BEFORE THE REAL ESTATE COMMISSION STATE OF NEVADA

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

Case No. 2020-401

Petitioner,

STIPULATION AND ORDER FOR SETTLEMENT OF DISCIPLINARY ACTION

vs.

RONALD M. POWELL,

Respondent.

This Stipulation for Settlement of Disciplinary Action ("Stipulation") is entered into by and between the State of Nevada, Department of Business and Industry, Real Estate Division ("Division"), through its Administrator Sharath Chandra ("Petitioner"), by and through their attorney of record, Louis V. Csoka, Senior Deputy Attorney General, and Ronald M. Powell ("RESPONDENT"), by and through his attorney of record, Steven Mack with the law firm of Gibbs, Giden, Locher, Turner, Senet & Widtbrott, LLP.

RESPONDENT, at all relevant times mentioned in this Complaint, held himself out and acted as a person licensed under NRS Chapter 645, including being previously licensed as an Appraiser under license number A.0206349-CR, and is, therefore, subject to the jurisdiction of the Division and the Commission and the provisions of NRS chapter 645 and NAC chapter 645.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS SET FORTH IN COMPLAINT

1. RESPONDENT, along with Paul M. Wynn ("WYNN"), who is a named "respondent" in a related Complaint before this Commission (Case No. 2019-1122), devised a purported real property assignment scheme whereby they have, in effect, acted as "marketing intermediaries" between an actual bona fide buyer and an actual bona fide seller, pocketing a windfall in a matter of days from their roles as such intermediaries and selling a substantially defective residential property in that process without the requisite disclosures of its defects or of the true nature of the transaction.

- 2. Since February 3, 2017, Joy Haines ("Seller") was the owner of the real property located at 6255 Bryce Canyon Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada 89156 (the "Property").
 - 3. Sometime thereafter, Seller marketed the Property as a "For Sale By Owner."
- 4. On or about July 8, 2017, Seller executed as Residential Purchase Agreement for the Property (the "Purported Purchase Agreement") with RKA Investment Properties, LLC ("RKA") for the total purchase price of \$ 45,000.00 (the "Purchase Price").
- At all relevant times, RESPONDENT owned and controlled RKA as its managing member.¹
- 6. On or about July 13, 2017, RKA assigned its rights under the Purported Purchase Agreement to Desert Acquisitions, LLC ("Desert") for an "assignment fee" of \$ 14,000.00 (which, shortly thereafter, 2 was reduced to \$ 13,000.00) (the "First Assignment").
- 7. At all relevant times, WYNN owned and controlled Desert³ as its managing member.
- 8. On or about July 14, 2017, Desert assigned its rights under the Purported Purchase Agreement to Daniel Leon ("Complainant" or the "Buyer") for an "assignment fee" of \$ 17,000.00 (the "Second Assignment" or the "Actual Bona Fide Sale of the Property").
- 9. Unlike WYNN or the RESPONDENT, the Buyer intended to complete and did complete the purchase and sale of the Property, by going through the requisite escrow and recordation process, wherein the Property was ultimately recorded in Buyer's name.
- 10. Therefore, as a practical matter, it took only about six (6) days, following the execution of the Purported Purchase Agreement, that the Actual Bona Fide Sale of the Property had then occurred.
- 11. However, to now complete his purchase of the Property, the Buyer had to pay\$ 75,000.00 as follows:

¹ Since these events, RESPONDENT has sold RKA.

² On or about August 1, 2017.

³ An affiliate/franchisee of HomeVestors.

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

28

- (1) the Purchase Price of \$ 45,000.00 to the Seller for the Property, pursuant to the Purported Purchase Agreement;
- (2)RKA's assignment fee of \$ 13,000.00 to RKA, under the First Assignment; and
 - Desert's assignment fee of \$ 17,000.00 to Desert, under the Second Assignment.
- 12. In short, in less than one week, RESPONDENT and WYNN, through RKA and Desert, have "arbitraged" \$ 30,000.00 in "assignment fees" from a property that RESPONDENT and WYNN did not plan to own whatsoever but had instead planned to market and sell, while the Seller still remained the title owner of the Property.
- 13 Once Seller understood the true nature of the transaction, she exclaimed "I got screwed!" by RESPONDENT and that she was not aware of any assignments whatsoever.
- 14. Once Buyer/Complainant understood the true nature of the transactions, he explained that WYNN and his agents did not disclose or explain to Buyer that the Property was not marketed and sold for \$75,000.00, but that Buyer, in substantial part, would be paying for RKA's and Desert's "assignment fees" instead.
- 15. Even more importantly, RESPONDENT, as well as WYNN and his agents,4 failed to disclose the defect with the Property, specifically, that there was no proper title to the mobile home on the Property, as the Mobile Home had not been legally affixed to the Property.
- 16. Indeed, RESPONDENT and WYNN knew that the improperly affixed mobile home would present a problem during the escrow process, whereby WYNN requested of the Title Company⁵ that (1) the Title Company process reflect the land value at \$45,000.000 and the mobile home value at \$0.00, and (2) the transfer of that mobile home should only occur outside the Title Company's escrow process.

⁴ Pedro Gongola and Jeff Lysen assisted WYNN on the transaction.

⁵ Ticor Title Company.

17. In sharp contrast to their careful and planned statements to the Title Company, WYNN and his agents specifically represented to Buyer that he was purchasing both the mobile home and the land with marketable title.

VIOLATIONS OF LAW ALLEGED IN THE COMPLAINT

1. RESPONDENT violated NRS 645.230(a) as he acted as a real estate Broker/Salesperson without an appropriate license when he entered into the assignment scheme with Wynn to sell, and received compensation for his role in the sale of, the substantially defective Property.

SETTLEMENT

By entering into this settlement agreement, the RESPONDENT neither admits nor denies the allegations above. In an effort to avoid the time and expense of litigating these issues before the Commission, the parties desire to compromise and settle the instant controversy upon the following terms and conditions:

- 1. It is the intent of the parties that, to all reasonable extent, RESPONDENT assist Complainant in obtaining a marketable title to the motor home currently affixed to the Property (the "Motor Home Titling Process"), and as to the same:
- A. RESPONDENT had already cooperated in the Motor Home Titling Process, with the Division and Complainant; and
- B. RESPONDENT further agrees to continue to cooperate in the Motor Home Titling Process in the same manner, if any further administrative requirements or costs may still arise as to the same, provided that RESPONDENT:
- (i) would have been required to do so had RESPONDENT acted as a direct real property seller of the Property to Complainant, as of the time of the Second Assignment, and
- (ii) expressly committed to provide Complainant with a marketable title to the motor home affixed to the Property, at that time.

By way of example, but without any limitations on any of the foregoing, costs, fees, and taxes that are normally allocated to time periods after the Second Assignment (i.e.,

past July 14, 2017) are not, as they would not have been, RESPONDENT's responsibility under this Stipulation.

Further, it is the intent of the parties hereto that no other party, including Complainant, may claim to be third party beneficiary under this Stipulation nor have any standing whatsoever to bring suit hereunder. Without any limitations on Section 10 of this Stipulation, the Division may not utilize the associated Complaint or the factual allegations therein against RESPONDENT in any future proceedings brought by the Division.

- 2. In specific reliance on RESPONDENT's stated commitments to Complainant's Motor Home Titling Process, in Sections 1(A) and 1(B) of this Stipulation above, the Division shall not require RESPONDENT to pay any (1) fines, (2) pre-hearing costs, or (3) attorneys' fees that would otherwise be payable to the Division.
- 3. RESPONDENT and the Division agree that by entering this Stipulation, the Division does not concede any defense or mitigation RESPONDENT may assert and that once this Stipulation is approved and fully performed, the Division will close its file in this matter.
- 4. RESPONDENT agrees and understands that by entering into this Stipulation, RESPONDENT is waiving her right to a hearing at which RESPONDENT may present evidence in her defense, her right to a written decision on the merits of the complaint, her rights to reconsideration and/or rehearing, appeal and/or judicial review, and all other rights which may be accorded by the Nevada Administrative Procedure Act, the Nevada Real Estate Brokers and Salespersons statutes and accompanying regulations, and the federal and state Constitutions. RESPONDENT understands that this Agreement and other documentation may be subject to public records laws. The Commission members who review this matter for approval of this Stipulation may be the same members who ultimately hear, consider, and decide the Complaint if this Stipulation is either not approved by the Commission or is not timely performed by RESPONDENT. RESPONDENT fully understands that she has the right to be represented by legal counsel in this matter at her own expense.

3 4

5 6

7 8

9 10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20

2122

23

24 25

26

- 5. Each party shall bear their own attorney's fees and costs, except as provided above.
- 6. Approval of Stipulation. Once executed, this Stipulation will be filed with the Commission and will be placed on the agenda for approval at its next public meeting. The Division will recommend to the Commission approval of the Stipulation. RESPONDENT agrees that the Commission may approve, reject, or suggest amendments to this Stipulation that must be accepted or rejected by RESPONDENT before any amendment is effective.
- 7. Withdrawal of Stipulation. If the Commission rejects this Stipulation or suggests amendments unacceptable to RESPONDENT, RESPONDENT may withdraw from this Stipulation, and the Division may pursue its Complaint before the Commission. This Stipulation then shall become null and void and unenforceable in any manner against either party.
- 8. Release. In consideration of the execution of this Stipulation, RESPONDENT for herself, her heirs, executors, administrators, successors, and assigns, hereby releases, remises, and forever discharges the State of Nevada, the Department of Business and Industry, and the Division, and each of their respective members, agents, employees, and counsel in their individual and representative capacities, from any and all manner of actions, causes of action, suits, debts, judgments, executions, claims, and demands whatsoever, known and unknown, in law or equity, that RESPONDENT ever had, now has, may have, or claim to have against any or all of the persons or entities named in this section, arising out of or by reason of the Division's investigation, this disciplinary action, and all other matters relating thereto.
- 9. Indemnification. RESPONDENT hereby agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the State of Nevada, the Department of Business and Industry, Petitioner, the Division, and each of their respective members, agents, employees, and counsel, in their individual and representative capacities, against any and all claims, suits, and actions brought against said persons and/or entities by reason of the Division's investigation, this

1	disciplinary action, and all other matters relati	ng thereto, and against any and all
2	expenses, damages, and costs, including court co	sts and attorney fees, which may be
3	sustained by the persons and/or entities named in this section as a result of said claims,	
4	suits, and actions.	
5	10. <u>Default</u> . In the event of default under this Stipulation, RESPONDENT	
6	agrees that Section 2 of this Stipulation may be set aside and the Division may assess	
7	RESPONDENT all of the Division's fines, costs, and fees that would have been required to	
8	be paid, in the event of a full conviction in this matter.	
9	11. RESPONDENT has signed and dated this Stipulation only after reading and	
10	understanding all terms herein.	
11	DATED this day of September, 2023 DATE	D this 27 day of September, 2023
12	2	
13		DADA DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS DUSTRY REAL ESTATE DIVISION
14	4	JOSIA WARALESTATE DIVISION
15	by.	Mences
16	RONALD M. POWELL An individual	SHARATH CHANDRA Administrator
17	APPROVED AS TO FORM:	
18	I ATODA ATOSE SA SISSE	ON D. FORD
19	9 SENET & WIDTBROTT, LLP Attorn	ney General
20		Louis V. Csoka
21		Louis V. Caopen
22	Senior Councel	V. Csoka (Bar. No. 7667)
23	7251 W. Lake Mead Blvd., Suite 450 555 E	r Deputy Attorney General . Washington Avenue, Suite 3900
24	Attorneys for Respondent Attorn	egas, NV 89101 neys for Real Estate Division
25	5	
26		
27	7	

ORDER IT IS ORDERED that the foregoing Stipulation and Order for Settlement of

Disciplinary Action, submitted by Petitioner and Respondent, is approved in full.

Dated: November ____, 2023.

REAL ESTATE COMMISSION STATE OF NEVADA

By: President, Nevada Real Estate Commission

Submitted by:

AARON FORD, Attorney General

13 By:

/s/ Louis V. Csoka

Louis V. Csoka (7667)
Senior Deputy Attorney General
555 E. Washington Ave. Ste 3900
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Attorneys for Real Estate Division