate weight approximately 1,270 pounds.
- 34. SI Topper explained to Owner Loera that since the cannabis and cannabis products were not properly labeled, they could not be traced back to a licensed source. Owner Loera decided to go through the Department Voluntary Condemnation and Destruction (VC&D) process for all of the cannabis/cannabis products present.
- 35. When asked whether the 20 incoming transfers of cannabis/cannabis products were going to physically arrive at Respondent's licensed premises, Owner Loera stated that they were

not. Owner Loera explained that she acted as a "broker" for cannabis/cannabis products and managed deals between several different licensed cannabis businesses. Owner Loera stated that she facilitated transfers, utilizing Respondent's license, between other licensed cannabis businesses, but the transfers of cannabis/cannabis products did not physically arrive at Respondent's licensed premises. Owner Loera explained that Respondent created shipping manifests in its CCTT account that reflected cannabis/cannabis products being picked up and transported from the originating licensee and received at Respondent's licensed premises; but in reality, the cannabis/cannabis products would never physically be delivered to Respondent. Owner Loera could not confirm where the cannabis/cannabis products were delivered.

- 36. Owner Loera was asked about the location of a failed batch of Lemon Cherry Pie bulk cannabis flower that was recorded in Respondent's CCTT account as being transferred to another licensee on April 9, 2025, without approval from the Department's Remediation and Recalls Unit. Owner Loera pointed to a white garbage bag filled with individual bags of bulk cannabis flower and indicated that the failed batch was there. There was no way to confirm whether the failed batch of bulk cannabis was contained in the bags since they were not affixed with required UID tags. Neither could Owner Loera provide any documentation to prove the unlabeled bags of bulk cannabis flower were associated to the failed batch of Lemon Cherry Pie.
- 37. When asked about Respondent's surveillance video and Prior to confirm the surveillance system was retaining a minimum of 90-days of video surveillance, Owner Loera explained that Respondent's surveillance system and cameras had not been functional since December 2024, due to a break-in/burglary that occurred at the licensed premises. A review of the Departments licensing database for any notifications of a break-in/burglary that had occurred in/or around December 2024 at Respondent's licensed premises failed to show any notification of the break-in/burglary.
 - 38. When asked about L.G., Owner Loera stated, "Oh, he is my Metrc² assistant."

² Metrc is the software for CCTT.

39. As of the date the Emergency Decision and Order was issued, the requested documents had not been received from Respondent, and neither had Respondent provided evidence of the destruction of the embargoed cannabis and cannabis product.

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(General Requirements: Track and Trace)

40. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code section 26030, subdivisions (a) and (c), and California Code of Regulations, title 4, section 15047.2, subdivision (d), in that Respondent intentionally misrepresented or falsified information entered in the California Cannabis Track and Trace system as more particularly alleged in paragraphs 24 through 39, above, which are hereby incorporated by reference and realleged as if fully set forth herein.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(General Requirement: Cannabis Activity with Licensee)

41. Respondent is further subject to disciplinary action under Code section 26030, subdivisions (a) and (c), and California Code of Regulations, title 4, section 15000.1, subdivision (b), in that Respondent conducted commercial cannabis activity with a person or persons that were not authorized to engage in commercial cannabis activity as more particularly alleged in paragraphs 24 through 39, above, which are hereby incorporated by reference and realleged as if fully set forth herein.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(General Requirements: Track and Trace Record Information)

42. Respondent is further subject to disciplinary action under Code section 26030, subdivisions (a) and (c), and California Code of Regulations, title 4, sections 15047.2, subdivisions (b) and (c), 15049 and 15049.2 in that Respondent failed to accurately record all commercial cannabis activity in the California Cannabis Track and Trace System, including information for approximately 1270 pounds of cannabis found on the premises, as more particularly alleged in paragraphs 24 through 39, above, which are hereby incorporated by reference and realleged as if fully set forth herein.

///

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(General Record Retention Requirements)

43. Respondent is further subject to disciplinary action under Code sections 26030, subdivisions (a) and (c), and 26160, and California Code of Regulations, title 4, sections 15037, subdivisions (a) and (b), in that Respondent failed to provide the Department with records related to commercial cannabis activity upon request, including as more particularly alleged in paragraphs 24 through 39, above, which are hereby incorporated by reference and realleged as if fully set forth herein.

FIFTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Reconcile Physical Inventory)

44. Respondent is further subject to disciplinary action under Code section 26030, subdivisions (a) and (c), and California Code of Regulations, title 4, sections 15000.1, subdivisions (a) and (c), 15049, and 15051 in that Respondent failed to reconcile physical inventory with its CCTT account inventory, with approximately 160 packages of cannabis products and 1270 pounds of cannabis found on the licensed premises not being accounted for in the Licensee's CCTT inventory account as more particularly alleged in paragraphs 24 through 39, above, which are hereby incorporated by reference and realleged as if fully set forth herein.

SIXTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Package Tags)

45. Respondent is further subject to disciplinary action under Code section 26030, subdivisions (a) and (c), and California Code of Regulations, title 4, sections 15048.5, subdivision (c), in that Respondent failed to affix package tags to cannabis and cannabis products held in a as more particularly alleged in paragraphs 24 through 39, above, which are hereby incorporated by reference and realleged as if fully set forth herein.

SEVENTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Storage of Inventory)

46. Respondent is further subject to disciplinary action under Code section 26030, subdivisions (a) and (c), and California Code of Regulations, title 4, section 15000.7, subdivision

PRAYER 1 2 WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that the following the hearing, the Director of Consumer Affairs issue a decision: 3 1. Revoking or suspending the Cannabis Microbusiness License Number 4 5 C12-0000362-LIC, issued to Respondent High Grade Enterprises with Vanessa Loera and Jasen Diaz, Owners; 6 2. Ordering Respondent High Grade Enterprises with Vanessa Loera and Jasen Diaz, 7 Owners to pay the Department of Cannabis Control the reasonable costs of the investigation and 8 9 enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 26031.1; 3. Ordering the destruction of cannabis and cannabis goods in the possession of 10 Respondent High Grade Enterprises with Vanessa Loera and Jasen Diaz, Owners, at 11 Respondent's expense if revocation of Cannabis Microbusiness License Number C12-0000362-12 LIC, is ordered, pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 4, section 15024.1, subdivision 13 (a); and 14 4. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper. 15 16 17 DATED: _May 16, 2025 18 19 Deputy Director of the Compliance Division 20 Department of Cannabis Control State of California 21 Complainant 22 SD2025801553 23 CCS Accusation.docx 24 25 26 27 28

PROOF OF SERVICE

Case Name: In the Matter of the Accusation Against: High Grade Enterprises

DCC Case No. DCC25-0000371-INV

License Number: C12-0000362-LIC. Microbusiness

I am a resident of the State of California, over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action. My business address is Department of Cannabis Control, 2920 Kilgore Road, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670. On October 27, 2025. I served the within documents:

ORDER ADOPTING STIPULATED SETTLEMENT AND ORDER AS FINAL DECISION

) at the Email address(es) listed below. I did not the transmission, any electronic message or
 □ VIA CERTIFIED MAIL by placing the envelope for collection and mailing following ordinary business practices for collecting and transmitting mail through the Unit States Postal Service to the individual(s) or entity(ies) listed below. □ Service via certified mail to be completed upon the following business day. 		g and transmitting mail through the United s) or entity(ies) listed below.
Vanes	Grade Enterprises ssa Loera & Jasen Diaz, Owners radeassociates@gmail.com	Alice C. Lin, Esq. Lin Legal Services alice@linlegalservices.com
Evely	n Schaeffer (email only)	Harinder K. Kapur (email only)

Evelyn Schaeffer (email only)
Deputy Director
Compliance Division
Department of Cannabis Control
Evelyn.Schaeffer@cannabis.ca.gov

Harinder K. Kapur (email only) Senior Assistant Attorney General Cannabis Control Section Office of Attorney General Harinder.Kapur@doj.ca.gov

I am familiar with the Department's business practices for collecting and transmitting mail through the United States Postal Service. In accordance with those practices, correspondence placed in the Department's internal mail collection system is, in the ordinary course of business, deposited in the United States Postal Service, with postage paid, on the same day.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, and the United States of America, that the above is true and correct.

Executed on October 27, 2025, at Rancho Cordova, California.

Christina C. Ubaldo