1 2 3 SH RI 4 OI ST 5 6 7 PA

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

## BEFORE THE REAL ESTATE COMMISSION

#### STATE OF NEVADA

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

Petitioner,

VS.

PAUL M. WYNN,

Respondent.

Case No. 2019-1122

F11130

SEP 0 5 2023

REAL ESTATE COMMISSION

BY Kelly Valader

# ORDER ON RESPONDENT PAUL M. WYNN'S SECOND 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 August 22, 2023 (the "Hearing"). RESPONDENT Paul M. Wynn ("RESPONDENT") appeared at the Hearing. Phil W. Su, Esq., Senior 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 SECOND PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION (the "Petition") and for good cause appearing, the Commission now enters its Order for 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 May 1, 2023, RESPONDENT submitted his Petition, by way of correspondence to the Commission.
- 2. In his Petition, RESPONDENT requested 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").

2 3

On May 1, 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

4

August 22, 2023. 4.

3.

5 6

monthly payment plan relative to his fines payable to the Division.

7

5. At the Hearing, RESPONDENT provided good cause for the granting of a payment plan.

8

6. Accordingly, the Commission and RESPONDENT agreed upon a monthly payment plan of three hundred dollars (\$ 300.00) relative to RESPONDENT's fines payable to the Division.

9 10

**CONCLUSIONS OF LAW** 

On August 22, 2023, RESPONDENT appeared before the Commission and requested a

11 12

& Tile Contractors Ass'n. of So. Nev. v. Jolley, Urga & Wirth, Ltd., 113 Nev. 737, 741, 941 P.2d 486,

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

1. A motion for reconsideration should only be granted in rare circumstances. See Mansory 489 (1997).

2. Here, considering RESPONDENT's arguments as to the granting of payment plan relative to RESPONDENT's fines payable to the Division pursuant to the Original Order, the Commission determined that good cause existed for the same and a three hundred dollar (\$ 300.00) monthly payment plan would be entirely proper.

3. This was a specific modification of the Commission's Original Order that RESPONDENT specifically had accepted at the Hearing.

### ORDER

- 1. RESPONDENT's Petition is granted.
- 2. RESPONDENT is granted his request for a three hundred dollar (\$ 300.00) per month payment plan, relative to RESPONDENT's fines payable to the Division, contained in the Original Order (the "Payment Plan").
- 3. Under the Payment Plan, the first payment shall be due upon receipt of this Order, with each additional payment due on the first day of each month thereafter, until paid in full.
- 4. The Commission retains jurisdiction for correcting any errors that may have occurred in the drafting and issuance of this document.

DigiSign Verified - 54cbb368-8cee-46f4-bac7-a8821622ca44