

1 **BEFORE THE COMMISSION OF APPRAISERS OF REAL ESTATE**

2 **STATE OF NEVADA**

3
4 SHARATH CHANDRA, Administrator,
5 REAL ESTATE DIVISION,
6 DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS AND
7 INDUSTRY, STATE OF NEVADA,

8 Petitioner,

9 vs.

10 KEITH T. KAVULA,
(License No. A.0007139-CR-INACTIVE),

11 Respondent.

CASE NO.: 2022-427

**RESPONDENT KEITH T. KAVULA'S
RESPONSE TO COMPLAINT AND
NOTICE OF HEARING**

FILED

FEB 27 2025

NEVADA COMMISSION OF APPRAISERS

mgallo

12
13 Respondent Keith T. Kavula ("Mr. Kavula"), by and through his attorneys at
14 LIPSON NEILSON P.C., hereby submits his response to the State of Nevada,
15 Department of Business and Industry, Real Estate Division ("the Division") Complaint
16 and Notice of Hearing filed December 19, 2024. Mr. Kavula was licensed as a Certified
17 Residential Appraiser on January 8, 2007. He maintained this licensure until January
18 31, 2025 when his license expired. Mr. Kavula has not renewed his license and is
19 currently employed full-time with the Clark County Assessor's office.

20 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

21 1. In response to Paragraph 1, Respondent is without knowledge or
22 information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding when
23 the grievance was received by the Division and therefore denies the same. Additionally,
24 to the extent that the Division's allegations purport to recite written documents, the
25 documents are the best evidence and speak for themselves. To the extent the allegations
26 are inconsistent with the documents, those allegations are denied.

27 2. In response to Paragraph 2, Respondent was provided with a copy of the
28 grievance by the Division. The letter from the Division simply included a copy of the

1 grievance and offered Respondent a chance to comment on the accusations made.
2 Respondent was not provided any information as to the nature or direction of the
3 Division's investigation. Respondent denies paragraph 2 to the extent the statements
4 are inconsistent with these points.

5 3. In response to Paragraph 3, Respondent was not provided any
6 information as to the nature or direction of the Division's investigation, but provided a
7 written response to the best of his ability and his work file for the appraisal. Respondent
8 denies paragraph 3 to the extent the statements are inconsistent with these points.

9 4. In response to Paragraph 4, to the extent that the Division's allegations
10 purport to recite written documents, the documents are the best evidence and speak for
11 themselves. To the extent the allegations are inconsistent with the documents, those
12 allegations are denied.

13 5. In response to Paragraph 5, to the extent that the Division's allegations
14 purport to recite written documents, the documents are the best evidence and speak for
15 themselves. To the extent the allegations are inconsistent with the documents, those
16 allegations are denied.

17 6. In response to Paragraph 6, to the extent that the Division's allegations
18 purport to recite written documents, the documents are the best evidence and speak for
19 themselves. To the extent the allegations are inconsistent with the documents, those
20 allegations are denied.

21 7. In response to Paragraph 7, to the extent that the Division's allegations
22 purport to recite written documents, the documents are the best evidence and speak for
23 themselves. To the extent the allegations are inconsistent with the documents, those
24 allegations are denied. This paragraph also contains legal conclusions which are the
25 purview of the Commission. Respondent denies the remaining allegations as pled.

26 8. In response to Paragraph 8, to the extent that the Division's allegations
27 purport to recite written documents, the documents are the best evidence and speak for
28 themselves. To the extent the allegations are inconsistent with the documents, those

1 allegations are denied. This paragraph also contains legal conclusions which are the
2 purview of the Commission. Respondent denies the remaining allegations as pled.

3 9. In response to Paragraph 9, to the extent that the Division's allegations
4 purport to recite written documents, the documents are the best evidence and speak for
5 themselves. To the extent the allegations are inconsistent with the documents, those
6 allegations are denied. This paragraph also contains legal conclusions which are the
7 purview of the Commission. Respondent denies the remaining allegations as pled.

8 10. In response to Paragraph 10, to the extent that the Division's allegations
9 purport to recite written documents, the documents are the best evidence and speak for
10 themselves. To the extent the allegations are inconsistent with the documents, those
11 allegations are denied. This paragraph also contains legal conclusions which are the
12 purview of the Commission. Respondent denies the remaining allegations as pled.

13 11. In response to Paragraph 11, to the extent that the Division's allegations
14 purport to recite written documents, the documents are the best evidence and speak for
15 themselves. To the extent the allegations are inconsistent with the documents, those
16 allegations are denied. This paragraph also contains legal conclusions which are the
17 purview of the Commission. Respondent denies the remaining allegations as pled.

18 12. In response to Paragraph 12, to the extent that the Division's allegations
19 purport to recite written documents, the documents are the best evidence and speak for
20 themselves. To the extent the allegations are inconsistent with the documents, those
21 allegations are denied. Respondent denies the remaining allegations as pled.

22 13. In response to Paragraph 13, to the extent that the Division's allegations
23 purport to recite written documents, the documents are the best evidence and speak for
24 themselves. To the extent the allegations are inconsistent with the documents, those
25 allegations are denied. Respondent denies the remaining allegations as pled.

26 14. In response to Paragraph 14, Respondent is without knowledge or
27 information sufficient to form a belief as to the details related to the Division's conduct
28 and the timing regarding same and therefore denies the same.

15. In response to Paragraph 15, Respondent is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the details related to the Division's conduct and therefore denies the same. Additionally, to the extent that the Division's allegations purport to recite written documents, the documents are the best evidence and speak for themselves. To the extent the allegations are inconsistent with the documents, those allegations are denied. Respondent denies the remaining allegations as pled.

VIOLATIONS OF LAW

In response to the First Violation, Respondent denies the allegations as pled.
In response to the Second Violation, Respondent denies the allegations as pled.
In response to the Third Violation, Respondent denies the allegations as pled.
In response to the Fourth Violation, Respondent denies the allegations as pled.
In response to the Fifth Violation, Respondent denies the allegations as pled.
In response to the Sixth Violation, Respondent denies the allegations as pled.
In response to the Seventh Violation, Respondent denies the allegations as pled.
In response to the Eighth Violation, Respondent denies the allegations as pled.
In response to the Ninth Violation, Respondent denies the allegations as pled.
In response to the Tenth Violation, Respondent denies the allegations as pled.
In response to the Eleventh Violation, Respondent denies the allegations as pled.
In response to the Twelfth Violation, Respondent denies the allegations as pled.
In response to the Thirteenth Violation, Respondent denies the allegations as
pled.

In response to the Fourteenth Violation, Respondent denies the allegations as
pled.

In response to the Fifteenth Violation, Respondent denies the allegations as pled.
In response to the Sixteenth Violation, Respondent denies the allegations as
pled.

DISCIPLINE AUTHORIZED

Respondent denies that he has committed any action which would serve as

1 grounds for any form of discipline, restriction or the imposition of education and fines
2 under the Nevada Revised Statutes or the Nevada Administrative Code. Respondent
3 instead requests that the Commission dismiss this matter in its entirety.

4 To the extent that the Commission disagrees and finds violations were
5 committed, discipline is unnecessary to protect the public as Respondent is no longer a
6 practicing appraiser. Such discipline would be strictly punitive in nature and not within
7 the spirit or intent of the Commission's purpose and mission.

8 To the extent the Commission does consider discipline warranted, we ask that
9 such discipline be mitigated. During the events in question, Mr. Kavula was the
10 caregiver for his father, who was diagnosed with Lewy Body disease. Lewy Body
11 disease is a debilitating illness that destroys the mind and the body at the same time.
12 Mr. Kavula watched his father slowly and painfully lose his mental faculties and his
13 ability to walk, talk or take care of himself in any fashion. Mr. Kavula's father ultimately
14 died from this illness in 2023. His son was with him until the end.

15 We thank the Commission for their time and will welcome the opportunity to be
16 heard and answer any questions they may have for the purposes of rendering a
17 decision in this matter.

18 Dated this 27th day of February, 2025.

19 LIPSON NEILSON P.C.

20
21 By: /s/ Janeen V. Isaacson
22 JANEEN V. ISAACSON (NV Bar No. 6429)
23 9900 Covington Cross Drive, Suite 120
24 Las Vegas, Nevada 89144
25 JIsaacson@lipsonneilson.com

26 *Attorneys for Respondent*
27
28

LIPSON NEILSON P.C.
9900 Covington Cross Drive, Suite 120
Las Vegas, Nevada 89144
(702) 382-1500 FAX: (702) 382-1512

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 27th day of February, 2025, service of the foregoing
**RESPONDENT KEITH T. KAVULA'S RESPONSE TO COMPLAINT AND NOTICE OF
HEARING** was made via electronic mail addressed to the following parties:

Maria Gallo Commission Coordinator Shareece N. Bates Administration Section Manager Nevada Real Estate Division 3300 W. Sahara Avenue, Suite 350 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 mgallo@red.nv.gov sbates@red.nv.gov	Phil W. Su, Esq. Senior Deputy Attorney General 1 State of Nevada Way, Ste. 100 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119 psu@ag.nv.gov <i>Attorneys for Real Estate Division</i>
--	---

/s/ Michele Stones
An Employee of LIPSON NEILSON P.C.