	-		
1	BEFORE THE REAL ESTATE COMMISSION		
2	STATE OF NEVADA		
3	SHARATH CHANDRA, Administrator,		
4	REAL ESTATE DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS & INDUSTRY,	Case No. 2018-161	
5	STATE OF NEVADA,	FILED	
6	Petitioner,	MAR 3 1 2020	
7	vs.	REAL ESTATE COMMISSION	
8	FREDERICK BRITTON,	BY Evely Tattle	
9	Respondent.		
10	FINDINGS OF FACT,		
11	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER		
12	This matter came on for hearing before the Real Estate Commission, Department of Business		
13	and Industry, State of Nevada (the "Commission"), during a regular agenda on March 10, 2020, at the		
	at the Grant Sawyer Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Room 4401, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101		
14	(the "Hearing"). RESPONDENT FREDERICK BRITTON (hereinafter, "RESPONDENT" or		
15	"BRITTON") did not appear. Karissa D. Neff, Esq., Deputy Attorney General with the Nevada		
16	Attorney General's Office, appeared on behalf of the Real Estate Division of the Department of		
17	Business and Industry, State of Nevada (the "Divi		
18	Ms. Neff advised the Commission that RESPONDENT had contacted her prior to the Hearing		
19		equest the continuance from the Division in writing.	
20	Evelyn Pattee testified regarding notice se	ent to the RESPONDENT. The Commission found	
21	appropriate service of the notice of the Hearing w	as made.	
22	RESPONDENT did not properly request a	continuance of the Hearing from the Division.	
23	After hearing testimony presented in this matter and for good cause appearing, the Commission		
24	now enters its Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order by default against RESPONDENT as		
25	follows:		
26	///		
27	111		
28	///		

-

1

\$

1		FINDINGS OF FACT	
2	The Co	mmission, by unanimous vote, based upon evidence presented during the Hearing, enters	
3	a finding of the	following facts by default:	
4	1	. RESPONDENT has been licensed as a salesperson under license number S.0175080	
5	since July 3, 20	014, said license currently being on inactive status.	
6	2.	On or around January 30, 2018, Wendell E. Thomas ("Complainant") filed a complaint	
7	with the Divis	ion alleging that on or around January 22, 2018, RESPONDENT agreed to represent him	
8	in the purchase of a residential property.		
9	3.	RESPONDENT sent Complainant a total of four property listings.	
10	4.	On or around January 24, 2018, RESPONDENT contacted Complainant and requested	
11	that Complainant provide him with a cashier's check in the amount of \$1,250 dollars to be used as an		
12	earnest money deposit in the event Complainant desired to purchase any of the properties.		
13	5.	That same day Complainant met RESPONDENT at a credit union.	
14	6.	RESPONDENT directed Complainant to have the credit union issue the cashier's checks	
15	made payable to GGGH&P LLC, a Nevada limited liability company ("GGGH&P).		
16	7.	RESPONDENT had the credit union issue one cashier's check in the amount of \$1,000	
17	dollars and one in the amount of \$250 dollars (collectively, the "Cashiers Checks"), both payable to		
18	GGGH&P.		
19	8.	RESPONDENT was a manager of GGGH&P.	
20	9.	On January 25, 2018, Complainant met RESPONDENT at the address of one of the four	
21	property listi	property listings RESPONDENT provided to him- 1300 Arlington Street, Las Vegas, NV 89104	
22	("Arlington F	("Arlington Property").	
23	10.	Complainant asked RESPONDENT to make an offer on the Arlington Property.	
24	11.	RESPONDENT informed Complainant that he would prepare the paperwork to submit	
25	Complainant	Complainants's offer on the Arlington Property and would email the offer to Complainant for his	
26	signature.		
27	12.	Later that week Complainant contacted RESPONDENT regarding the status of the offer	
28	on the Arling	on the Arlington Property and also asked RESPONDENT if he could view another property.	

.

\$

Despite repeated attempts at contacting RESPONDENT, Complainant never heard back 2 14. 3 from RESPONDENT. In the meantime, Complainant informed his loan officer that he had given the Cashiers 4 15. 5 Checks to RESPONDENT and that RESPONDENT had failed to return his calls regarding whether an 6 offer had been made on the Arlington Property. The loan officer advised Complainant to contact the bank to determine if the Cashier's 7 16. 8 Checks were cashed. The bank informed Complainant that the Cashier's Checks made payable to GGGH&P 9 17. had been cashed and that GGGH&P belonged to RESPONDENT. 10 On or around February 2, 2018, the Division properly gave notice to RESPONDENT that 11 18. it had opened an investigation regarding Complainant's complaint with the Division and requested 12 13 responses from RESPONDENT and RESPONDENT's broker. In response to the Division's letter, RESPONDENT claimed that the Cashier's Checks he 14 19. cashed and kept from Complainant were not for an earnest money deposit in connection with Claimant's 15 16 purchase of residential real estate. Rather, RESPONDENT claimed that the Cashier's Checks were to pay RESPONDENT 17 20. for the sale of Vietnamese currency called Dong to Complainant. 18 RESPONDENT's broker, Jaime A. Velez ("Velez"), also responded to the Division's 19 21. 20 February 2, 2018 letter. In Velez's response to the Division, Velez claimed that the Division's investigation 21 22 22 involved RESPONDENT's prior broker- not Velez. In his response to the Division, Velez also stated that on or around January 30, 2018, he 23 23. received a text from AmeriFirst Financial ("AmeriFirst") depicting the events that had transpired as 24 25 alleged in Complainant's complaint with the Division. Velez advised AmeriFirst that Complainant should file a formal complaint with the 26 24. Division. 27 28 Page 3 of 5

RESPONDENT texted Complainant that he had been in a class and would call him back.

13.

1

1 25 In his response to the Division, Velez also stated that because the Greater Las Vegas Real 2 Estate Association had advised Velez that RESPONDENT had failed to pay his dues (which Velez stated 3 RESPONDENT always had difficulty doing), and after communicating with AmeriFirst, Velez sent 4 **RESPONDENT's** license to the Division. 5 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW 6 Based on the foregoing findings of fact by default, the Commission concludes by unanimous 7 vote that RESPONDENT has committed the following violations of law by default: 8 26. RESPONDENT violated NRS 645.633(1)(i) by engaging in deceitful, fraudulent or 9 dishonest dealings by misleading Complainant into issuing the Cashier's Checks to RESPONDENT's 10 personal business entity, claiming that they were to be used as an earnest money deposit in connection 11 with Complainant's purchase of a residential property. RESPONDENT then kept the money, despite not making any offer on any residential property on Complainant's behalf or entering into any purchase 12 13 agreement on Complainant's behalf. 14 ORDER 15 The Commission, being fully apprised in the premises, and good cause appearing to the 16 Commission, by unanimous vote, ORDERS as follows: 17 1. RESPONDENT shall pay the Division's costs in the amount \$1,111.80 ("Amount Due"). 18 The Amount Due shall be payable to the Division within 30 days of the effective date of this Order. 19 2. RESPONDENT's salesperson license (license number S.0175080) is hereby revoked. 3. The Division may institute debt collection proceedings for failure to timely pay the Amount 20 Due, including action to reduce this Order to a judgment. Further, if collection goes through the State of 21 Nevada. 22 then RESPONDENT shall also pay the costs associated with collection. 23 111 24 25 111 26 111 27 111 28

4. The Commission retains jurisdiction for correcting any errors that may have occurred in the drafting and issuance of this document. 5. This Order shall become effective on the 30^{th} day of April 2020. DATED this 31 st day of March, 2020. REAL ESTATE COMMISSION STATE OF NEVADA By President, Nevada Real Estate Commission Submitted by: AARON D. FORD Attorney General By Karissa D. Neff, Esq. Deputy Attorney General 555 E. Washington Avenue, Suite 3900 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 486-3894 Attorneys for Nevada Real Estate Division Page 5 of 5