### 

# BEFORE THE COMMISSION FOR COMMON-INTEREST COMMUNITIES AND CONDOMINIUM HOTELS STATE OF NEVADA

Sharath Chandra, Administrator, Real Estate Division, Department of Business & Industry, State of Nevada,

Case No. 2018-1026

Petitioner,

vs.

Michael Skahill,

Respondent.

## FINDINGS OF FACT. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

This matter came on for hearing before the Commission for Common-Interest Communities and Condominium Hotels, State of Nevada (the "Commission"), during a regular agenda on May 19, 2020, via telephone and video with no physical public location (as permitted by the Governor's Declaration of Emergency, Directive 006, as amended by Directives 016 and 018). Respondent Michael Skahill ("RESPONDENT") appeared by phone and Karissa D. Neff, Esq., Deputy Attorney General with the Nevada Attorney General's Office, appeared by video on behalf of the Real Estate Division of the Department of Business and Industry, State of Nevada (the "Division"). The hearing on this matter had been originally set to begin on March 17, 2020, but the Commission's meeting was cancelled and all matters were continued to May 19, 2020, due to COVID-19.

Ms. Neff presented testimony from Kelly Valadez, the Commission coordinator, regarding service of the notices of the Complaint, hearing and documents on RESPONDENT. A Notice of Default was filed with the Division on May 1, 2020 and properly served on RESPONDENT in accordance with NRS 116.770(6). The Commission, having determined that RESPONDENT was properly served with the Complaint in this matter but that he failed to timely respond as required by NRS 116.770(5), even after the notice of default was sent to him, voted in favor of entering RESPONDENT's default and

making a decision based on the allegations in the complaint pursuant to NAC 116A.595(13).

The Commission, having considered the evidence introduced by the Division and being fully advised, enters the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order. Under Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) and Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) Chapter 116A, the Commission has legal jurisdiction and authority over this matter.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

The Commission, based upon the filed complaint, finds that the following Findings of Fact have been proven by a preponderance of the evidence in accordance with NAC 116A.595(13).

- 1. On or around August 2, 2018, RESPONDENT, on behalf of the Association, submitted the Association's Annual Association Registration to the Division along with a check in the amount of \$191.25 for Unit Fees (the "Check").
- 2. The Check was improperly signed because it only had RESPONDENT's signature and not a second signature from the appropriate person on behalf of the Association, and was also short of the amount due.
- 3. On August 10, 2017, the Division notified RESPONDENT that the check was short and that a balance was still owed.
- 4. The Division received an unsigned check from the Association dated August 16, 2017, in the amount of \$12.75- the balance due.
- 5. On July 30, 2018 and on August 13, 2018, the Division properly notified RESPONDENT that it was opening up an investigation to determine if statutory and/or administrative codes had been violated with respect to improperly signed checks and requested that RESPONDENT provide the following documents to the Division: (1) the management agreement with the Association, (2) operating and reserve bank statements along with the cancelled checks from the Association from January 1, 2017 to present, and (3) the governing documents for the Association (collectively the "Division Requested Documents").
  - 6. On August 12, 2018, RESPONDENT provided a response to the Division and

stated that if the Division had an issue with the Association's check, the Division should have returned it and that the Division's investigation, "sounds to me like a compliance issue in your office."

- 7. RESPONDENT claimed that he normally signs checks and then sends them to a board member to sign, and that if the board members don't sign them, that there is nothing he can do.
- 8. In his August 12, 2018 response to the Division, RESPONDENT failed to provide the Division Requested Documents.
- 9. Thereafter, on August 27, 2018, October 18, 2018, and again on November 26, 2018, the Division properly notified RESPONDENT of its investigation and again requested that RESPONDENT provide the Division Requested Documents.
- 10. RESPONDENT never provided the Division Requested Documents or provided a subsequent response to the Division.
- 11. On July 12, 2019, the Division properly notified RESPONDENT of its intent to commence disciplinary action against him.

#### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Based on the foregoing findings of fact, the Commission concluded by unanimous vote that RESPONDENT committed the following violations of law:

- 12. RESPONDENT violated NRS 116.31153 by sole signing a check to the Division.
- 13. RESPONDENT violated NRS 116A.630(6)(a) by failing to ensure the financial transactions of a client are current, accurate and properly documented by improperly signing checks to the Division.
- 14. RESPONDENT violated NRS 116A.630(9) by failing to make the financial records of an association available for inspection by the Division when he failed to provide the Division Requested Documents.
- 15. RESPONDENT violated NRS 116A.630(10) by failing to cooperate with the Division involving complaints filed with the Division when he failed to provide the Division

Requested Documents.

- 16. RESPONDENT violated NAC 116A.345(2)(a) by failing to comply with the Division's request to provide the Division Requested Documents.
- 17. RESPONDENT violated NAC 116A.355(2)(c) by engaging in deceitful, fraudulent or dishonest conduct by blaming the Division for the deficiencies related to the checks he wrote to the Division and then by failing to provide the Division Requested Documents.
- 18. RESPONDENT violated NAC 116A.355(2)(f) by failing to cooperate with the Division in the investigation of a complaint, including, without limitation, failure to produce any document, book or record in the possession or control of the community manager after requested by the Division by failing to provide the Division Requested Documents.
- 19. RESPONDENT violated NRS 116A.630(2)(a) by failing to comply with state laws when he improperly sole signed and/or failed to sign checks and failed to provide the Division Requested Documents.

#### **ORDER**

The Commission, being fully apprised in the premises and good cause appearing to the Commission, ORDERS as follows:

- 1. Within 45 days of the effective date of this Order, RESPONDENT shall produce the following documents to the Division:
  - (a) His management agreement with the Association,
  - (b) Proof of his correspondence with the Association's financial institution(s), requesting its operating and reserve bank statements along with the cancelled checks from the Association from January 1, 2017 to present. (Once RESPONDENT receives the requested information from the financial institution(s), he shall promptly provide it to the Division); and
  - (c) The governing documents for the Association.