

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The parties stipulated to the findings of fact and order.

2. Petitioner is a body corporate and politic established and existing pursuant to California Health and Safety Code §§ 40000, *et seq.* and §§ 40400, *et seq.*, and is the sole and exclusive local agency with the responsibility for comprehensive air pollution control in the South Coast Basin.

3. Respondent operates a metal fabrication and aerospace company (Facility ID No. 208715) located at 1351 Manhattan Avenue, Fullerton, CA 92831 (“Facility”), within and subject to the jurisdiction of the District.

4. As part of its business, and relevant to this Order for Abatement, Respondent has operated the following laser cutters at the Facility:

Manufacturer	Model	Serial No.	Rating (Watts)
Mitsubishi	ML3015HV	6530HV0100	4,500
Mitsubishi	ML3015SR	6930R5060	4,500

The laser cutter with serial number 6530HV0100 is hereinafter referred to as “Laser Cutter 0100,” the laser cutter with serial number 6930R5060 is hereinafter referred to as “Laser Cutter 5060,” and, collectively, are hereinafter referred to as “Laser Cutters.” On April 30, 2026, Respondent stated that Laser Cutter 0100 is out of service.

5. The Laser Cutters are used as part of Respondent’s business to cut various metals. District Inspector Lucas Anotado inspected the Facility on September 18, 2025, during which one of Respondent’s managers, Alex Cruz, informed Inspector Anotado that the Laser Cutters are used by Respondent to cut titanium, aluminum, and stainless steel.

6. Respondent has not obtained District-issued permits for the Laser Cutters as required by Rule 203. Respondent violated Rule 203(a) by operating the Laser Cutters without a Permit to Operate.

7. **District Rule 203(a)** provides, in relevant part, a “person shall not operate or use any equipment . . . , the use of which may cause the issuance of air contaminants . . . without first obtaining a written permit to operate from the Executive Officer”

1 8. **District Rule 219(d)(5)(H)** provides that certain equipment is exempt from permit
2 requirements, but further states that the “exemption does not include laser cutting, etching and
3 engraving equipment that are rated at more than 400 watts” and also “does not include cutting
4 equipment. . . that is used to cut stainless steel.”

5 9. During Inspector Anotado’s September 18, 2025, inspection, he observed the Laser
6 Cutters connected to power and capable of operating. Inspector Anotado recorded the specifications
7 of the Laser Cutters, including the manufacturer, model numbers, and serial numbers, which were
8 visible on the equipment. Mr. Cruz stated that the Laser Cutters were rated at approximately 4,300
9 and 4,500 watts. Inspector Anotado later confirmed after reviewing Respondent’s website that the
10 Laser Cutters were both rated at 4,500 watts. Inspector Anotado spoke to Respondent’s managers,
11 Mr. Cruz and Eli Karim, and Robert Karim, Respondent’s President/CEO, and advised them that
12 Permits to Operate were required for the Laser Cutters. Inspector Anotado explained the permit
13 application process and fee calculator. Inspector Anotado also explained that the Laser Cutters were
14 not exempt from permitting under District Rule 219(d)(5)(H).

15 10. In response, Respondent’s representatives said they were not going to obtain permits
16 for the equipment or pay the associated fees. Inspector Anotado issued Notice to Comply E62707
17 instructing Respondent to submit applications for both Laser Cutters and informed Respondent’s
18 representatives that he would return for a follow-up inspection in two weeks.

19 11. On October 7, 2025, Inspector Anotado and Supervising Air Quality Inspector Shawn
20 Bennage conducted a follow-up inspection at the Facility and confirmed that both Laser Cutters were
21 still present and operational.

22 12. The inspectors met with Mr. Cruz, Mr. Eli Karim, and Mr. Robert Karim.
23 Respondent’s representatives affirmed that they would not be submitting permit applications for the
24 Laser Cutters.

25 13. Supervising Inspector Bennage said that without the Permits to Operate, continued
26 operation of the Laser Cutters was prohibited. Supervising Inspector Bennage explained to Mr. Eli
27 Karim the application process, guiding him through the application forms, fee calculator, and
28 applicable rule exemptions, and explained the District’s order for abatement process.

1 14. After Respondent failed to apply for and obtain the required Permits to Operate, on
2 December 9, 2025, the District issued Notice of Violation P64195 to Respondent, citing
3 Respondent's violation of District Rule 203(a).

4 15. On April 30, 2026, after Petitioner filed its Petition for an Order for Abatement,
5 District Inspector Anotado and Supervising Inspector Bennage conducted a follow-up visit to the
6 Facility. During this visit, Mr. Eli Karim and Mr. Robert Karim informed the inspectors that
7 sometime after the inspectors' October 7, 2025, inspection, Laser Cutter 0100 had broken down and
8 was subsequently taken out of service. Respondent's representatives informed the inspectors that
9 they were no longer operating Laser Cutter 0100 and did not intend to repair it to bring it back into
10 operation. The inspectors confirmed with Respondent's representatives that Laser Cutter 5060 was
11 still actively being operated.

12 16. At the April 30, 2026, visit, the District inspectors again explained to Respondent's
13 representatives the permit requirements for Laser Cutter 5060, which is still in operation.

14 17. As of the date of the hearing, Respondent has not applied for or obtained Permits to
15 Operate for the Laser Cutters.

16 18. Rule 219(d)(5)(H) does not exempt the Laser Cutters from the permit requirement set
17 forth in Rule 203(a) because the Laser Cutters are used to cut stainless steel and they are rated at
18 4,500 watts, which exceeds 400 watts.

19 CONCLUSION

20 19. This [Stipulated] Order for Abatement is not intended to be, nor will it act as, a
21 variance. Nothing herein, however, shall be deemed or construed to limit the authority of the District
22 to issue Notices of Violation, to seek civil penalties or injunctive relief, or to other administrative or
23 legal relief for violation of District rules. The Findings of Fact are based on evidence presented by
24 Petitioner and Respondent as of the date hereof.

25 20. The issuance of the Order for Abatement is not expected to result in the closing or
26 elimination of an otherwise lawful endeavor, but if it does result in such closure or elimination, the
27 District contends that it would not be without a corresponding benefit in reducing air contaminants.

28 21. Issuance of this Order for Abatement, upon a fully noticed hearing, will not constitute

1 a taking of property without due process of law.

2 **ORDER**

3 Therefore, in reliance on the evidence presented, the aforesaid statements and good cause
4 appearing, Respondent is hereby ordered to cease operating each of the Laser Cutters or for each
5 Laser Cutter still in operation, comply with the following conditions:

6 **CONDITIONS**

7 1. Within 7 calendar days from the date of this Order, Respondent shall submit an
8 application for a Permit to Operate for each of the Laser Cutters still in operation. Respondent shall
9 submit each application for expedited review.

10 2. If the District requests additional information to process the application for the Laser
11 Cutters, Respondent shall provide such additional information within 3 business days (that is, not
12 including weekends or state or federal holidays), or within the timeframe requested by the District,
13 whichever is later.

14 3. Respondent shall notify the Clerk of the Hearing Board (ClerkofBoard@aqmd.gov),
15 Air Quality Inspector II Lucas Anotado (lanotado@aqmd.gov), and Supervising Air Quality
16 Inspector Shawn Bennage (sbennage@aqmd.gov) within 3 calendar days of achieving final
17 compliance. Final compliance is achieved upon Respondent receiving notice that its permit
18 applications are complete and Respondent has paid all fees for the applications and expedited
19 reviews.

20 4. The Hearing Board shall retain jurisdiction over this matter until May 13, 2027, or
21 until Respondent has fully complied with the terms of this Order and achieved compliance,
22 whichever occurs earlier, unless this Order is amended and modified.

23
24 **FOR THE BOARD:** _____

25
26
27 **DATED:** _____

1 So stipulated,

2 _____

3 Signature

Date

4 _____

5 Print Name and Title

6 Respondent Laser Industries, Inc.

7

8

9 So stipulated,

10

11 _____

12 Grace LeBlanc, Deputy District Counsel I

Date

13 Petitioner South Coast Air Quality Management District

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28