

February 6, 2023

FILED

FEB 07 2023

REAL ESTATE COMMISSION
BY 

Kelly Valadez

Commission Coordinator

Nevada Real Estate Division

3300 W. Sahara Avenue, suite 350

Las Vegas, Nevada 89102

RE: NRED vs. Ahmad Sharif-Yazdi

Dear Ms. Kelly Valadez

I am in receipt of the package you mailed on 01/10/2023 regarding Notice of Hearing. Per your instructions I will answer to each allegation and any defenses that I rely on.

I would like to start by stating that NRED does a great job policing the Real Estate industry. If it was not for this office, there would be "purge" the movie every day. Being a Property Manager most of my time is spent resolving complaints from my owners and tenants. It is very stressful to keep everybody following rules and happy at all the times. Some unhappy folks of course contact NRED with a complaint. Mr. Holle and his staff have the monumental task of sorting out complaints from all of Nevada. Mr. Holle and his investigators have resolved the complaints against me in a great manner in the past.

The events of this complaint mostly happened in the peak of the Covid Crisis about May to June of 2020. There was added stress for everyone. I do not blame his office for interpreting my answers the wrong way. I blame it on the Covid stress. In this case the Investigator read my communications the wrong way. It was an honest mistake anyone can do. It lead to a set of wrong assumptions and sent her investigation on the wrong course. Mr. Holle's office did not suppress my evidence and they did not deliberately attempt to mislead anyone. However, they created a new "Alternate Reality". Their subsequent reviews failed to catch the wrong assumptions. I really do not believe that they changed the facts on purpose. If I disagree with their Case Analysis and conclusions, in no way it is meant to disrespect anyone. They simply made a few small unintentional assumptions and failed to revise them.

I believe the District Attorney Office prepared the 312 pages report sent to me along with "The Factual Allegations". Many of the 312 pages are duplicates. But my communications with NRED have been chopped off and only partially presented. I sent over 190 pictures. Only one picture has been included (page 309). The Complainant sent many irrelevant pictures. Those pictures are prominently included twice (pages 63-81 and 292-298).

My answers to the "Factual Allegations"

1-Correct. No defense

2-Correct. Footnote 1 attempts to be misleading and states: Compensation, based, "in part", on gross rent..... My compensation is based "only" on collected rents and there are no other "parts". I am entitled to 7% of the collected Rent "only". I do not get any commissions or fees from "sewer and trash fees" or repair related charges. I want it to be clear that I do not get any fees from the Security Deposit Charges. I want it to be clear that the vendors do not pay me any portion of their invoices. I just want to avoid "footnote 1" sowing any seeds of doubt. If I withhold the tenant's security deposit, I do not get any compensation.

3-Correct. No defense.

4-Can Be correct but can be misleading. The rent is \$1,795. Sewer and Trash Fee is \$40 per month (no compensation to me). The Lease shows the break down. Again, I do not want "Footnote 1" to be misinterpreted.

5-Correct. No defense.

6-Correct. No defense.

7-Correct. I also collected \$100 key deposit. The tenant had agreed to pay "Additional Security Deposit" of \$1,800 due to their horrible credit history. The tenant intentionally lied to me just to move into the house. She made up a bunch of excuses and never paid the extra deposit. I had to forget about it. Based on my experience in eviction courts, judges do not allow eviction for non-payment of additional deposits. The tenant lied many times during her tenancy and during her move out. She violated the lease many times.

8-False. I refunded \$836 from the "Security Deposit" and the "Key Deposit".

9-Correct. No defense.

10-Correct. No Defense.

11-False. I did send the tenant proper documentation. The tenant lied about the condition of property when she moved out. Her pictures (Pages 63-81 and 292-298) were grossly misleading. I reviewed her claims vs what I documented. I had charged her nominal amounts for the damages and charges based on what the lease allowed me. In my judgment the tenant was not entitled to any additional refunds. My duties do not include arguing with tenants when they lie. It is a waste of time. During my last phone conversation with the tenant, I told her to go to small claim courts and file a complaint, since you disagree with me. The court can sort out the truth and the lies.

12-Correct and it can be misleading at the same time. The Lease is the standard Realtor Association of Nevada Lease. It is obvious this Allegation fails to mention: the Lease allows many other charges,

specifically the \$60 tenant copay for minor repairs. The tenants had a chance to review the lease before moving in. Tenants agreed to all charges when they signed it.

13-False. It is grossly misleading. The Lease is "Black and White with no Shades of Grey". The allegation is using a huge wide brush and painting the Lease with Grey. Per this claim, all repairs can be interpreted as normal wear and tear. The only thing needed is a bigger brush, then every repair is normal wear and tear. NRED was presented with clear evidence in black and white with no misleading shades of grey. I will bring more supporting exhibits. I supplied proper documents for the Refrigerator repair, the air filters and filter vent clips. The evidence has been deliberately ignored. My explanation for the garage door sensor has been ignored as well.

14-False. My pictures were deliberately suppressed so the District Attorney's Office make such ridiculous allegation. Foot note 3 talks about my pictures but in a misleading way. I would like the District Attorney's Office to provide the Commissioners and I only one court case that any Judge ruled landscaping is normal wear and tear. Footnote 4 contradicts footnote 3!!!. Suppressing evidence and making over exaggerated bogus claims is a shameless effort to mislead the Commissioners. It is not expected from any District Attorney's Office in the United States of America.

15-Correct. NRED's January 7, 2021 letter included the Exhibit A (pages 260, 272, 278 and 285). It is supposed to be specific. But it claimed charges must be paid by previous tenant/ or owner. Charges to previous tenant was an odd conclusion. On February 6, 2021 (pages 267-268) I asked for more specific charges. I explained the events one more time. I included my former explanations too. On February 11, 2022 the letter (page 264) informed me the charges in question were for example the fridge repair, the AC maintenance and camera door bell.

Violations:

The investigator's case analysis (261-263) is based on unintentional errors when reading my communications. Further, misinterpretations have taken it totally off course. It leads to wrong conclusions and wrong recommendation. The "Factual Allegations" however deliberately creates misinformation and attempts to be misleading. I rely on the Real Estate Commissioners as fresh new sets of eyes to look at my "ENTIRE" evidence.

Since 07/01/2020 I have come in receipt of more evidence supporting my case. Based on the General Information about the Hearing Procedure I am allowed to submit Copies of my Exhibits no later than 5 working days before the hearing. I will organize the Exhibits and deliver to your office on or before February 9, 2023.

Sincerely,



Ahmad Sharif Yazdi

88 Realty

B.0001241.LLC

PM.0163168.BKR