BEFORE THE REAL ESTATE COMMISSION STATE OF NEVADA

SHARATH CHANDRA, Administrator, REAL ESTATE DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY, STATE OF NEVADA, Case No. 2019-998, AP20.009.S

Petitioner.

VS.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

STIPULATION AND ORDER FOR SETTLEMENT OF DISCIPLINARY ACTION

STEVEN M. ORTEGA (License No. A.0007017-CR),

OCT 19 2022

Respondent.

NEVADA COMMISSION DE ARTERASERS

This Stipulation for Settlement of Disciplinary Action (this "Stipulation") is entered into by and between the State of Nevada, Department of Business and Industry, Real Estate Division ("Division"), through its Administrator Sharath Chandra ("Petitioner"), by and through their attorney of record, Louis V. Csoka, Deputy Attorney General, and Steven M. Ortega ("RESPONDENT").

RESPONDENT, at all relevant times mentioned in this Complaint, was licensed by the Division as a Licensed Residential Appraiser. He is therefore subject to the jurisdiction of the Division and the Commission and the provisions of NRS chapter 645C and NAC chapter 645C.

SUMMARY OF FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS SET FORTH IN THE COMPLAINT

- 1. The Respondent is licensed by the Division as a Certified Residential Appraiser, License No. A.0007017-CR.
- 2. The Respondent's Appraisal Report was prepared for a single-family residence located at 6145 Duncan Drive, Las Vegas, Nevada 89108, APN 138-11-603-003 ("Property").
 - 3. The gross living area of the Property is recorded as 4,110 square feet.
 - 4. The assignment type is identified as "estimate of value."

2728

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 5. The effective date of Respondent's Appraisal Report is identified as November 8, 2018, and the signature date is November 13, 2018.
 - The Respondent's Appraisal Report states the appraised value is \$800,000.00. 6.
- 7. Respondent's Appraisal Report contains significant errors, as summarized herein.
- Among other issues, the Respondent's work file contains no data, information, 8. or documentation indicating a client or intended user.
- 9. Respondent's work file contains no engagement letter, e-mail, or handwritten notes indicating the client, intended user, or intended use.
- 10. Respondent's work file does not contain a disclosure to the client that a lender or its agent is required to directly engage the services of an appraiser in a federally-related transaction.
- The intended use is not included in the work file nor reported correctly in the 11. Appraisal Report.
- 12. While the Respondent made adjustments for the gross living area, site size, view, number of stories, bathroom count, garage capacity, number of fireplaces, on-site amenities, covered patio/balcony, and upgrades, Respondent's work file contains no data, information, or documentation to support these adjustments.
 - 13. The intended use of Respondent's Appraisal Report is unclear.
- 14. The wording used as to intended use is generic and not specific to the assignment -while wording in one place references mortgage finance transaction, the Appraisal Report still appears to have been performed for the homeowner and not for mortgage underwriting.
- 15. Further, while the living space in the garage has improvements to the same level as the main living area of the subject Property, Respondent's work file contains no explanation as to why all of such improved area still classified as garage space and not living area.
 - In particular, while the garage appears to be both a garage and a casita, as 16.

reflected in the Respondent's description, that the garage includes "finished floors . . . , lighting, . . . [air conditioning] and heating unit, . . . a storage room, bedroom with wet bar and full bath. The wet bar has granite countertops. The bath features granite countertops and marble surrounds."

- 17. Yet, with such features, the living area described in the garage creates an additional detached gross living area and diminishes garage capacity, which is not accounted for in the Appraisal Report.
- 18. Respondent also fails to properly delineate the relevant neighborhood, as to adjustments being made.
- 19. In particular, while the neighborhood specified in the Respondent's Appraisal Report is an extensive geographic area, it is beyond what the market would consider the subject neighborhood.
- 20. Further, there is no statement indicating the extent of data researched in terms of comparable criteria searched in the Multiple Listing Service.
- 21. The Respondent's Appraisal Report and work file contain little to no analysis used to arrive at the opinions and conclusions.
- 22. Such lack of analysis suggest that the market-derived adjustments were not used but adjustments are automatic or standard adjustments.
- 23. While the Respondent certifies that he had utilized market-derived adjustments, there is no analysis within the Appraisal Report or work file to support this certification.
- 24. There is no explanation or support as to how certain significant condition adjustment was developed.
- 25. Condition upgrade to comparable sales are also not properly accounted for relative to the instant appraisal.
 - 26. The Appraisal Report also contains a series of other errors.
- 27. First, while the Appraisal Report lists the neighborhood as custom, the neighborhood name should be how the market identifies the area and not a generic

description of the area.

- 28. Second, while the subject Property is incorrectly noted as 20,171 square feet, the public records show 20,038 square feet.
- 29. Third, while the Appraisal Report states the "subject is typical in shape, size, and topography for the subdivision," the subject property is not located within a planned subdivision.
- 30. Fourth, while the Property's description and building sketch indicate up to four (4) improvements, Respondent had checked only one (1) improvement in his general description section.
- 31. Fifth, given the renovations at the Property, the subject age of the Property should be lower than the original age of forty-one (41) that Respondent had checked in his Appraisal Report.
- 32. Sixth, while the Respondent's Appraisal states for comparable sales days on the market as 1 to 49 days in the sale comparison section, the Multiple Listing Service indicates 1 to 90 days.
- 33. Seventh, while Respondent states the subject Property has not been listed in the past year, the Property had been listed in the prior year (i.e., August 24, 2018).
- 34. Eight, while the Respondent states gross living area for listing 1 as 3,982 square feet (without distinguishing types of areas), listing 1 has an above-ground gross living area of 2,212 square feet and only a finished basement of 1,770 square feet.
- 35. Ninth, while Respondent represents some comparable sales as being in a Planned Unit Development ("PUD"), a number of comparable properties and the Property are not in such a PUD.
 - 36. Further, there is no analysis of supply and demand in the Appraisal Report.
- 37. Given that there was a nine-month supply, the supply and demand should state that there was an oversupply.
- 38. If there is an oversupply, the marked time of under three months, as the Respondent's checked boxes indicate, is not applicable.

- 39. Moreover, Respondent fails to include in Respondent's Appraisal Report and work file a development of the highest and best use for the subject Property.
- 40. Developing highest and best use for a custom property is important, as there can be under and over improvements for the market areas.
- 41. While the subject has a large detached building, there is no discussion about how this improvement compares to comparables in the subject Property's market.

PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

In an effort to avoid the time and expense of litigating these issues before the Commission, as well as any possible further legal appeals from any such decision, the parties desire to compromise and settle the instant controversy in Case No. 2019-998, AP 20.009.S, upon the following terms and conditions:

- 1. RESPONDENT agrees to pay the Division a total amount of THREE THOUSAND DOLLARS AND NO CENTS (\$ 3,000.00) ("Amount Due"), consisting of THREE THOUSAND DOLLARS AND NO CENTS (\$ 3,000.00) in fines imposed by the Division, for all violations as pled in the above-summarized Complaints, with no separately stated and allocated pre-hearing costs and attorneys' fees payable to the Division.
- 2. The Amount Due shall be payable to the Division as follows: RESPONDENT shall pay the entirety of the Amount Due over a two-year period in equal monthly installments. The first payment shall be due beginning thirty (30) days from date of the order approving this Stipulation, and each subsequent payment shall be due by the same date each month thereafter, until the Amount Due is paid in full. Lump sums can be made in pre-payment with no penalties.
- 3. RESPONDENT further agrees to take the following Division approved education courses:
 - Not less than a 20-hours of continued education.

The 20 hours of continued education set forth herein above shall be completed within 24 months of the Appraisal Commissioner signing the Stipulation. None of the above listed education will count towards license renewal. Within 1 year of completing the required

5 6

8 9

7

11

12

13

10

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

education, the RESPONDENT will submit one (1) month of appraisal logs. The Division will select from those logs random appraisals to be reviewed for USPAP compliance, unless the Division finds additional issues with the appraisals reviewed, in which event the Division shall be permitted to pursue additional investigation

- 4. RESPONDENT and the Division agree that by entering into this Stipulation, the Division does not concede any defense or mitigation RESPONDENT may assert and that, once this Stipulation is approved and fully performed, the Division will close its files in these matters, provided that, if any further violations are discovered in these matters beyond the scope of facts and violations already plead in the Complaints, the Division is not barred from further reviewing any of the same to determine if any such further violations not already covered in the Complaints have taken place and should subject RESPONDENT to further disciplinary action.
- 5. RESPONDENT agrees and understands that by entering into this Stipulation, RESPONDENT is waiving his right to a hearing in each matter at which RESPONDENT may present evidence in his defense, his right to a written decision on the merits of the complaint, his rights to reconsideration and/or rehearing, appeal and/or judicial review, and all other rights which may be accorded by the Nevada Administrative Procedure Act, the Nevada Real Estate Brokers and Salespersons statutes and accompanying regulations, and the federal and state Constitutions.
- 6. RESPONDENT understands that this Agreement and other documentation may be subject to public records laws. The Commission members who review this matter for approval of this Stipulation may be the same members who ultimately hear, consider, and decide the Complaints if this Stipulation is either not approved by the Commission or is not timely performed by RESPONDENT.
- 7. RESPONDENT fully understands that he has the right to be represented by legal counsel in these matters at his own expense.
- 8. Each party shall bear their own attorney's fees and costs, except as provided above.

- 9. Approval of Stipulation. Once executed, this Stipulation will be filed with the Commission and will be placed on the agenda for approval at its next public meeting. The Division will recommend to the Commission approval of the Stipulation. RESPONDENT agrees that the Commission may approve, reject, or suggest amendments to this Stipulation that must be accepted or rejected by RESPONDENT before any amendment is effective.
- 10. <u>Withdrawal of Stipulation</u>. If the Commission rejects this Stipulation or suggests amendments unacceptable to RESPONDENT, RESPONDENT may withdraw from this Stipulation, and the Division may pursue its Complaints before the Commission. This Stipulation then shall become null and void and unenforceable in any manner against either party.
- 11. Release. In consideration of the execution of this Stipulation, RESPONDENT for himself, his heirs, executors, administrators, successors, and assigns, hereby releases, remises, and forever discharges the State of Nevada, the Department of Business and Industry, and the Division, and each of their respective members, agents, employees, and counsel in their individual and representative capacities, from any and all manner of actions, causes of action, suits, debts, judgments, executions, claims, and demands whatsoever, known and unknown, in law or equity, that RESPONDENT ever had, now has, may have, or claim to have against any or all of the persons or entities named in this section, arising out of or by reason of the Division's investigations, these disciplinary actions, and all other matters relating thereto.
- 12. <u>Indemnification</u>. RESPONDENT hereby agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the State of Nevada, the Department of Business and Industry, Petitioner, the Division, and each of their respective members, agents, employees, and counsel, in their individual and representative capacities, against any and all claims, suits, and actions brought against said persons and/or entities by reason of the Division's investigations, these disciplinary actions, and all other matters relating thereto, and against any and all expenses, damages, and costs, including court costs and attorney fees, which may be

sustained by the persons and/or entities named in this section as a result of said claims, 1 2 suits, and actions. Default. In the event of default under this Scipulation RESPONDENT 3 13. that his license shall be immediately suspended and the unpaid balance of the 4 administrative fine and costs, together with any attorneys' fees and costs that may have 5 been assessed, shall be due in full to the Division within ten calendar days of the date of 6 default. Debt collection actions for unpaid monetary assessments in this case way be 7 instituted by the Division or its assignee. 8 9 14. RESPONDENT has signed and dated this Stipulation only after reading and 10 understanding all terms herein. OCTUBER DATED this ____ day of September, 2022. DATED this 29 day of September 2022 11 12 NEVADA DEP 13 & INDUSTRY TATE DIVISION 14 15 SHARATH 16 Administrator 17 Approved as to form: 18 AARON D. FORD 19 Attorney General 20 21 By: /s/ Louis V. Csoka LOUIS V. CSOKA (Bar. No. 7667) 22 Deputy Attorney General 23 555 E. Washington Avenue, Suite 3900 Las Vegas, NV 89101 24 Attorneys for Real Estate Division 25 111 26 27

ORDER

1 IT IS ORDERED that the foregoing Stipulation and Order for Settlement of 2 3 Disciplinary Action, submitted by Petitioner and Respondent, is approved in full. Dated: October 18, 2022. 4 5 COMMISSION OF APPRAISERS OF REAL 6 **ESTATE** STATE OF NEVADA 7 8 By: 9 Commission of Appraisers of Real President. Estate 10 Submitted by: 11 12 AARON FORD, Attorney General 13 By: 14 /s/ Louis V. Csoka 15 LOUIS V. CSOKA (Bar No. 7667) Deputy Attorney General 555 E. Washington Ave. Ste 3900 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 16 17 Attorneys for Real Estate Division 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28