BEFORE THE REAL ESTATE COMMISSION STATE OF NEVADA

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

Petitioner,

VS.

JAMES SHARKEY, (S.0195534 – REVOKED, BUSB.0007200 – REVOKED, B – DENIED, PROV.0001300-TSA – CLOSED, TS.3007674-AGEN – CLOSED, TS.3012578-REP – CLOSED, TS.3017714-REP - CLOSED),

Respondent.

Case No. 2024-749

FILED

FEB 2 4 2025

REAL ESTATE COMMISSION
BY Kelly Valadey

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

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 February 11, 2025 and heard through February 12, 2025 (the "Hearing"). RESPONDENT James Sharkey ("RESPONDENT") appeared, with his counsel Tony M. May (Bar No. 8563) with May Brock Law Group. Christal Park Keegan, 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").

The Commission heard preliminary matters on the pending motion. The Commission considered the oral arguments presented and the filed documents, and proceeded with hearing the parties presentations during which the Division's documents bate stamped pages NRED 000001 – 000334 and Respondents documents bate stamped pages RESP 000001 – 000002, 000006 – 000007, 000027, 000038-000042, 000044, 000055-000071, 000090-000092, 000097, 000188-000189, 000191, 000193-000194, 000195, 000197 were admitted into the record.

After hearing testimony presented in this matter and for good cause appearing, the Commission now enters its Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order against RESPONDENT as follows:

JURISDICTION

RESPONDENT, at all relevant times mentioned in this Complaint, held himself out and/or otherwise performed acts as a person licensed as a broker, salesperson, and/or business broker permit holder. RESPONDENT is, therefore, subject to the jurisdiction of the Division and the Commission, and the provisions of NRS Chapter 645 and NAC Chapter 645.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Commission, based on the evidence presented during the Hearing, by unanimous vote enters the finding of the following facts:

- Starting from about April 30, 2024, the RESPONDENT'S business broker permit was inactive. NRED 000005, and NRED 000006.
- 2. Starting from about June 13, 2024, the RESPONDENT'S real estate salesperson license was inactive. NRED 000003 NRED 000004, and NRED 000006.
- 3. Yet, on or about July 19, 2024, the RESPONDENT reached out to the listing agent (Complainant #1) to show his client the commercial property located at 229 S. Las Vegas Blvd., Las Vegas, NV (the "Property"). NRED 000191, and NRED 000183.
- 4. The inactive licensed RESPONDENT also negotiated the commercial lease with the listing agent by text: "Can we do 3 years?" NRED 000192.
- 5. Further, the next day, on July 20, 2024, the RESPONDENT requested the Property brochure from the listing agent and stated, "I'm gonna draw up the LOI." (emphasis added). NRED 000193, NRED 000186, and NRED 000128 NRED 000130.
- 6. On or about July 23, 2024, the RESPONDENT texted the listing agent stating, "I am still working on getting the LOI signed by the tenant. We might have a deal here but has some work." NRED 000194.
- 7. On July 24, 2024, the listing agent sent RESPONDENT "the LOI with all of the changes" and stated, "Please have your client sign." NRED 000189.

- Approximately 1.5 hours later, the RESPONDENT sent the listing agent the Signed LOI
 "See attached". NRED 000188, and NRED 000238.
- 9. About Thirty (30) minutes thereafter, the RESPONDENT emailed the listing agent along with Audrey Sharkey (S.0195760), stating his broker's application was still being processed but that his wife would be processing all transactions through the brokerage Viking REI. NRED 000190.
- 10. But the RESPONDENT'S email also stated, "I will be remaining the point of contact." NRED 000190.
- 11. Furthermore, the RESPONDENT'S email was erroneously signed in the capacity as "Principle Broker." NRED 000190, NRED 000006, NRED 000178, and NRED 000239.
- 12. Importantly, the RESPONDENT'S email also included his real estate salesperson license number and business broker permit number, both of which were inactive at the time. NRED 000189, NRED 000177, NRED 000003 NRED 000005, and NRED 000239.
- 13. On or about July 29, 2024, the listing agent asked another agent (Complainant #2) to handle the commercial Property transaction while she was out of the country for two weeks. NRED 000203.
- 14. That day, the RESPONDENT texted the agent covering: "did you guys develop the lease yet?" NRED 000204.
- 15. When the agent responded "No", the RESPONDENT texted: "If you need to have me draw up a commercial lease, I can absolutely do that. If you guys prefer to drop the lease yourself, let me know let's get a closing..." (emphasis added). NRED 000204, and NRED 000205.
- 16. Towards the end of the transaction, on or about August 5, 2024, the agent texted the RESPONDENT: "First of all, why am I even dealing with you if you are not the agent on this? You need to have your wife call me." NRED 000227, and NRED 000216 NRED 000219.
- 17. In response, the RESPONDENT texted: "If you want me to have my wife call you while I sit next to her and speak I will when she gets home." NRED 000227.
- 18. On August 23, 2024, the Division sent an opening investigation letter to RESPONDENT'S broker (Complainant #3). NRED 000009 NRED 000010.

- 19. On or about September 3, 2024, the Broker allegedly informed RESPONDENT'S wife he would not pay an entity that does not have a licensed broker, a real estate commission. NRED 000230, and NRED 000232.
- 20. Thereafter, on September 11, 2024, the RESPONDENT sent the Broker an attacking email calling him "a weak broker" and threatening "Your welcome for not filing a complaint against you, for not going after our commission and leaving us out to dry." NRED 000230.
- 21. Importantly, in this email the RESPONDENT acknowledged his expectation of receiving a commission on the commercial Property: "We had a verbal commission agreement I want to acknowledge for 10% to Viking REI and 90% to James Sharkey INC. for the leasing of commercial property." (emphasis added). NRED 000230.
- 22. Also, on or about August 23, 2024, the Division sent an opening investigation letter to RESPONDENT. NRED 000007.
- 23. Suddenly, the RESPONDENT switched from using his james@sharkeyfamilyrealtor.com email to his MasterTrade Painters email. NRED 000198, and NRED 000083.
- 24. But his construction email included a link to his MasterTrade Painters website which displayed a giant logo claiming to be a broker: "Broker Sharkey Realty Group James Sharkey [sic]". NRED 000051, NRED 000053 NRED 000054, NRED 000060 NRED 000065, NRED 000068 NRED 000072, NRED 000074, NRED 000076 NRED 000080, NRED 000085 NRED 000088, NRED 000091 NRED 000094, NRED 000095 NRED 000097, NRED 000097 NRED 000099, NRED 000102 NRED 000103, NRED 000107 and NRED 000135.
- 25. Accordingly, on or about September 13, 2024, the Division issued a Cease-and-Desist Order against the RESPONDENT. NRED 000014 NRED 000015.
- 26. Despite the Cease-and-Desist, the RESPONDENT continued to hold himself out as an active real estate licensee. NRED 000112, NRED 000135, NRED 000156, and NRED 000163.
- 27. The RESPONDENT also continued to make misrepresentations that the RESPONDENT was actually a Las Vegas REALTOR member Public ID#874250527 NRDS#629069762. NRED 000112, NRED 000142, NRED 000163, NRED 000172, and NRED 000174.

28. Therefore, on or about September 25, 2024, the Division informed the RESPONDENT it would proceed formally against him. NRED 000180.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Whereas the Commission found that the Division proved by a preponderance of the evidence the foregoing findings of fact, and by unanimous vote concludes that the RESPONDENT committed the following violations of law, as presented in the Complaint:

- 1. RESPONDENT violated NRS 645.230(1)(a), on the First Count (Count #1) when he engaged in the business of, acted in the capacity of, and/or advertised or assumed to act as a real estate salesperson without an active license.
- 2. RESPONDENT violated NRS 645.230(1)(a), on the Second Count (Count #2) when he, or by and through his MasterTrade Painters and/or James Sharkey, Inc., engaged in the business of, acted in the capacity of, and/or advertised or assumed to act in the capacity as a real estate broker when he never had a broker's license.
- 3. RESPONDENT violated NRS 645.230(1)(d), when he engaged in the business of, acted in the capacity of, and/or advertised or assumed to act as a business broker without an active permit.
- 4. RESPONDENT violated NRS 645.630(1)(a) on the First Count (Count #1) when he materially misrepresented himself as a real estate salesperson while his license was inactive.
- 5. RESPONDENT violated NRS 645.630(1)(a) on the Second Count (Count #2) when he materially misrepresented himself as a "Principle Broker" when he never had a broker's license.
- 6. RESPONDENT violated NRS 645.630(1)(a) on the Third Count (Count #3) when he materially misrepresented himself as a business broker when his permit was inactive.
- 7. RESPONDENT violated NRS 645.633(1)(h) when he acted grossly negligent for failing to have an active real estate salesperson's license.
- 8. RESPONDENT violated NRS 645.633(1)(i) pursuant to NAC 645.605(1) on the First Count (Count #1) when he represented himself as a real estate salesperson despite knowing he did not have an active license.

9. RESPONDENT violated NRS 645.633(1)(i) pursuant to NAC 645.605(1) on the Second Count (Count #2) when he represented himself as a broker despite knowing his broker application was not approved yet, and subsequently denied.

- 10. RESPONDENT violated NRS 645.633(1)(i) pursuant to NAC 645.605(1) on the Third Count (Count #3) when he represented himself as a business broker despite knowing he did not have an active permit.
- 11. RESPONDENT violated NRS 645.633(1)(a) for willfully using the Las Vegas REALTORS organization's trade name, service mark and/or insigne of membership when he was not a member and/or without the legal right to do so.

ORDER

The Commission, being fully apprised in the premises, and good cause appearing to the Commission, and by unanimous vote, ORDERS as follows:

- 1. Respondent shall pay an administrative fine to the Division in the total amount of Fifty-Eight Thousand and Five Hundred Thirty-Eight Dollars and Thirty-Nine Cents (\$58,538.39) ("Amount Due"), which includes a fine of Forty-Four Thousand Dollars (\$44,000) for violations of law and Fourteen Thousand Five Hundred Thirty-Eight Dollars and Thirty-Nine Cents (\$14,538.39) for the Division's costs and attorney's fees, within ninety (90) days from the effective date of this Order.
 - 2. All Respondent's licenses and permits shall be revoked on the effective date of this Order.
- 3. If payment is not actually received by the Division on or before its due date, it shall be a default by RESPONDENT. In the event of default, the unpaid balance of the administrative fine and costs, together with any attorney's fees and costs that may have been assessed, shall be due in full to the Division within ten (10) calendar days of the date of default, and the Division may obtain a judgment for the amount owed, including collection fees and costs.

||---

25 || . .

26 || . .

27 || . .

28 | . .

Page 6 of 7