BEFORE THE REAL ESTATE COMMISSION 1 STATE OF NEVADA 2 3

SHARATH CHANDRA, Administrator, REAL ESTATE DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS & INDUSTRY, STATE OF NEVADA.

Petitioner,

Respondent.

VS.

PAUL M. WYNN,

8 9

4

5

6

7

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

27

26

28

Case No. 2019-1122

MAR 1 3 2023

REAL ESTATE COMMISSION

ORDER ON RESPONDENT PAUL M. WYNN'S PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION

This matter came on for hearing before the Real Estate Commission, Department of Business and Industry, State of Nevada (the "Commission"), during a regular agenda set for a three-day stack commencing on February 21, 2023 (the "Hearing"). RESPONDENT Paul M. Wynn ("RESPONDENT") appeared at the Hearing. Louis V. Csoka, Esq., Deputy Attorney General with the Nevada Attorney General's Office, appeared on behalf of the Real Estate Division of the Department of Business and Industry, State of Nevada (the "Division"). After argument on RESPONDENT PAUL M. WYNN'S PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION (the "Petition") and for good cause appearing, the Commission now enters its Order against RESPONDENT as follows:

JURISDICTION

RESPONDENT, at all relevant times mentioned in the associated Complaint, held a Broker/Salesperson license number BS. 0143587, and is, therefore, subject to the jurisdiction of the Division and the Commission, and the provisions of NRS chapter 645 and NAC chapter 645.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

- 1. On January 11, 2023, RESPONDENT submitted his Petition, by way of correspondence to the Commission.
- 2. In his Petition, RESPONDENT only requested: (A) a reconsideration of the due date; and (B) the granting of a payment plan, relative to RESPONDENT's fines payable to the Division, as set forth in the Commission's Order, dated October 5, 2022 (the "Original Order").

- 3. On January 12, 2023, the Commission staff accepted the Petition and scheduled the same for consideration before the Commission, during a regular agenda set for a three-day stack commencing on February 21, 2023.
- 4. On February 21, 2023, RESPONDENT appeared before the Commission and opted to further reargue the specific merits of the Commission's Original Order, instead of focusing on the narrow and specific requests contained in his Petition.
- 5. Counsel for Division pointed out that RESPONDENT failed to raise any new facts, any new laws, or any other reasons that would require a reconsideration of the Commission's Original Order.
- 6. Counsel for Division further noted that the Division takes no position as to any payment plan.
- 7. Having focused his entire efforts on challenging and overturning the Commission's Original Order, RESPONDENT did not ultimately make any workable specific proposals relative to how any payment plan might actually work.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. A motion for reconsideration should only be granted in rare circumstances. See Mansory & Tile Contractors Ass'n. of So. Nev. v. Jolley, Urga & Wirth, Ltd., 113 Nev. 737, 741, 941 P.2d 486, 489 (1997). Specifically, a court may reconsider its prior decision, only if the request is supported by new law or evidence, or when the underlying decision is clearly erroneous. Id. (citations omitted); see also Hsu v. County of Clark, 123 Nev. 625, 631-632 (2007) (stating that "[a]bsent . . . extraordinary circumstances," a court "should . . . loathe" to revisit its prior decisions.") (emphasis added).
- 2. Given that RESPONDENT failed to raise any new facts, any new laws, or any other reasons that would require a reconsideration of the Commission's Original Order, the Petition is denied.
- RESPONDENT could still refile his Petition, specifically limited to his original narrower request for a payment plan, relative to RESPONDENT's fines payable to the Division, contained in the Original Order.

ORDER

- 1. RESPONDENT's Petition is denied.
- 2. RESPONDENT may still seek a payment plan before the Commission through an

	}
1	appropriate filing in the future.
2	2. The Commission retains jurisdiction for correcting any errors that may have occurred in
3	the drafting and issuance of this document.
4	3. This Order shall become effective on the 13th day of Mar, 2023.
5	DATED this 13th day of March, 2023.
6	
7	REAL ESTATE COMMISSION STATE OF NEVADA
8	
9	By: Spiridon Filios President, Nevada Real Estate Commission
10	President, Nevada Real Estate Commission
11	Submitted by:
12	AARON D. FORD Attorney General
13	Attorney General
14	By: /s/ Louis V. Csoka
15	Louis V. Csoka, Esq.
16	Senior Deputy Attorney General
17	555 E. Washington Avenue, Suite 3900 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
18	(702) 486-3894 Attorneys for Nevada Real Estate Division
19	Tritorine ye for the hada read Solute Sith Stori
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	