22

23

24

25

26

27

28

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,

Petitioner.

vs.

Michael Skahill,

Respondent.

Case No. 2018-1026



FEB 1 2 2020

NEVADA COMMISSION FOR COMMON INTEREST COMMUNITIES AND CONDOMINIUM HOTELS

Kelly Valader

COMPLAINT FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION AND NOTICE OF HEARING

The Real Estate Division of the Department of Business and Industry, State of Nevada (the "Division"), by and through its counsel, Aaron D. Ford, Attorney General of the State of Nevada, and Michelle D. Briggs, Esq., Senior Deputy Attorney General, and Karissa D. Neff, Deputy Attorney General, hereby notifies Respondent Michael Skahill ("RESPONDENT" or "Skahill") of an administrative hearing before the Commission for Common-Interest Communities and Condominium Hotels, State of Nevada, which is to be held pursuant to Chapters 233B and Chapters 116 and 116A of the Nevada Revised Statutes ("NRS") and Chapter 116 and 116A of the Nevada Administrative Code ("NAC"). The purpose of the hearing is to consider the allegations stated below and to determine if an administrative penalty will be imposed on the RESPONDENT pursuant to the provisions of NRS and NAC including, but not limited to, NAC 116A.360.

JURISDICTION AND NOTICE

1. During all relevant times mentioned in this complaint, RESPONDENT held an active supervising community manager certificate from the Division (CAM.0007489-SUPR) and is, therefore, subject to the jurisdiction of the Division and the provisions of NRS Chapters 116 and 116A and NAC Chapters 116 and 116A.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

2. RESPONDENT was the community manager for Las Brisas Apartment

Homes Community Association (the "Association").

- 3. 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").
- 4. 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.
- 5. On August 10, 2017, the Division notified RESPONDENT that the check was short and that a balance was still owed.
- 6. The Division received an unsigned check from the Association dated August 16, 2017, in the amount of \$12.75- the balance due.
- 7. 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").
- 8. 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."
- 9. 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.
- 10. In his August 12, 2018 response to the Division, RESPONDENT failed to provide the Division Requested Documents.

- 11. 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.
- 12. RESPONDENT never provided the Division Requested Documents or provided a subsequent response to the Division.
- 13. On July 12, 2019, the Division properly notified RESPONDENT of its intent to commence disciplinary action against him.

VIOLATIONS OF LAW

- 14. RESPONDENT violated NRS 116.31153 by sole signing a check to the Division.
- 15. 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.
- 16. 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.
- 17. RESPONDENT violated NRS 116A.630(10) by failing to cooperating with the Division involving complaints filed with the Division when he failed to provide the Division Requested Documents.
- 18. RESPONDENT violated NAC 116A.345(2)(a) by failing to comply with the Division's request to provide the Division Requested Documents.
- 19. 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.
- 20. 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.

21. 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.

DISCIPLINE AUTHORIZED

Pursuant to the provisions of NAC 116A.360 the Commission has discretion to impose discipline as it deems appropriate, including, but not limited to one or more of the following actions:

- 1. Revoke or suspend the certificate;
- 2. Refuse to renew or reinstate the certificate;
- 3. Place the community manager on probation;
- 4. Issue a reprimand or censure to the community manager;
- 5. Impose a fine of not more than \$5,000 for each violation of a statute or regulation;
 - 6. Require the community manager to pay restitution;
- 7. Require the community manager to pay the costs of the investigation and hearing;
- 8. Require the community manager to obtain additional education relating to the management of common-interest communities; and
 - 9. Take such other disciplinary action as the Commission deems appropriate.

The Commission may order one or any combination of the discipline described above.

NOTICE OF HEARING

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE, that a disciplinary hearing has been set to consider this Administrative Complaint against the above-named RESPONDENT in accordance with Chapters 233B and 116 and 116A of the Nevada Revised Statutes and Chapters 116 and 116A of the Nevada Administrative Code.

THE HEARING WILL TAKE PLACE at the Commission meeting scheduled for March 17-19, 2020, beginning at approximately 9:00 a.m. each day, or until such time as the Commission concludes its business. The Commission meeting will be held on March 17-18, 2020 at the Nevada State Business Center, 3300 W. Sahara Avenue, Nevada Room, Suite 400, Las Vegas, Nevada 89102, and on March 19, 2020 at the Nevada State Business Center, 3300 W. Sahara Avenue, Tahoe Room, Suite 430, Las Vegas, Nevada 89102, with videoconferencing to Division of Insurance, 1818 E. College Parkway, Ste. 103, Carson City, Nevada 89706.

STACKED CALENDAR: Your hearing is one of several hearings that may be scheduled at the same time as part of a regular meeting of the Commission that is expected to last from March 17-19, 2020. Thus, your hearing may be continued until later in the day or from day to day. It is your responsibility to be present when your case is called. If you are not present when your hearing is called, a default may be entered against you and the Commission may decide the case as if all allegations in the complaint were true. If you need to negotiate a more specific time for your hearing in advance because of coordination with out of state witnesses or the like, please call Kelly Valadez, Commission Coordinator, at (702) 486-4606.

YOUR RIGHTS AT THE HEARING: Except as mentioned below, the hearing is an open meeting under Nevada's open meeting law, and may be attended by the public. After the evidence and arguments, the commission may conduct a closed meeting to discuss your alleged misconduct or professional competence. You are entitled to a copy of the transcript of the open and closed portions of the meeting, although you must pay for the transcription.

As a RESPONDENT, you are specifically informed that you have the right to appear and be heard in your defense, either personally or through your counsel of choice. At the hearing, the Division has the burden of proving the allegations in the complaint and will call witnesses and present evidence against you. You have the right to respond and to

present relevant evidence and argument on all issues involved. You have the right to call and examine witnesses, introduce exhibits, and cross-examine opposing witnesses on any matter relevant to the issues involved.

You have the right to request that the Commission issue subpoenas to compel witnesses to testify and/or evidence to be offered on your behalf. In making this request, you may be required to demonstrate the relevance of the witness's testimony and/or evidence. Other important rights and obligations, including your obligation to answer the complaint, you have are listed in NAC 116A.560 through NAC 116A.655, NRS Chapter 233B, and NRS Chapters 116 and 116A and NAC 116 and 116A. Note that under NAC 116A.585, not less than five (5) working days before a hearing, RESPONDENT must provide to the Division a copy of all reasonably available documents that are reasonably anticipated to be used to support his or her position, and a list of witnesses RESPONDENT intends to call at the time of the hearing. Failure to provide any document or to list a witness may result in the document or witness being excluded from RESPONDENT'S The the defense. purpose of the hearing is to determine if RESPONDENT has violated any of the provisions of NRS and NAC Chapters 116 and 116A, and to determine what administrative penalty is to be assessed against RESPONDENT, if any, pursuant to NAC 116A.360.

DATED: February 11, 2020.

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

REAL ESTATE INDUSTRY &

By:

ndra. Administrator 3300 W. Sahara Avenue, Suite 350 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 (702) 486-4033

AARON D. FORD Attorney General

Michelle D. Briggs, Esq. (Bar No. 7617)

Senior Deputy Attorney General Karissa D. Neff, Esq. (Bar No. 9133) Deputy Attorney General 555 E. Washington Avenue, Suite 3900 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 486-3894 Attorneys for the Division