

1 **BEFORE THE COMMISSION OF APPRAISERS OF REAL ESTATE**
2 **STATE OF NEVADA**

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

7 Petitioner,

8 vs.

9 GLENN J. HOWARD
10 (License No. A.0007090-RES -
11 SUSPENDED),

12 Respondent.

Case No. 2024-645

FILED

FEB 12 2026

NEVADA COMMISSION OF APPRAISERS

mgallo

13 **FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER**

14 This matter came on for hearing before the COMMISSION OF APPRAISERS OF
15 REAL ESTATE OF THE STATE OF NEVADA (the "Commission") on Tuesday, January
16 13, 2026, (the "Hearing"). RESPONDENT GLENN J. HOWARD ("RESPONDENT") did
17 not appear in person, through counsel, or otherwise. Phil W. Su, Senior Deputy Attorney
18 General, appeared on behalf of Petitioners SHARATH CHANDRA, Administrator, REAL
19 ESTATE DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS & INDUSTRY, STATE OF
20 NEVADA ("Division").

21 Mr. Su, on behalf of the Division, advised the Commission of the nature of the
22 violations contained within the formal complaint and that the RESPONDENT did not
23 provide an answer to the properly filed Complaint. Mr. Su also explained that Notice of
24 Default had been filed on January 5, 2026, and mailed to RESPONDENT, thereby placing
25 RESPONDENT on notice that the Division would be seeking default against him. Mr. Su
26 further advised the Commission of RESPONDENT'S prior disciplinary history, as set
27 forth in the Complaint, and that his license is presently in suspended status.

28 Thereafter, the Division proceeded with a presentation of evidence pursuant to
NAC 645C.500(13), that the respondent received notice of the hearing and has not filed

1 an answer within the time prescribed pursuant to NRS 645C.510. The Division's
2 Commission Coordinator, Maria Gallo, testified regarding proper service via certified mail
3 to the RESPONDENT, and the costs and fees incurred by the Division.

4 After further discussion, the Commission determined that the Division issued
5 effective notice of the hearing, the Complaint and notice thereof, and took all efforts
6 required by law to inform the RESPONDENT of the matter before the Commission.
7 Therefore, the Commission, having considered the evidence introduced by the Division
8 and being fully advised, enters the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and
9 Order:

10 JURISDICTION

11 At all times relevant to this Complaint, the Respondent was a Residential
12 Appraiser licensed by the Division, and therefore, is subject to the Jurisdiction of the
13 Division and the provisions of NRS and NAC Chapter 645C. By availing himself of the
14 benefits and protections of the laws of the State of Nevada, the Respondent has submitted
15 to the jurisdiction of the Division.

16 PROCEDURAL HISTORY

17 1. On or about July 9, 2024, the Division received a complaint alleging the
18 Respondent committed misrepresentations, numerous errors, and extraordinary opinions
19 of value, in the two appraisal reports prepared October 12, 2020, and July 9, 2022, on the
20 same Subject Property 9739 Fox Estate Street, Las Vegas, Nevada 89141 ("Complaint").

21 2. The Division could not commission a Standard 3 Review of the underlying
22 appraisal performed by the Respondent to determine if compliance with the Uniform
23 Standard of Professional Appraisal Practice ("USPAP") exists within the subject report
24 because Respondent failed to supply a work file.

25 3. From 2019 to 2024, Respondent has a total of seven cases on file, including
26 this case – 2019-585; 2019-751; 2020-576; 2020-623; 2021-607; 2021-675; 2024-645 -
27 whereby, the Respondent proceeded to commission on all previous cases, and currently
28 has a suspended license for failure to pay administrative fines in the amount of

1 \$25,803.52.

2 4. Given the numerous prior disciplines and current suspended license, the
3 Division determined this matter should be heard by the Nevada Commission of
4 Appraisers of Real Estate ("Commission").

5 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

6 1. On or about August 15, 2024, the Division opened its investigation against
7 the Respondent, requesting the entire work file, and any supporting documentation on or
8 before October 9, 2024.

9 2. The Respondent failed to respond by the due date, therefore, on or about
10 January 16, 2025, the Division, as a courtesy, provided an extension to respond by
11 January 31, 2025.

12 3. On May 23, 2025, the Respondent untimely submitted his rebuttal to the
13 Division but failed to include his work file and any supporting documentation.

14 4. On May 23, 2025, the Division, as a courtesy, provided the Respondent with
15 yet another extension to May 30, 2025, to provide the documentation and work file.

16 5. As of August 8, 2025, the Division had yet to receive any documents or work
17 file from the Respondent.

18 **VIOLATIONS OF LAW**

19 **First Violation**

20 The Respondent's actions constitute unprofessional conduct pursuant to NRS
21 645C.480 for failing to produce his work file and any documents after being requested to
22 do so numerous times by the Division as part of its investigation of a complaint.

23 **ORDER (2024-645)**

24 The Commission, being fully apprised of the premises and good cause appearing,
25 hereby **ORDERS:**

- 26 1. RESPONDENT shall pay to the Division a total of Fourteen Thousand Nine
27 Hundred Sixty-Eight Dollars and 59/100 cents (\$14,968.59), consisting of
28 \$10,000.00 in administrative fines and fees and costs in the amount of

