

business after it changed its identity to a corporation;
(3) it had no prior record of disciplinary action before the department; and (4) it is a large, successful Toyota new car franchise, employing approximately 50 people on a full time basis.

The penalty imposed by the director was as follows:

For each failure to give 3-day notice, 5 days' suspension; for each used car report of sale dereliction, 5 days' suspension; for each false report of true date of sale, 15 days' suspension; for false certificate of non-operation, 30 days' suspension; for false reports of first date of operation, 30 days' suspension; for charging excessive registration fees, 30 days' suspension. It was provided that all suspensions were to run concurrently, thereby resulting in a total period of 30 days' suspension. The director further ordered that 25 days of the suspension be stayed for a period of one year, subject to the condition that appellant obey all the laws of the United States, the State of California and its political subdivisions and obey all rules and regulations of the Department of Motor Vehicles.

The main thrust of this appeal is four-fold. Specifically, appellant argues that the 3-day notice violations lack evidentiary support; that the sanctions imposed for the remaining 3-day notice violations -- which the appellant recites as 5 in number -- are not commensurate with the findings; that Finding VIII,