NEVADA REAL ESTATE COMMISSION
MINUTES

VIA IN PERSON AND WEBEX VIRTUAL MEETING

February 11, 2025

Nevada State Business Center
3300 W. Sahara Avenue, 4th Floor-Nevada Room
Las Vegas, Nevada 89102

VIDEO CONFERENCE TO:
Division of Insurance
1818 College Parkway, Suite 103
Carson City, Nevada 89706

The meeting was called to order at 9:07 a.m.

1-B) Swearing in of Newly Appointed Commissioner
President Plummer swore in Commissioner David Tina.

1-A) Introduction of Commissioners in Attendance
Darrell Plummer, Washoe County; Donna Ruthe, Clark County; Forrest Barbee, Clark County; William Bradley Spires, Douglas County; and David Tina, Clark County.

Commission Counsel: Deputy Attorney General Joseph Ostunio and Senior Deputy Attorney General Todd Weiss.

1-C) Introduction of Division Staff in Attendance
Sharath Chandra, Administrator; Charvez Foger, Deputy Administrator; Shareece Bates, Administration Section Manager; Kelly Valadez, Commission Coordinator; Maria Gallo, Commission Coordinator; Jan Holle, Chief Compliance Audit Investigator; Shaun Mclean, Compliance Audit Investigator; Annalyn Carrillo, Education and Information Officer; Senior Deputy Attorney General Phil W. Su and Deputy Attorney General Christal P. Keegan.

2) Public Comment
James Sharkey stated that the Attorney General has made factually inaccurate claims against him in a previous case by stating that he was convicted of a felony. Mr. Sharkey stated that his comment has nothing to do with his case today and that we should be acting in a fair and equal manner.

DRAFT MINUTES

4-A) <u>For Possible Action: Discussion and Decision Regarding Respondent's Petition for Reconsideration of Discipline Terms and a Payment Plan.</u>

<u>NRED v William Francis Beaubien</u>

<u>Case No. 2024-521</u>

<u>Parties Present</u>

William Francis Beaubien was present.

Christal P. Keegan, Deputy Attorney General, was present representing the Division.

Mr. Beaubien stated that his case was previously heard during the Real Estate Commission meeting held November 19, 2024, where the Commission ordered that he pay $4,400.00. Mr. Beaubien stated that he has significant medical issues and with his medical bills and not doing a real estate transaction in over a year, he does not have the money to pay. Mr. Beaubien stated that he wanted to pay the original $250.00 fine in the beginning and at several stages throughout the process, but the Attorney General wanted the matter to go to hearing.

Ms. Keegan stated that the representations that Mr. Beaubien has made against the Attorney General's office are false, because she tried to settle the matter, but Mr. Beaubien rejected the settlement. Ms. Keegan stated that even though Mr. Beaubien has stated that he is willing to pay the $250.00, Mr. Beaubien has not made any payment towards the amount due. Ms. Keegan stated that there has been no documentation presented regarding any medical issues, so those claims are unsubstantiated. Ms. Keegan stated that the State filed their opposition to the respondent's request for reconsideration of a payment plan December 20, 2024, with four exhibits. Ms. Keegan stated that there is a lack of faith in Mr. Beaubien's request filed November 22, 2024, and it is deficient. Ms. Keegan stated that despite Mr. Beaubien's request and burden of proof, he has made no payment or presented a payment plan of what he is able to pay, and Mr. Beaubien has given the Commission no assurances that he intends to make any payments. Ms. Keegan stated that on November 19, 2024, this case had a full hearing where the Commission unanimously ordered Mr. Beaubien to pay $4,483.60 within 30 days, and this amount is reasonable and lawful. Ms. Keegan stated that the four main considerations in the opposition which support what the Commission ordered are that there was no irregularity that amounted to reversable error during the hearing, Mr. Beaubien had proper notice of the original hearing pursuant to NRS 645.680, and there is no new material evidence that Mr. Beaubien could not have produced during the November 19, 2024, hearing. Ms. Keegan stated that there was no error in law and the Commission's disciplinary order is statutorily authorized and the State asks the Commission to stand by its order and deny Mr. Beaubien's request.

Commissioner Barbee moved in the matter of NRED v William Francis Beaubien Case# 2024-521 that the Commission deny the respondent's petition for reconsideration and payment plan. Seconded by Commissioner Ruthe. Motion carried.

DRAFT MINUTES

5-A) For Possible Action: Discussion and Decision Regarding Respondent's Petition for Rehearing.

NRED v Christopher B. Caguiat

Case No. 2024-165

Parties Present

Christopher B. Caguiat was present.

Christal P. Keegan, Deputy Attorney General, was present representing the Division.

Mr. Caguiat stated that he was not able to attend his hearing on November 19, 2024, because of medical reasons when a decision in his case was made. Mr. Caguiat stated that he is requesting a rehearing to defend the decision that was made.

Ms. Keegan stated that the medical reasons that Mr. Caguiat just created have never been made known to the State prior to November 19, 2025, hearing or thereafter. Ms. Keegan stated there is no proof of medical issues and that Mr. Caguiat was properly noticed. Ms. Keegan stated that Mr. Caguiat has paid nothing toward the total amount due and his petition presented no legal basis for a rehearing. Ms. Keegan stated that Mr. Caguiat has not stated that he did not know about the hearing, and he could have been present virtually. Ms. Keegan stated that the State's position is that Mr. Caguiat did not substantiate his request. Ms. Keegan stated that based on statute that prohibits oral arguments, she will submit on Mr. Caguiat's emailed request and the State's opposition, both filed with the Division.

Commissioner Ruthe moved in the matter of NRED v Christopher B. Caguiat Case# 2024-165 that the Commission deny the petition for rehearing. Seconded by Commissioner Barbee. Motion carried.

6-B) NRED v Nicole Elena Chavarin, for possible action

Case No. 2024-964

Parties Present

Nicole Elena Chavarin was present.

Phil W. Su, Senior Deputy Attorney General, was present representing the Division.

Mr. Su stated that there is a signed settlement agreement in this matter. Mr. Su stated that this case involves the failure to submit trust account reconciliations, but Ms. Chavarin has since submitted them to the Division. Mr. Su stated that he is prepared to present the stipulation for settlement to the Commission for their approval.

Mr. Su read a summary of the factual allegations, alleged violations of law, and proposed settlement into the record

Settlement

- Respondent agrees to pay the Division a total amount of $2,647.73 ("Amount Due"), consisting of $1,000.00 administrative fine imposed by the Division, the Division's pre-hearing costs and fees in the amount of $360.00, and pre-hearing attorney's fees in the amount of $1,287.73.

  The Amount Due shall be payable to the Division within 90 days of the effective date of

DRAFT MINUTES

this Order.

Commissioner Tina moved in the matter of NRED v Nicole Elena Chavarin Case# 2024-964 to accept the stipulation for settlement as presented. Seconded by Commissioner Ruthe. Motion carried.

6-H) NRED v Dane C. Brooks, for possible action
Case No. 2024-364

6-I) NRED v Dane C. Brooks, for possible action
Case No. 2024-540

6-J) NRED v Dane C. Brooks, for possible action
Case No. 2024-1012

Parties Present
Dane Brooks was present.
Phil W. Su, Senior Deputy Attorney General, was present representing the Division.

Mr. Su stated that the complaints in these three matters were timely filed by the Division, however, no answers were filed by Mr. Brooks. Mr. Su stated that Mr. Brook requested continuances in the matters that was received by the Division on February 10, 2025, and denied. Mr. Su stated that while the State was prepared for a default in all three matters, but Mr. Brooks is present to make a request.

Mr. Brooks stated that the matters are big and will require additional time in an attempt to try and settle these matters with Deputy Attorney General Su, but also to gather more statements and evidence that surround these issues. Mr. Brooks stated that in addition, it may require that he seek legal counsel. Mr. Brooks stated that the complaints that were reported to the Commissioners were 30 days ago, but he received them on January 13, 2025, which was 18-20 business days for him to review all the material and defend himself, or prepare for a rigorous defense, which he finds a huge challenge. Mr. Brooks stated that he is respectfully requesting a 30-day extension, but if that is not available, he would accept the Commission's decision on a timeframe for an extension.

Mr. Su stated that typically a respondent's initial request for an initial continuance is granted, and he believes it is more efficient for the Commission to grant a continuance because there is the potential for a settlement. Mr. Su stated that it is his understanding that the respondent's license is expired.

Mr. Su asked if the respondent was practicing.

Mr. Brooks stated no.

Commissioner Ruthe moved in the matters of NRED v Dane C. Brooks Case# 2024-1012, 2024-364, and 2024-540 that the Commission grant a continuance. Seconded by Commissioner Spires. Motion carried 4:1 with Commissioner Barbee opposed.

DRAFT MINUTES

7-A) For Possible Action: Discussion and Decision Regarding the Instructor Denial Appeal Pursuant to NAC 645.426.

Deven Singh

Parties Present

Deven Singh was present.
Annalyn Carrillo, Education and Information Officer, was present for the Division.

Ms. Carrillo stated that NAC 645.426(3) provides that applicants must come before the Commission for approval if they had any prior discipline.
Mr. Singh gave a statement.

The Commission questioned Mr. Singh.

Commissioner Barbee moved for Deven Singh's Instructor Denial Appeal that the Commission provide the instructor certificate with the restriction on teaching property management.

Motion failed due to not receiving a second.

Commissioner Tina moved to approve Mr. Singh to instruct all continuing education classes. Seconded by Commissioner Ruthe. Motion carried 4:1 with Commissioner Barbee opposed.

6-C) NRED v Zarbod Zanganeh, for possible action
Case No. 2023-959

6-D) NRED v Alicia Prescott-LaRiviere, for possible action
Case No. 2023-960

Parties Present

Zarbod Zanganeh was present.
Alicia Prescott-LaRiviere was present.
Tye Hanseen, Esq. was present representing Mr. Zanganeh and Ms. Prescott-LaRiviere.
Phil W. Su, Senior Deputy Attorney General, was present representing the Division.

Mr. Su stated that a stipulation for settlement has been reached in these matters, and he is prepared to present the settlement for the Commission's consideration.

Mr. Su read the factual allegations, alleged violations of law, and proposed settlement into the record.

Settlement for Zarbod Zanganeh Case# 2023-959

- With regard to Case # 2023-959, Respondent Zanganeh agrees to pay the Division a total amount of fourteen thousand three hundred forty-eight dollars and 20/100 cents ($14,348.20) ("Amount Due"), consisting of $10,000.00 in administrative fines imposed by the Division, the Division's pre-hearing costs and fees in the amount of $1,600.00, and pro-rated pre-hearing attorney's fees in the amount of $2,748.20.
  The Amount Due shall be payable to the Division in twelve monthly installments of $1,195.68, with first installment due within thirty (30) days of the date of the order approving this settlement. Pre-payment of any amounts owed may be made without

DRAFT MINUTES

penalty.
The monthly installment payments will be made in accordance with correspondence the Division will provide to Respondent Zanganeh after the order approving this settlement becomes effective.
If the due date for a payment falls on a holiday or a weekend, the payment is due to the Division the last business day prior to the due date.
No grace period is permitted. If any payment is not actually received by the Division in full on or before its due date, it shall be construed as an event of default by Respondent Zanganeh.

- Respondent Zanganeh agrees to take twelve (12) hours of continuing education, consisting of six (6) hours in contracts and six (6) hours in agency/agency relationships. This education shall be completed within six (6) months from the date of the Commission's Order Approving Stipulation. The hours must be live education and will not count toward Respondent Zanganeh's continuing education requirements for license renewal.
- Respondent Zanganeh agrees to submit to a voluntary downgrade of his broker license, B.1000811.LLC, to a broker-salesperson license, for a period of three (3) years from the date of the order approving this settlement (to run concurrently with the three year voluntary downgrade set forth in the settlement stipulation for Case 2024-420, which is being submitted to the Commission contemporaneously with this stipulation for Case 2023-959). Upon successful completion of the downgrade period without additional disciplinary action by this Commission, Respondent Zanganeh may reapply to the Division for reinstatement of the broker license.

<u>Settlement for Alicia Prescott-LaRiviere Case# 2023-960</u>

- With regard to Case # 2023-960, Respondent Prescott-LaRiviere agrees to pay the Division a total amount of nine thousand three hundred forty-eight dollars and 20/100 cents ($9,348.20) ("Amount Due"), consisting of $5,000.00 in administrative fines imposed by the Division, the Division's pre-hearing costs and fees in the amount of $1,600.00, and pro-rated pre-hearing attorney's fees in the amount of $2,748.20.
The Amount Due shall be payable to the Division in twelve monthly installments of $779.02, with first installment due within thirty (30) days of the date of the order approving this settlement. Pre-payment of any amounts owed may be made without penalty.
The monthly installment payments will be made in accordance with correspondence the Division will provide to Respondent Prescott-LaRiviere after the order approving this settlement becomes effective.
If the due date for a payment falls on a holiday or a weekend, the payment is due to the Division the last business day prior to the due date.
No grace period is permitted. If any payment is not actually received by the Division in full on or before its due date, it shall be construed as an event of default by Respondent Prescott-LaRiviere.
- Respondent Prescott-LaRiviere agrees to take twelve (12) hours of continuing education, consisting of six (6) hours in contracts and six (6) hours in agency/agency relationships. This education shall be completed within six (6) months from the date of the Commission's Order Approving Stipulation. The hours must be live education and will

DRAFT MINUTES

not count toward Respondent Prescott-LaRiviere's continuing education requirements for license renewal.

Mr. Su stated that the remaining terms are standard except Release #12 is a release that is mutual. Mr. Su stated that Indemnification #13 states that the respondents can only indemnify questions that have been taken by themselves and not the other party.

President Plummer stated that there are two individuals but three cases with the broker having two cases and agent under the broker having one case. President Plummer stated that the cases are related because the agent wrote the offer, and the broker got very involved. President Plummer stated that the buyer attempted to purchase it appears that they had a house to sell that was not disclosed causing delay of the seller's ability to sell. President Plummer stated that the buyer came back later with another agent because he felt abandoned, and then the broker filed a lien against the property causing the seller more legal costs to sell their house. President Plummer stated that these cases are connected because it was the agent under the broker who wrote the offer for the buyer.

Commissioner Tina stated that he is not asking about 2023-959 or 2023-960 but that Mr. Su mentioned case 2024-420 in the settlement.

Mr. Su stated yes, he did. Mr. Su stated that he would like to make a correction to the record, because he had spoken about this with the respondent's attorney, Mr. Hanseen, that the downgrade to broker salesperson was to also include a term that there is no supervision allowed because of the downgrade, but for some reason it did not make it into the final copy of the stipulation.

Commissioner Barbee asked if cases 2023-960, 2023-959, and 2024-420 are all part of this stipulation.

Mr. Su stated that this stipulation only involves cases 2023-959 and 2023-960, but it references case 2024-420 because there are two stipulations being considered.

President Plummer asked after a decision has been made for this stipulation pertaining to cases 2023-959 and 2023-960, then case 2024-420 will be heard separately with its own stipulation.

Mr. Su stated yes, that is correct.

Commissioner Ruthe stated that for her own clarification, she is going to ask again that case 2024-420 will be heard separately with a separate written stipulation.

Mr. Su answered yes.

Commissioner Barbee moved in the matter of NRED v Zarbod Zanganeh Case# 2023-959 and NRED v Alicia Prescott-LaRiviere Case# 2023-960 to approve the stipulation for settlement as presented. Seconded by Commissioner Spires. Motion carried.

DRAFT MINUTES

6-E) NRED v Zarbod Zanganeh, for possible action
Case No. 2024-420

Parties Present
Zarbod Zanganeh was present.
Tye Hanseen, Esq. was present representing Mr. Zanganeh.
Phil W. Su, Senior Deputy Attorney General, was present representing the Division.

Mr. Su stated that a stipulation for settlement has been reached in this matter, and he is prepared to present the settlement for the Commission's consideration.

Mr. Su read the factual allegations, alleged violations of law, and proposed settlement into the record.

Settlement

- Respondent Zanganeh agrees to pay the Division a total amount of fourteen thousand nine hundred eighty dollars and 04/100 cents ($14,980.04) ("Amount Due"), consisting of $12,500.00 in administrative fines imposed by the Division, the Division's pre-hearing costs and fees in the amount of $360.00, and pre-hearing attorney's fees in the amount of $2,120.04.
  The Amount Due shall be payable to the Division in twelve monthly installments of $1,248.37, with first installment due within thirty (30) days of the date of the order approving this settlement. Pre-payment of any amounts owed may be made without penalty.
  The monthly installment payments will be made in accordance with correspondence the Division will provide to Respondent Zanganeh after the order approving this settlement becomes effective.
  If the due date for a payment falls on a holiday or a weekend, the payment is due to the Division the last business day prior to the due date.
  No grace period is permitted. If any payment is not actually received by the Division in full on or before its due date, it shall be construed as an event of default by Respondent.
- Respondent agrees to take twelve (12) hours of continuing education, consisting of six (6) hours in ethics and six (6) hours in risk reduction. This education shall be completed within six (6) months from the date of the Commission's Order Approving Stipulation. The hours must be live education and will not count toward Respondent's continuing education requirements for license renewal.
- Respondent agrees to submit to a voluntary downgrade of his broker license, B.1000811.LLC, to a broker-salesperson license, for a period of three (3) years from the date of the order approving this settlement (to run concurrently with the three-year voluntary downgrade set forth in the settlement stipulation for Case 2023-959, which is being submitted to the Commission contemporaneously with this stipulation for Case 2024-420). Upon successful completion of the downgrade period without additional disciplinary action by this Commission, Respondent Zanganeh may reapply to the Division for reinstatement of the broker license.

Mr. Su stated that he would note for the record that this order, just like the previous order, does not in itself contain a term that Mr. Zanganeh would not supervise agents which was an

DRAFT MINUTES

understanding of the parties not captured in this stipulation, but it is part of the proposal that the Division has provided to the Commission for consideration.

Commissioner Ruthe stated that to be clear, it is not in writing, but it was agreed upon that the respondent cannot supervise agents.

Mr. Su stated yes that it was negotiated but somehow was not captured in the final stipulation.

Commissioner Ruthe stated that from her point, not agreed upon, not signed, may not happen.

Mr. Su stated that the Commission may order it to happen, but unfortunately it was something that was not captured in the stipulation, but the term was negotiated.

Mr. Hanseen stated that subject to the Commission's approval that this is not going to be a problem.

President Plummer asked Mr. Zanganeh if he read, understands, and agrees to the terms of the stipulation, as well as the condition that will be added into the motion that he will not be able to supervise any other agents.

Mr. Zanganeh answered yes.

Commissioner Ruthe moved in the matter of NRED v Zarbod Zanganeh Case# 2024-420 to reject the stipulation as presented. Seconded by Commissioner Tina. Motion carried 4:1 with President Plummer opposed.

Commissioner Barbee moved in the matter of NRED v Zarbod Zanganeh Case# 2024-420 that the stipulated settlement previously rejected but as read into the record with the addition of a restriction for supervision for the 3-year period concurrent with the downgrade of the license be approved. Seconded by Commissioner Spires. Motion carried.

6-A) NRED v Linda Abrams, for possible action
Case No. 2024-236

Parties Present
Linda Abrams was not present.
Phil W. Su, Senior Deputy Attorney General, was present representing the Division.

Mr. Su stated that even though Ms. Abrams is not present, there is a proposed stipulation that Ms. Abrams has signed. Mr. Su stated that a default was entered two meetings ago but the default was set aside at the previous meeting and the parties were able to reach settlement terms of her failure to submit the 546A Form.

President Plummer asked if the respondent's attempt with this settlement was to not have her license revoked.

DRAFT MINUTES

Mr. Su stated that was never the indication, but simply Ms. Abrams failure to submit her 546A Form which she has since submitted. Mr. Su said her license was revoked as part of the default, but the default was set aside when she was granted a rehearing.

Mr. Su read the factual allegations, alleged violations of law, and proposed settlement into the record.

Settlement

- Respondent agrees to pay the Division a total amount of $2,180.40 ("Amount Due"), consisting of the $250.00 administrative fine imposed by the Division, the Division's pre-hearing costs and fees in the amount of $360.00, and pre-hearing attorney's fees in the amount of $1,570.40.
  The Amount Due shall be payable to the Division within 90 days of the effective date of this Order.
  No grace period is permitted. If the payment is not actually received by the Division on or before its due date, it shall be construed as an event of default by Respondent.

Commissioner Tina moved in the matter of NRED v Linda Abrams Case# 2024-236 to accept the stipulation for settlement as presented. Seconded by Commissioner Barbee. Motion carried.

3-A) Discussion Regarding the Administrator's Report.

Sharath Chandra, Administrator, stated that legislative session has started and on the real estate side there is a one bill in BDR form that has not been seen yet, but the Division will track it when seen. Mr. Chandra stated that there are there are other bills from last session that have been reintroduced this session. Mr. Chandra stated that two are landlord bills and the Division's position is mostly neutral and to be there to provide information and context for the lawmakers to have those discussions. Mr. Chandra stated that the Division's new technology project is moving along. Mr. Chandra stated that the vendor is conducting sessions with each section of the Division to gain an understanding of each section's requirements and processes. Mr. Chandra stated that the vendor has completed their sessions with the licensing section and will now format a product and present a demo for the Division to see if everything lines up. Mr. Chandra stated that the Division's intention is to move everything to an online format with new applications and renewals and that whole life cycle. Mr. Chandra stated that the proposal for the Division to be self-funded was intended to be a Governor recommended bill, but that item was dropped during the last budget session. Mr. Chandra stated that the Division will still be funded by the general fund and there is no money for things that the Division asked for, which is what is to be expected if the Division does not become self-funded. Mr. Chandra stated that part of the self-funding included the ability for the Division to open a northern office, and with changes in the real estate industry, the nature of complaints and calls to be able to have additional staff to provide those resources and education, but all those areas are still pending. Mr. Chandra stated that the Division's lease in the current building is until 2028-2029. Mr. Chandra stated that the majority of Business and Industry have started relocating to the US Bank building that is at the corner of I-15 and Sahara. Mr. Chandra stated that the legislative buildings have moved to a new complex off of Warm Springs near the airport.

DRAFT MINUTES

3-B) Discussion Regarding the Disciplinary Report.
Shareece Bates, Administration Section Manager, presented this report. Ms. Bates provided the Commission with a written report.

3-C) Discussion Regarding the Compliance Section's Current Caseload Report, Including a Summary of Recent Topics of Complaints Filed.
Jan Holle, Chief Compliance Audit Investigator, presented this report. Mr. Holle provided the Commission with a written report.

3-D) Discussion Regarding the Administrative Sanction Report.
Jan Holle, Chief Compliance Audit Investigator, presented this report. Mr. Holle provided the Commission with a written report.

3-E) Discussion Regarding the Continuing Education Supervisor's Report.
Annalyn Carrillo, Education and Information Officer, presented this report. Ms. Carrillo provided the Commission with a written report.

3-F) For Possible Action: Discussion and Decision to Approve Minutes of the November 19, 2024, Meeting.
Commissioner Ruthe moved to approve the minutes of the November 19, 2024, meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Spires. Motion carried.

6-G) NRED v James Sharkey, for possible action
Case No. 2024-749
James Sharkey was present.
Tony May, Esq. was present representing Mr. Sharkey.
Nathan Elser, respondent's previous broker, was present.
Dawn Houlf, witness, was present.
John Wunder, witness, was present.
Brenda Williams, witness was present.
Christal P. Keegan, Deputy Attorney General, was present representing the Division.

Preliminary Matter
Ms. Keegan stated that the State has a pending Motion in Limine, with a Supplement and Reply that were filed to help keep these proceedings on track. Ms. Keegan stated that this case is about unlicensed activity and material misrepresentations Mr. Sharkey committed during the commercial lease transaction, and anything else is not relevant. Ms. Keegan stated that the status of Mr. Sharkey's license between July 19, 2024, when he first showed the property to his client until his client signed the lease on August 12, 2024, and the misrepresentations that Mr. Sharkey made during that time period are what this case concerns. Ms. Keegan stated if any evidence introduced does not aid in understanding that, it is irrelevant and should be excluded. Ms. Keegan stated that the State is asking that the Commission grant its Motion in Limine. Ms. Keegan stated that the testimony of Amy Elser should be limited to fifteen minutes because she is not a material witness, and Dawn Houlf should be excluded from testifying because she was not the broker at the time. Ms. Keegan stated that if Ms. Houlf is here as a character witness that is not what this case is about. Ms. Keegan stated that if the Commission does allow Ms. Houlf

DRAFT MINUTES

to testify, the States asks that her testimony be limited to fifteen minutes and allow the State to recall its witnesses to testify about Mr. Sharkey's character. Ms. Keegan stated that the State is asking that the Commission grant its motion to limit documents that are already in the Division's set as listed on page 7 of the motion and consider excluding the list of documents that the State has identified that have nothing to do with this case which include the documents in the Supplemental Disclosure. Ms. Keegan stated that the State would like to point out that Mr. Sharkey's Opposition refers to exhibits A and B, but those documents were never submitted, and the State argues that his Opposition is not supported. Ms. Keegan stated that she apologizes that the Commission has to take the time to consider this because it is something that the parties could have stipulated prior to the hearing had it had the opportunity. Ms. Keegan stated that Mr. Sharkey waited until the week before the hearing and submitted 225 documents on February 3, 2025, and the First Supplemental on February 6, 2025, which did not give enough time to set up a meeting and go through the documents.

Mr. May stated that respondent had an attorney for several weeks who had to withdraw in early January because his wife had several health problems and Mr. Sharkey tried to find another attorney to no avail. Mr. May stated that Mr. Sharkey became his client on February 3, 2025, and at that time he disclosed his list of witnesses and documents according to the rules. Mr. May stated that he did forget to include the documents with his opposition because he was trying to get up to speed on this case and the Motion in Limine did not help. Mr. May stated that he has never been involved in an administrative proceeding where he has submitted documents per the rules and have the other side tell him that he cannot do that and that somehow, they have been harmed. Mr. May stated that the State has been involved in this case for months with unlimited resources, agents, and whatever they need to prepare for this case and my client does not. Mr. May stated that Mr. Sharkey found him after trying multiple times to find an attorney, he agreed to take the case because Mr. Sharkey needs help and guidance. Mr. May stated that he does not think that anything that he has done has been improper or harmed the Commission or Division, and that he is simply trying to represent his client the best he can in a short time period. Mr. May stated that for the Attorney General's office to say that the Commission should arbitrarily set my witnesses to fifteen minutes complies with the process. Mr. May stated that Ms. Houlf's and Ms. Elser's testimony is going to be quick, but to arbitrarily say their testimony is limited to fifteen minutes is inappropriate, because both witnesses and the documents were disclosed per the rules. Mr. May stated that he tried to appease the Attorney General's office by explaining the best he could who the witnesses were since he had not yet had time to go through all of the documents but was frustrated when he received the Motion in Limine because he is just trying to do his job. Mr. May stated that his client should be able to use the documents that were produced on February 3, 2025, and the documents that were provided in the First Supplemental Disclosure because they are pertinent. Mr. May stated that the Commission is aware of some animosity between Mr. Sharkey and the Attorney General's office when Mr. Sharkey spoke during public comment stating that there were underlying issues. Mr. May stated that he is trying to represent his client to the best of his ability. Mr. May stated that he cited a case before the contractor's board about an attorney that was prohibited from being able to cross-examine and that case was taken to the Supreme Court where the Supreme court returned the case to the contractor's board stating that they were blocked from being able to defend their client. Mr. May stated that NRS 233B.123(4) addresses what he is allowed to do and should or should not do. Mr. May stated that he has done the best he can, and that Mr. Sharkey should not

DRAFT MINUTES

be penalized because he could not find an attorney. Mr. May stated that in moving forward, the Commission can make their decision on a case-by-case basis, which is what he thought was going to happen.

President Plummer asked Ms. Keegan what the Commission should be considering and if there was a recommendation for a motion because they have several documents in front of them.

Ms. Keegan stated that the State is asking that the Commission grant the Motion in Limine and everything else falls from that motion. Ms. Keegan stated that the State is not asking for witnesses or documents that are not redundant or irrelevant be excluded, but rather that immaterial witnesses that have nothing to do with this case be limited to fifteen minutes, exclude documents that are already in the Division's set, and exclude documents that are irrelevant for the purpose of keeping this hearing on track.

President Plummer asked Ms. Keegan if there were witnesses to be excluded within the motion.

Ms. Keegan stated that the motion did ask for Dawn Houlf to be excluded because she was not the broker at the time. Ms. Keegan stated that Mr. May can expand upon what Ms. Houlf will testify to or what he intends to elicit from her testimony. Ms. Keegan stated that if Ms. Houlf's testimony is about Mr. Sharkey's character, that is not what this case is about. Ms. Keegan stated that if the Commission feels that the information would be helpful in making a determination of the disciplinary component in the proceedings, she requests the Commission to limit Ms. Houlf's testimony to fifteen minutes.

President Ruthe moved to support the Motion in Limine and limit repetitious irrelevant and/or immaterial witnesses and similarly exclude evidence otherwise offered to confuse the issues and waste time. Seconded by Commissioner Tina. Motion carried.

Mr. May stated that in the respondent's documents that were submitted, he would ask that the Commission strike pages RESP 000036 and RESP 000037 which were produced in error and considered attorney/client privilege.

Mr. May stated that he also moves to exclude NRED 000117-000121 in the State's documents which are posts from his client's Instagram page, because they are mostly irrelevant, and believes they were produced in order to paint an unfair prejudicial picture of his client. Mr. May stated that pursuant to NRS 48.025 and NRS 48.035 that those State documents be excluded from the record.

Mr. May stated that State's documents NRED 000126-000127 there is nothing identifying where this document came from or when it was printed and makes the document irrelevant.

Ms. Keegan stated that the State's documents NRED 000117-000121 are relevant because it corresponds with violation 11 in the complaint "willfully using the realtor trademark" and the document has Sharkey Family Realtor with the ® registered logo. Ms. Keegan stated that this document is time-stamped, September 26, 2024, at 8:40 a.m., when Mr. Sharkey had no real estate licenses and was not a realtor. Ms. Keegan stated the State sees no claims of prejudice

DRAFT MINUTES

and Mr. May is concocting prejudice or bias where there is none. Ms. Keegan stated that this Instagram was accessed publicly, so to claim that it is in the Division's documents and that Mr. Sharkey has been harmed when Mr. Sharkey is the one who publicly posted the information. Ms. Keegan stated that she opposes excluding these documents.

Ms. Keegan stated that the State's documents NRED 000126-000127 are the investigator, Sean Gustafson's documents, which provides information, and she does not understand what the motion to exclude is about.

Ms. Keegan stated that the State thanks Mr. May for acknowledging that his documents RESP 000036 and 000037 should be excluded and that is why the State excluded those documents in the Motion in Limine, particularly RESP 000037 because that was evidence of compromised offers under NRS 48.105.

President Plummer stated that both sides agree that respondent's Exhibits RESP 000036-000037 are not admitted.

President Plummer stated that any documents to be admitted will be decided later.

Mr. May stated that he is asking that the Instagram post be excluded.

President Plummer stated that it would be addressed later.

Opening Statements
Ms. Keegan gave an opening statement.
Mr. May gave an opening statement.

State's Witness
Sean Gustafson, Compliance-Audit Investigator, testified.

Ms. Keegan moved to admit the State's Exhibits bates stamped NRED 000001-000334 into the record.

Mr. May stated that he objects to State's exhibit D because there is hearsay provided by the broker and he should establish that information through his testimony. Mr. May stated that he will restate his original objections to State's Exhibits NRED 000117-000121 being prejudicial and regarding NRED 000126-000127 there is no way to know from where or when this document was produced. Mr. May stated that as for Exhibit B, except for the complaint and the documents that the investigator received, he would object to everything else as hearsay by individuals who provided the information and they should be the ones who establish that it is a valid document before it is admitted as evidence,

Ms. Keegan stated that regarding Exhibit D, the respondent's brokers and those documents, that is part of the Division's investigator's process to gather information from the broker at the time and obtain any relevant records. Ms. Keegan stated that part of a sound investigation is to get documents from the complainant, respondent, the respondent's brokers, and that is what is

DRAFT MINUTES

included in these documents, and the State counters their objection stating Exhibit B should be admitted. Ms. Keegan stated that she had already made her opposition to not admitting Exhibit A, in regard to State's Exhibit NRED 000117 and all the other objections raised during the preliminary matters. Ms. Keegan stated that she has already addressed Exhibit B which are part of the Division's investigation and the complaint that initiated the investigation with the Division.

Ms. Keegan stated that she would ask the Commission to admit all of the State's Exhibits bates stamped NRED 000001-000334 into the record.

President Plummer stated that the State's Exhibits are admitted and the objections by Mr. May are noted.

Mr. May cross-examined the witness.

Mr. May moved to admit respondent's Exhibit bates stamped RESP 000073 into the record.

Ms. Keegan objected stating there is no way to know when this photograph was taken.

President Plummer stated overruled.

Mr. May stated for the record that the document that he is trying to produce shows the outfit that Mr. Sharkey wears as a contractor, which is what he was wearing when he showed up to meet the client regardless of the date that it was taken.

Mr. May moved to admit respondent's Exhibit bates stamped RESP 000191 into the record.

Ms. Keegan made a standing objection to Mr. May bringing the respondent's documents to the attention of the investigator when they were not part of his investigation.

President Plummer stated sustained.

Mr. May stated that this text message is very important because it shows who was talking on the phone. Mr. May stated that there has been a decision made that his client negotiated a deal that he didn't do and based on the additional information, it shows that it was not Mr. Sharkey on the phone, but it was Audrey Sharkey. Mr. May stated that this is very problematic if this piece of evidence is not admitted.

President Plummer stated that he will allow the respondent's Exhibit bates stamped RESP 000191 to be admitted.

Ms. Keegan re-examined the witness.

The Commission had no questions of the witness.

The witness was dismissed.

DRAFT MINUTES

State's Witness
John Wunder testified.

Mr. May cross examined the witness.

Mr. May moved to admit respondent's Exhibit bates stamped RESP 000017 into the record.

Ms. Keegan objected, stating that this document is already in the Division's documents, bates stamped NRED 000250-000252, so it is redundant.

President Plummer stated that the Commission already has the documents.

Ms. Keegan re-examined the witness.

Mr. May re-cross examined the witness.

The Commission asked questions of the witness.

The witness was dismissed.

State's Witness
Brenda Williams testified.

Mr. May cross examined the witness.

Ms. Keegan re-examined the witness.

The witness was dismissed.

9) Public Comment
Neil Schwartz stated that he would like to request that the Real Estate Division and the Commission institute some type of review of the post programs and modules of the subject matter to see if they still reflect what is happening in the industry. Mr. Schwartz stated that the last time a review was done was ten years ago and based on what he sees in the field as a teacher, it appears that the post needs to be reviewed to see if it is relevant to what is going on. Mr. Schwartz stated that the CE classes seem to be flexible in that endeavor, but since the post classes are a requirement and controlled by the Real Estate Division, they need to be reviewed.

10) For Possible Action: Adjournment
Meeting recessed at 4:44 p.m. on February 11, 2025.

DRAFT MINUTES

NEVADA REAL ESTATE COMMISSION
MINUTES

VIA IN PERSON AND WEBEX VIRTUAL MEETING

February 12, 2025

Nevada State Business Center
3300 W. Sahara Avenue, 4th Floor-Nevada Room
Las Vegas, Nevada 89102

VIDEO CONFERENCE TO:
Division of Insurance
1818 College Parkway, Suite 103
Carson City, Nevada 89706

The meeting was called to order at 9:03 a.m.

1-A) Introduction of Commissioners in Attendance
Darrell Plummer, Washoe County; Donna Ruthe, Clark County; Forrest Barbee, Clark County; William Bradley Spires, Douglas County; and David Tina, Clark County.

Commission Counsel: Senior Deputy Attorney General Todd Weiss and Deputy Attorney General Joseph Ostunio.

1-C) Introduction of Division Staff in Attendance
Sharath Chandra, Administrator; Shareece Bates, Administration Section Manager; Kelly Valadez, Commission Coordinator; Maria Gallo, Commission Coordinator; Jan Holle, Chief Compliance Audit Investigator; Shaun Mclean, Compliance Audit Investigator; Annalyn Carrillo, Education and Information Officer; Senior Deputy Attorney General Phil W. Su and Deputy Attorney General Christal P. Keegan.

2) Public Comment
No public comment.

6-G) NRED v James Sharkey, for possible action
Case No. 2024-749
Parties Present
James Sharkey was present.
Tony May, Esq. was present representing Mr. Sharkey.
Nathan Elser, respondent's previous broker, was present.
Valerie DiBenedetto, witness, was present.
Amy Elser, witness, was present.
Christal P. Keegan, Deputy Attorney General, was present representing the Division.

DRAFT MINUTES

President Plummer stated that this case commenced yesterday but was not concluded and will be continuing today.

State's Witness
Valerie DiBenedetto testified.

Ms. Keegan moved to admit respondent's Exhibit bates stamped RESP 000195 into the record.

President Plummer stated so admitted.

Ms. Keegan moved to admit respondent's Exhibit bates stamped RESP 000197 into the record.

President Plummer stated so admitted.

Ms. Keegan moved to admit respondent's Exhibit bates stamped RESP 000198 into the record.

Mr. May cross examined the witness.

Mr. May moved to admit respondent's Exhibit bates stamped RESP 000193 into the record.

President Plummer stated so admitted.

Mr. May moved to admit respondent's Exhibits bates stamped RESP 000001-000002 into the record.

Ms. Keegan objected, stating that RESP 000001 seems to have been manipulated with a hi-lighted area and does not appear to be a clean copy of the Form 508.

President Plummer stated that he will allow the documents to be admitted.

Mr. May moved to admit respondent's Exhibit bates stamped RESP 000054 into the record.

Ms. Keegan objected, stating that this document is already in the Division's documents, bates stamped NRED 000261, so it is redundant.

President Plummer stated not admitted.

Mr. May moved to admit respondent's Exhibits bates stamped RESP 000055-000071 into the record.

Ms. Keegan objected, stating that these documents are already in the Division's documents, bates stamped NRED 000308-000317, so it is redundant.

Mr. May stated that the sub-lease is in the Division's documents, but it does not contain the verification part.

DRAFT MINUTES

President Plummer stated so admitted.

Ms. Keegan re-cross examined the witness.

Ms. Keegan moved to admit respondent's Exhibit bates stamped RESP 000199 into the record.

President Plummer stated so admitted.

The Commission questioned the witness.

The witness was dismissed.

State's Witness
Nathan Elser testified.

Ms. Keegan moved to admit respondent's Exhibit bates stamped RESP 000097 into the record.

President Plummer stated so admitted.

Mr. May cross examined the witness.

The Commission asked questions of the witness.

The witness was dismissed.

The State rested their case.

Respondent's Witness
Amy Elser testified.

Ms. Keegan cross examined the witness.

Ms. Keegan moved to admit respondent's Exhibit bates stamped RESP 000222 into the record.

Mr. May objected stating that if they are going to admit respondent's Exhibit bates stamped RESP 000222, respondent's Exhibits bates stamped RESP 000218-000222 should all be admitted.

President Plummer stated he would only address what Ms. Keegan was asking to be admitted.

President Plummer stated that respondent's Exhibit bates stamped RESP 000222 is admitted into the record.

Mr. May re-cross examined the witness.

Mr. May moved to admit respondent's Exhibit bates stamped RESP 000220 into the record.

DRAFT MINUTES

President Plummer stated so admitted.

The Commission had no questions of the witness.
The witness was dismissed.

Respondent's Witness
James Sharkey testified.

Mr. May moved to admit respondent's Exhibit bates stamped RESP 000038-000042 into the record.

President Plummer stated so admitted.

Mr. May moved to admit respondent's Exhibit bates stamped RESP 000073 into the record.

Ms. Keegan objected because it has not been established that he was wearing that uniform on the day of the showing.

President Plummer stated admission is denied.

Mr. May stated that Mr. Sharkey is testifying that he was wearing that uniform, and the exhibit should be admitted based on his testimony.

President Plummer stated that since it has not been validated by anyone else, he is denying admission.

Mr. May moved to admit respondent's Exhibit bates stamped RESP 000044 into the record.

President Plummer stated so admitted.

Mr. May moved to admit respondent's Exhibits bates stamped RESP 000193-000194 into the record.

President Plummer stated so moved.

Mr. May moved to admit respondent's Exhibit bates stamped RESP 000225 into the record.

President Plummer stated so admitted.

Mr. May moved to admit respondent's Exhibits bates stamped RESP 000006-000007 into the record.

President Plummer stated so admitted.

Mr. May moved to admit respondent's Exhibit bates stamped RESP 000027 into the record.
President Plummer stated so admitted.

DRAFT MINUTES

Mr. May moved to admit respondent's Exhibits bates stamped RESP 000090-000092 into the record.

President Plummer stated so admitted.

Mr. May moved to admit respondent's Exhibits bates stamped RESP 000188-000189 into the record.

President Plummer stated so admitted.

President Plummer stated that since it is a stacked agenda, he is going to move from this case to another case because of timeliness and some conflicts.

6-F) NRED v Andrew J. Arevalo, for possible action
Case No. 2024-660

Parties Present
Andrew J. Arevalo was
Chandon Alexander, Esq. was present representing Mr. Arevalo.

Mr. Alexander stated that there are six witnesses in this matter and most of the professional witnesses have expressed unavailability for tomorrow. Mr. Alexander stated that because of the number of witnesses there is the possibility of their hearing goes a full day even if tomorrow was open and there is concern that they would end up with a bifurcated proceeding because of it spilling over. Mr. Alexander stated that due to these reasons, he is requesting a continuance. Mr. Alexander stated that putting on their case in chief without their expert witnesses would greatly prejudice Mr. Arevalo. Mr. Alexander stated that their purpose is not to delay, but to promote justice and give Mr. Arevalo a fair hearing. Mr. Alexander stated that the Division is not prejudiced in any way to move this hearing to the next meeting scheduled.

Ms. Keegan stated that this case was already granted a continuance once before moving it further out, so moving this to May would be a second continuance. Ms. Keegan stated that a May hearing would come after Mr. Arevalo's license renewal, so the State has an interest in hearing this case sooner rather than later. Ms. Keegan stated that the respondent's witnesses' availability is not the State's problem, but rather Mr. Alexander's responsibility to make sure his witnesses are available from February 11-13, 2025, for the duration of the hearing.

President Plummer stated that this is a time constraint issue even though he agrees with the opposition by Ms. Keegan that was presented.

Commissioner Ruthe stated that she can see both points and does not know if the case would be concluded tomorrow, then it would end in the middle of the case lingering until the next meeting.

Commissioner Tina stated that he would not like to begin hearing and case tomorrow and then continue May and lose everything. Commissioner Tina said that it would be best to continue the case and hear it all at one time.

DRAFT MINUTES

Commissioner Barbee stated that he agrees that it makes sense to continue until the next scheduled meeting.

Commissioner Tina moved in the matter of NRED v Andrew J. Arevalo Case# 2024-660 that the Commission grant a continuance until the Commission meeting scheduled for May 13-15, 2025. Seconded by Commissioner Barbee. Motion carried.

6-G) NRED v James Sharkey, for possible action
Case No. 2024-749

Parties Present
James Sharkey was present.
Tony May, Esq. was present representing Mr. Sharkey.

President Plummer stated that in returning to this matter, Mr. May had completed his examination of Mr. Sharkey and Ms. Keegan would begin her cross examination.

Respondent's Witness
Ms. Keegan cross examined Mr. Sharkey.

Mr. May re-examined the witness.

The Commission asked questions of the witness.

The witness was dismissed.

Closing Statements
Ms. Keegan gave a closing statement.
Mr. May gave a closing statement.

Commissioner Plummer stated that many things are being taken into consideration but one of the last comments by Mr. May in his closing referred to Mr. Sharkey as small unsophisticated realtor. President Plummer stated that he thought Mr. Sharkey was well-educated, with sixty something hours of continuing education, and other than not being able to take down a website, pretty intelligent. President Plummer stated that he heard Mr. Sharkey say several times that he had made some mistakes that he probably should not have. President Plummer stated that yes, because Audrey Sharkey is related in marriage, Mr. Sharkey may have been involved in knowledge of the transactions from the beginning, but he made a mess of this. President Plummer stated that from day one, the witness Mr. Wunder stated he did not know who Audrey Sharkey was and when he was looking at a building to lease, Mr. Sharkey showed up with both hats he potentially wears. President Plummer stated that he does not care what attire someone wears, Mr. Sharkey should have made it very clear in that moment to the person and to the agent meeting there, because he knew he did not have a license, and showing up in different attire, in and of itself did not make anything clear. President Plummer stated that Mr. Sharkey having his wife have someone sign the duties owed form, when the consumer typically signs it electronically, does not show any evidence of procuring anything other than trying to get the commission paid over to a firm that Mr. Sharkey is not even with, and his apparent intent was

DRAFT MINUTES

getting a contract. President Plummer stated that wearing too many hats will cause trouble. President Plummer stated that Mr. Sharkey knowingly surrendered his license, but he should have been more careful than that and he is sophisticated enough to know that he screwed up. President Plummer stated that Mr. Sharkey kept showing up at buildings to be a contractor, but the person only knows him as a realtor, and the witness said that. President Plummer stated that Mr. Sharkey wants to dismiss the Mr. Wunder's character as a witness and the witness did a fine job of explaining his knowledge or lack of knowledge regarding Audrey Sharkey. President Plummer stated that Mr. Sharkey's contractor portion might have been involved since the beginning but was it clear with transparency. President Plummer stated that there were two listing agents that testified as witnesses that had no understanding of Mr. Sharkey other than as a licensed real estate agent. President Plummer stated that there were so many things that were compounded, taking so many hours looking at the same documents that made if very clear that there was no transparency with Mr. Sharkey having no license. President Plummer stated that people do not have to be harmed financially to have been harmed and there is a purpose to having a license and not having a license. President Plummer stated that the industry has been harmed by Mr. Sharkey performing activities without a license.

Factual Allegations

Commissioner Ruthe moved in the matter of NRED v James Sharkey Case# 2024-749 that those factual allegations 1-28 have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence. Seconded by Commissioner Tina. Motion carried.

Violations of Law

Commissioner Barbee moved in the matter of NRED v James Sharkey Case# 2024-749 that those violations of law 1-11 have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence. Seconded by Commissioner Ruthe. Motion carried.

Division Recommendations for Discipline

Jan Holle presented this:

- Total fine of $44,000.00 plus the costs of the investigation and hearing in the amount of $14,538.39 payable within 90 days of the effective date of the order.
- Revocation of all licenses and permits.

Commissioner Tina moved in the matter of NRED v James Sharkey Case# 2024-749 that the respondent pay a $44,000.00 fine plus the costs of the investigation and hearing in the amount of $14,538.39 payable within 90 days of the effective date of the order, and that all of respondent's licenses and permits be revoked. Seconded by Commissioner Ruthe. Motion carried.

8-A) For Possible Action: Discussion and Decision Regarding License Denial Appeal Pursuant to NAC 645.335.

Kelvin Atkinson

File No.: S-LDA-25-008

Parties Present

Kelvin Atkinson was present.

Susan Clark, Licensing Section Manager, was present.

DRAFT MINUTES

Mr. Atkinson requested that the Commission go into closed session.

Commissioner Ruthe moved that the Commission go into closed session. Seconded by Commissioner Barbee. Motion carried.

The Commission went into closed session.

Commissioner Ruthe moved that the Commission go back into open session. Seconded by Commissioner Spires. Motion carried.

Commissioner Tina moved to approve Kelvin Atkinson's license denial appeal, file number S-LDA-25-008 and grant him a license. Seconded by Commissioner Ruthe. Motion carried.

8-B) For Possible Action: Discussion and Decision Regarding License Denial Appeal Pursuant to NAC 645.335.

Macrina Rose Blanco
File No.: S-LDA-25-009

Parties Present
Macrina Rose Blanco was present.
Susan Clark, Licensing Section Manager, was present.

Ms. Blanco requested that the Commission go into closed session.

Commissioner Tina moved that the Commission go into closed session. Seconded by Commissioner Spires. Motion carried.

Commissioner Spires moved that the Commission go back into open session. Seconded by Commissioner Ruthe. Motion carried.

Commissioner Tina moved to approve Macrina Rose Blanco's license denial appeal, file number S-LDA-25-009 and grant her a license. Seconded by Commissioner Spires. Motion carried.

8-C) For Possible Action: Discussion and Decision Regarding License Denial Appeal Pursuant to NAC 645.335.

Troy Bond
File No.: S-LDA-25-010

Parties Present
Troy Bond was present.
Susan Clark, Licensing Section Manager, was present.

Mr. Bond stated that he did not want a closed session.

Ms. Clark stated that the Division received Mr. Bond's real estate salesperson application, and the application disclosed that Mr. Bond had felony convictions for possessing a firearm and distributing drugs. Ms. Clark stated that his application was denied pursuant to NRS 645.330(2)(a).

DRAFT MINUTES

Mr. Bond gave a statement.

Commissioner Ruthe moved to approve Troy Bond's license denial appeal, file number S-LDA-25-010, and grant him a license. Seconded by Commissioner Spires. Motion carried.

9) <u>Public Comment</u>

Mr. Su stated that he wanted to commend his colleague Christal Keegan who pursued through these hearings with flu-like symptoms because she did a tremendous job. Mr. Su stated that this is Kelly Valadez' last meeting and he wanted to say that she has been a tremendous asset and friend, and he wanted to say thank you.

President Plummer stated that Phil Su and Christal Keegan both do a great job as the Deputy Attorney Generals for the Division, and as difficult as it is through the process of fairness, even though sometimes difficult and long, it was necessary, and he appreciates Mr. Su and Ms. Keegan professionalism. President Plummer stated that he cannot thank Division's staff enough for supporting the Commission and making it easy to come and do something pretty serious. President Plummer stated that the Commission will miss Ms. Valadez and wishes her the best in her new opportunity with the State.

10) <u>For Possible Action: Adjournment</u>

Meeting adjourned at 4:33 p.m. on February 12, 2025.

Prepared by: Kelly Valadez

DRAFT MINUTES