

NEVADA REAL ESTATE COMMISSION MINUTES

VIA IN PERSON AND TEAMS VIRTUAL MEETING

February 10, 2026

Nevada State Business Center
3300 W. Sahara Avenue, 4th floor-Nevada Room
Las Vegas, Nevada 89102

VIDEO CONFERENCE TO:

Division of Insurance
1818 College Parkway, Suite 103
Carson City, Nevada 89706

The meeting was called to order at 9:07 a.m.

1-A) Introduction of Commissioners in Attendance

Donna Ruthe, Clark County; Forrest Barbee, Clark County; William Bradley Spires, Douglas County; David Tina, Clark County; and Christopher Raynor, Washoe County.

Commission Counsel: Stephanie Itkin-Goodman, Deputy Attorney General

1-B) Introduction of Division Staff in Attendance

Sharath Chandra, Administrator; Charvez Foger, Deputy Administrator; Shareece Bates, Administration Section Manager; Maria Gallo, Commission Coordinator; Amy Reveyrand, Commission Coordinator; Rebecca Bruce, Chief Compliance Audit Investigator; James Silva, Appraisal Compliance Investigator, Annalyn Carrillo, Education and Information Officer; Susan Clark, Licensing Section Manager; Phil Su, Senior Deputy Attorney General; and William Peper, Deputy Attorney General.

2) Public Comment

No public comment.

3-A) Discussion regarding the Administrator's Report

Administrator Sharath Chandra provided a brief overview of the Division's technology project. He noted that, while technology projects naturally come with challenges, the Division is making strong progress toward delivering a system that surpasses the current platform and will offer expanded online services. Mr. Chandra explained that the Division continues to focus on the education component of the project. He shared that he recently viewed an impressive demonstration of the education module and is optimistic about integrating those features into the final product. Mr. Chandra expressed his appreciation to everyone involved for their support, for enabling the Division to work directly with the developers, and for providing the resources and backing that have sustained the project to this point.

Mr. Chandra reported that the Division is preparing for the upcoming legislative session and has already begun work on its budget. Mr. Chandra emphasized this will be an important session for real estate from both a budget and planning standpoint, as the Division remains committed to providing as many resources as possible to licensees and the public. Mr. Chandra stated that the Division will request authorization to open a northern office, noting the need is long overdue. The recession and financial crisis forced the closure of offices, and the Division has continued operating with pre-2009 staffing levels while gradually rebuilding its workforce. The goal is to establish a northern office with some licensing functionality. While online modules will help reduce workload, the current process of mailing everything to the south is no longer workable. Mr. Chandra also noted the need for an additional position in the compliance section to manage increased call volume, walk-ins, and emails. The Division's goal is to address issues at the front end, answer questions, and route matters appropriately to compliance, but the rising volume requires more support. Mr. Chandra explained that achieving these goals requires moving to a self-sustaining funding model. The Real Estate Division is one of the few agencies funded through the general fund, which must prioritize health, safety, education, fire, and police services. As a result, there is often little left for the Division, despite serving more than 40,000 licensees and responding to evolving industry demands. Mr. Chandra reiterated that fees paid by licensees should support the services provided to them, including education, licensing, compliance, and enforcement. Mr. Chandra stated that the state and the Governor's Office now recognize this need, and the Director of Business and Industry will propose a Governor-recommended option to transition the Division to a self-funded model. Mr. Chandra addressed concerns about revenue fluctuations, noting that under the general fund the Division has even less control over its financial stability. A self-funded model would allow the Division and the Commission to make responsible fiscal decisions and set priorities, consistent with how most licensing agencies operate. Mr. Chandra highlighted that the Commission is widely regarded as a benchmark for other commissions, known for its deliberation, due process, and well-reasoned decisions. Mr. Chandra emphasized that the Division does not rely on fines and fees for revenue; those funds go directly to the general fund, ensuring that enforcement decisions remain based solely on facts. Mr. Chandra encouraged licensees and associations to seek clarification if they have questions about the proposed changes and to reach out to the Commissioners, who understand the history and rationale behind the effort. Mr. Chandra welcomed feedback and constructive criticism as the Division continues to improve. Mr. Chandra concluded by noting that the budget and self-funding initiatives will make this a very busy legislative session for everyone involved.

Mr. Chandra reported that the Division is also working on several bills related to homeowners' associations (HOAs). He noted that the Director of Business and Industry has convened an HOA task force, and recommendations from that group may be forthcoming. The overarching goal is to support HOAs in becoming more self-sustaining and able to make decisions that best serve their communities. Mr. Chandra highlighted the role of the Ombudsman's Office, which works directly with homeowners to resolve issues before they escalate. Staff in that office are working diligently, and he encouraged anyone experiencing HOA-related concerns to reach out so the Division can help identify solutions. Mr. Chandra also noted that the Division's education section provides support to HOAs. A long-term goal is to create a unified education program that serves all audiences—real estate licensees, HOAs, homeowners, and the general public—so that the Division communicates consistently across all housing-related topics. Mr.

Chandra emphasized the importance of a seamless, comprehensive education approach that reflects the interconnected nature of Nevada’s housing and community issues.

3-B) Discussion regarding the Disciplinary Report.

Shareece Bates presented this report. The Commissioners were provided with the report in the meeting packet.

3-C) Discussion Regarding the Compliance Section’s Current Caseload Report, Including a Summary of Recent Topics of Complaints Filed.

Rebecca Bruce presented this report. The Commissioners were provided with the report in the meeting packet.

3-D) Discussion Regarding the Administrative Sanction Report.

Rebecca Bruce presented this report. The Commissioners were provided with the report in the meeting packet.

3-E) Discussion Regarding the Continuing Education Report.

Annalyn Carrillo presented this report. The Commissioners were provided with the report in the meeting packet.

3-F) Discussion Regarding the Request for a Commission Opinion on Real Estate Agents Handling Estate Sales.

President Ruthe opened the discussion by referencing Susan Russell’s public comment and asked the administrators whether the matter should be directed to the Appraisal Committee or another body. Administrator Sharath Chandra recommended that the Commission treat the topic as a general discussion for now and confirmed that the Division will place the issue on the Appraisal Section’s agenda and report back. Commissioner Tina stated that this Commission is not the appropriate body to address the issue and noted other mechanisms already exist for addressing such concerns. Commissioner Barbee agreed, explaining licensing is handled at the county level and that established processes are already in place for addressing complaints involving individuals acting outside their authorized scope. Commissioner Barbee expressed doubt that the Commission could take further action beyond what was already proposed. Commissioner Spires commended the quality of the submitted letter and agreed that the issue is important but should be handled by the appropriate body, likely the Appraisal Committee. President Ruthe supported forwarding the matter, expressing concern about consumer vulnerability and potential legal consequences. She acknowledged the validity of Ms. Russell’s concerns and appreciated that the matter would be advanced for further action. Administrator Chandra confirmed the referral and suggested developing educational materials to help licensees understand the responsibilities and risks associated with this type of specialized work. Mr. Chandra noted that the materials submitted by Ms. Russell will be included in the Appraisal Committee’s review and that the Division will also examine any relevant county-level considerations. President Ruthe mentioned her familiarity with Ms. Russell and her willingness to participate in the process. Commissioner Barbee asked whether a joint informational bulletin from both the Appraisal and Real Estate Commissions could be issued. Administrator Chandra agreed that this would be beneficial.

3-G) For Possible Action: Discussion and Possible Action to Approve the Minutes of the November 4, 2025, Meeting.

Commissioner Barbee moved to approve the minutes of the November 4, 2025, meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Raynor. Motion carried.

**5-B) NRED v Casey Block, for possible action
Case No. 2025-305**

Parties Present

Casey Block was present virtually.

Phil W. Su, Esq., Senior Deputy Attorney General, was present representing the Division.

Preliminary Matters

Mr. Su stated that there is a stipulation for settlement in this matter to be presented for the Commission's consideration and approval. Mr. Su stated this case is the result of Mr. Block failing to submit his Form 546A. Mr. Su read the summary of factual allegations, alleged violations of law, and proposed settlement into the record.

Settlement

- Respondent agrees to pay the Division a total amount of One Thousand Four Hundred Two Dollars and Forty Cents (\$1,402.40) ("Amount Due"), consisting of zero additional administrative fines, the Division's pre-hearing costs and fees in the amount of \$400.00, and pre-hearing attorney's fees in the amount of \$1,002.40.
- The Amount Due shall be payable to the Division within sixty (60) days of the effective date of this Stipulation by the Commission.

Commissioner Barbee moved on the matter of NRED v Casey Block Case# 2025-305 to accept the stipulation for settlement as presented. Seconded by Commissioner Spires. Motion carried.

**5-A) NRED v Karina Jett, for possible action
Case No. 2024-680**

Parties Present

Karina Jett was present.

Joshua J. Floth, Esq., was present representing Karina Jett.

Michael C. Van, Esq., was present representing Karina Jett.

Phil W. Su, Esq., Senior Deputy Attorney General, was present representing the Division.

Preliminary Matters

Mr. Van stated this is a reasonably complicated case. Mr. Van said the basis for the lot of this is because there was a poorly represented underlying court case. Mr. Van requested a continuance due to the change of counsel on this case and the duration of the trial he and Mr. Floth had recently concluded, noting they have not had time to converse with Mr. Su in an attempt to settle this case.

Mr. Su provided that a stipulation would be a non-starter and pointed out that Ms. Jett had four months to prepare.

Commissioner Tina motioned to hear the case at this time. Seconded by Commissioner Spires. Motion carried.

Opening Statements

Mr. Su gave an opening statement.

Mr. Van gave an opening statement.

State's Witness

Shannon Goddard, Compliance Audit/Investigator II, testified.

Mr. Su moved that the State's exhibit A-D be admitted into evidence.

President Ruthe stated so moved.

Mr. Van cross-examined the witness.

Mr. Su re-examined the witness.

Mr. Van recross-examined the witness.

The Commission had no questions.

The witness was dismissed.

Respondent's Witness

Charles Jeff Moore testified.

Mr. Su cross-examined the witness.

The Commission questioned the witness.

The witness was dismissed.

Respondent's Testified

Karina Jett testified.

Mr. Floth moved that the respondent's exhibits A – JJ admitted into evidence.

President Ruthe stated so moved.

Mr. Su cross-examined the witness.

Mr. Floth re-examined the witness.

The Commission questioned the witness.

The witness was dismissed.

Respondent's Witness

Joseph Scott testified.

The witness was dismissed.

Closing Statements

Mr. Su gave a closing statement.

Mr. Van gave a closing statement.

Factual Allegations

Commissioner Tina moved in the matter of NRED vs Karina Jett, Case# 2024-680 that factual allegations 1-4 and 6-11 have been proven. Seconded by Commissioner Raynor. Motion carried.

Commissioner Barbee moved on the matter of NRED vs Karina Jett Case# 2024-680 that factual allegation 5 had not been proven. Seconded by Commissioner Spired. Motion carried.

Violations of Law

Commissioner Barbee moved on the matter of NRED vs Karina Jett Case# 2024-680 that all violations 1-4 have been proven. Seconded by Commissioner Raynor. Motion carried.

Division Recommendations

Rebecca Bruce, Chief Compliance Audit Investigator, recommended a fine in the amount of \$40,000.00 plus the fees and cost of the hearing and investigation to be payable within 90 days from the execution of the Order. The Division also recommended continuing education in the amount of 18 hours; 3 hours each in Ethics, Agency, Law and Legislation, Risk Reduction, and 6 hours of Contracts from live instruction not to be applied towards the renewal requirements for continuing education. The education must be completed within 6 months of the execution of the Order.

Amy Reveyrand, Commission Coordinator, testified the actual, reasonable, and necessary fees and costs totaled \$15,676.64.

Commissioner Barbee expressed his appreciation of the fact the recommendation was not to revoke or suspend Ms. Jett's license.

Motion

Commissioner Tina moved on the case of NRED v Karina Jett, Case# 2024-680, that the Commission finds the factual allegations and violations of law have been proven. The Respondent shall be fined \$40,000.00 plus the costs and fees of \$15,676.74 all to be paid within 90 days of the date of the Order. Continuing education consisting of 3 hours Ethics, 3 hours Agency, 3 hours Law and Legislation, 3 hours of Risk Reduction and 6 hours of Contracts must be completed within 6 months, will not count toward the continuing education requirements of

all license renewals, and must be from live instruction. Seconded by Commissioner Barbee.
Motion carried.

Hearing was concluded.

6) Public Comment

No public comment.

7) For Possible Action: Adjournment

Meeting recessed at 4:10 on February 10, 2026.

**NEVADA REAL ESTATE COMMISSION
MINUTES**

VIA IN PERSON AND TEAMS VIRTUAL MEETING

February 11, 2026

Nevada State Business Center
3300 W. Sahara Avenue, 4th floor-Nevada Room
Las Vegas, Nevada 89102

VIDEO CONFERENCE TO:

Division of Insurance
1818 College Parkway, Suite 103
Carson City, Nevada 89706

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m.

1-A) Introduction of Commissioners in Attendance

Donna Ruthe, Clark County; Forrest Barbee, Clark County; William Bradley Spires, Douglas County; David Tina, Clark County; and Christopher Raynor, Washoe County.

Commission Counsel: Stephanie Itkin-Goodman, Deputy Attorney General

1-B) Introduction of Division Staff in Attendance

Sharath Chandra, Administrator; Charvez Foger, Deputy Administrator; Shareece Bates, Administration Section Manager; Maria Gallo, Commission Coordinator; Amy Reveyrand, Commission Coordinator; Rebecca Bruce, Chief Compliance Audit Investigator; Annalyn Carrillo, Education and Information Officer; Susan Clark, Licensing Section Manager; Phil Su, Senior Deputy Attorney General; and Christal Keegan, Deputy Attorney General.

2) Public Comment

No public comment.

5-D) NRED v Neeru Seth, for possible action

Case No. 2025-171

Parties Present

Neeru Seth was present by telephone.

Phil W. Su, Esq., Senior Deputy Attorney General, was present representing the Division.

Opening Statement

Mr. Su gave an opening statement.

Ms. Seth gave an opening statement.

State's Witness

Joann Gierer, Compliance Audit/Investigator II, testified.

Mr. Su moved that the State's exhibit NRED 1-232 be admitted into evidence.

President Ruthe stated so moved.

Ms. Seth cross-examined the witness.

Ms. Seth requested a continuance.

Commissioner Tina moved to not extend a continuance. Seconded by Commissioner Barbee. Motion carried.

The witness was dismissed.

State's Witness

Rebecca Bruce, Chief Compliance Officer, testified.

Ms. Seth cross-examined the witness.

The Commission questioned the witness.

The witness was dismissed.

Closing Statements

Ms. Su gave a closing statement.

Ms. Seth gave a closing statement.

Commissioner Raynor stated that he has a clear understanding of how other states operate, and he believes the rules are largely the same in California. He did not feel that simply announcing a lack of licensure is sufficient justification. He referenced a case involving an out-of-state broker who closed a transaction in Las Vegas under similar circumstances. That broker earned \$250,000 and was ultimately required to return the full amount along with the associated legal fees.

Commissioner Ruthe expressed concern that a licensee who is a California broker, along with an assisting agent, entered Nevada, conducted a property sale, and did not engage a Nevada licensee to facilitate the transaction. She noted that the broker clearly understood the licensing requirements yet chose to proceed in violation of them. She further stated that such conduct would be unacceptable not only in Nevada but also if a Nevada licensee attempted the same in California or any other jurisdiction.

Violation of Law

Commissioner Tina moved pursuant to NAC 645.860 find that the state has proven factual allegations 1-14 and the violations of law 1-3 are true and proven by stature and custom regarding NRED v Neeru Seth in Case# 2025-171. Seconded by Commissioner Barbee. Motion carried.

Rebecca Bruce states the Division recommends a fine of \$249,000.00 which is equal to the economic gain in this transaction plus the cost and fees of the investigation and hearing to be paid within 90 days of execution of the Order. Additionally, the Division would like to note pursuant that to NAC 645.870, the Commission has the option of reporting the disciplinary action to the disciplinary board of California Division of real estate. If you choose to make that reporting, please note so in your Order.

Amy Reveyrand, Commission Coordinator, testified that the cost and fees of \$5,482.21 are actual, reasonable and necessary.

Commissioner Barbee moved on the matter of NRED v Neeru Seth Case# 2025-171 that the respondent pay a fine of \$249,000.00 plus cost of the hearing \$5,482.21 to be paid within 90 days of effective date of the Order. Additionally, would like the Order submitted to the California Department of Real Estate for further action. Seconded by Commissioner Raynor. Motion carried.

5-C) NRED v Deann Dussault, for possible action

Case No. 2025-355

Parties Present

Deann Dussault was not present.

Phil W. Su, Esq., Senior Deputy Attorney General, was present representing the Division.

Preliminary Matters

Mr. Su stated that the Division had received no answer in this matter, no known request for a continuance, and no response from Ms. Dussault to the timely, formally filed complaint. Mr. SU recommended the Division move to a default against her, Pursuant to NAC 645.860.

Mr. Su stated that the Division would submit that there was proper service upon Deann Dussault.

State's Witness

Amy Reveyrand, Commission Coordinator, testified regarding service of complaint.

Mr. Su asked that the State's exhibits bates stamped 1-14 be admitted.

President Ruthe stated so admitted.

Mr. Su moved to admit the proof of mailing.

President Ruthe stated so admitted.

Commissioner Tina moved pursuant to NAC 645.860 find the state has proven sufficient service of notice to the respondent in NRED v Deann Dussault Case# 2025-355. Seconded by Commissioner Barbee. Motion carried.

Mr. Su stated proceeding with NAC 645.860, failure of party to appear at hearing of complaint requested the Commission consider moving for default against Deann Dussault in the underlying complaint.

Mr. Su read the factual allegations and violations of law into the record.

Commissioner Barbee moved in the matter of NRED v Deann Dussault Case# 2025-355 that the factual allegations and violations of law had been proven. Seconded by Commissioner Spires. Motion carried.

Division Recommendations

Rebecca Bruce recommended a fine of \$10,000.00 plus the cost and fees of the investigation and hearing to be paid within 30 days of the execution of the Order. The Division also recommends the revocation of all licenses and permits for a period of 10 years.

Ms. Reveyrand testified to the cost and fees of \$1,647.78.

Commissioner Barbee asked for clarification regarding revocations. Specifically, he wanted to know whether there is a difference between what the Commission can impose at a hearing versus what a respondent can agree to in a stipulated settlement, and whether there is a statutory or regulatory limitation of one year versus ten years.

Mr. Su explained that in stipulated settlements, the action is generally not a revocation because the Division cannot revoke a license through a stipulation. Instead, the respondent would agree to a voluntary surrender of their license for a set period. The typical range of one to ten years is used because another statute—found in NRS 622—states that revocations cannot be for less than one year. While that statute does not directly apply to this Division, it provides useful guidance.

Mr. Su states after the ten-year period ends, if the individual wants to reapply for a license, they must usually submit a new application, have it denied by the Division, and then the matter is brought before the Commission with an explanation of why they are seeking re-licensing. Overall, if the respondent agrees to the terms, the action is treated as a voluntary surrender rather than a revocation.

Commissioner Tina moved in the matter of NRED v Deann Dussault Case# 2025-355 the respondent be fined \$10,000.00 plus the hearing fees and costs of \$1,647.78 all payable within 30 days of the effective date of the Order and that all licenses and permits be revoked for a period of ten years. Seconded by Commissioner Raynor. Motion carried.

4-E) For Possible Action: Discussion and Decision Regarding License Denial Appeal Pursuant to NAC 645.335.

Leo Mark Solari II

File No.: S-LDA-25-021

Parties Present

Leo Mark Solari II was present.

Susan Clark, Licensing Section Manager, was present.

Mr. Solari requested that the Commission go into closed session.

Commissioner Barbee motioned to go into closed session, seconded by commissioner Spires. Motion carried.

The Commission went into closed session.

Commissioner Spires moved that the Commission go back into open session. Seconded by Commissioner Barbee. Motion carried.

The Commission went back into open session.

Motion

Commissioner Tina moved to approve Leo Mark Solari's appeal file number S-LDA-25-021 for licensure. Seconded by Commissioner Spires. Motion carried.

4-D) For Possible Action; Discussion and Decision Regarding License Denial Appeal Pursuant to NAC 645.335.

Ashley Autumn Mitchell

File No.: S-LDA-25-019

Parties Present

Ashley Mitchell was present.

Kent Divich was present on behalf of Ashley Mitchell.

Susan Clark, Licensing Section Manager, was present.

Ms. Mitchell requested that the Commission go into closed session.

Commissioner Spires motioned to go into closed session, seconded by commissioner Barbee. Motion carried.

The Commission went into closed session.

Commissioner Spires moved that the Commission go back into open session. Seconded by Commissioner Barbee. Motion carried.

The Commission went back into open session.

Motion

Commissioner Barbee moved to approve Ashley Autumn Mitchell's appeal file number S-LDA-25-019 for licensure. Seconded by Commissioner Spires. Motion carried.

4-C). For Possible Action; Discussion and Decision Regarding License Denial Appeal Pursuant to NAC 645.335.

Michael R. Romero Jr.

File No.: S-LDA-25-018

Parties Present

Michael R. Romero Jr. was present.
Jessica Cordero was present on behalf of Michael Romero.
Susan Clark, Licensing Section Manager, was present.

Mr. Romero was sworn in.

Mr. Romero requested that the Commission go into closed session.

Commissioner Spires motioned to go into closed session, seconded by Commissioner Barbee.
Motion carried.

The Commission went into closed session.

Commissioner Tina moved that the Commission go back into open session. Seconded by Commissioner Raynor. Motion carried.

The Commission went back into open session.

Motion

Commissioner Tina moved to approve Michael R. Romero appeal file number S-LDA-25-018 for licensure. Seconded by Commissioner Spires. Motion carried 3:2 with Commissioners Raynor and Barbee opposed.

4-B) For Possible Action; Discussion and Decision Regarding License Denial Appeal Pursuant to NAC 645.335.

Shanice Shallies

File No.: S-LDA-25-017

Parties Present

Shanice Shallies was present.
Susan Clark, Licensing Section Manager, was present.

Ms. Shallies stated that she wanted an open session.

Ms. Clark stated that the Division received Ms. Shallies' real estate salesperson application and pursuant to NRS 645.330(2)(a) denied her application.

Ms. Shallies gave her statement.

The Commission took time to review the submitted documents.

Commissioner Barbee questioned Ms. Shallies.

Motion

Commissioner Tina moved to approve Shanice Shallies' appeal file number S-LDA-25-017 and grant her a license. Seconded by Commissioner Spires. Motion carried 3:2 with Commissioners Raynor and Barbee opposed.

4-A) For Possible Action; Discussion and Decision Regarding License Denial Appeal Pursuant to NAC 645.335.

Isleidy Bentmim

File No.: S-LDA-25-016

Parties Present

Isleidy Bentmim was present.

Susan Clark, Licensing Section Manager, was present.

Ms. Bentmim requested that the Commission go into closed session.

Commissioner Raynor motioned to go into closed session, seconded by Commissioner Tina. Motion carried.

The Commission went into closed session.

Commissioner Spires moved that the Commission go back into open session. Seconded by Commissioner Barbee. Motion carried.

The Commission went back into open session.

Motion

Commissioner Tina moved to approve Isleidy Bentmim's appeal file number S-LDA-25-016 for licensure. Seconded by Commissioner Spires. Motion failed 2:3 with Commissioners Raynor, Barbee and Ruthe apposed.

Commissioner Raynor moved to deny Isleidy Bentmim's appeal file number S-LDA-25-016 for licensure. Seconded by Commissioner Barbee. Motion carried 3:2 with Commissioners Spires and Tina apposed.

5) Public Comment

Michelle Norris stated that she was impressed with how the Commission meeting functions.

7) For Possible Action: Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m. on February 11, 2026.



Prepared by: Amy Reveyard