## REAL ESTATE AGENCY BEFORE THE REAL ESTATE COMMISSIONER

In the Matter of the Real Estate License of	
BRENDA DALTON LEITCH	FINAL ORDER BY DEFAULT
,	

- 1.1 On February 5, 2019, the Real Estate Commissioner issued, by certified mail, a Notice of Intent to Revoke Brenda Dalton Leitch's (Leitch) property manager license. The Oregon Real Estate Agency (Agency) sent the Notice of Intent to Leitch's last known address of record with the Agency. The Notice of Intent was also mailed to Leitch by regular first class mail in a handwritten envelope.
- 1.2 The certified mailing of the Notice of Intent and the first class mailing of the Notice of Intent were sent to Leitch at 1049 Nautical Dr., Hammond, OR 97121. These mailings have not been returned to the Agency.
- 1.3 Over twenty (20) days have elapsed since the mailing of the notice issued in this matter and no written request for hearing has been received.
- 1.4 Copies of the entire investigation file are designated as the record for purposes of default, including any submission from respondent and all information in the administrative file relating to the mailing of notices and any responses received.

2.

Based upon the foregoing and upon a review of the above described investigation reports, documents and files, the Real Estate Commissioner finds:

2.1 Oregon Administrative Rule 863-001-0006 states, in part, that a notice of intent is properly served when deposited in the United States mail, registered or certified mail, addressed to the real estate licensee or to any other person having an interest in a proceeding before the Commissioner at the licensee's or other person's last known address of record with the Agency.

- 2.2 Leitch's last known address of record with the Agency was 1049 Nautical Dr., Hammond, OR 97121.
- 2.3 A certified mailing of the Notice of Intent was mailed to Leitch at her last known address of record on February 5, 2019. The certified mailing has not been returned to the Agency.
- 2.4 The Notice of Intent was also mailed first class to Leitch's address of record on February 5, 2019. The first class mailing in the handwritten envelope has not been returned to the Agency. In accordance with ORS 40.135(1)(q), there is a presumption that the mailing properly addressed and placed with the U.S. Postal Service was delivered. That presumption has not been overcome by any evidence.
- 2.5 Over twenty (20) days have elapsed since the mailing of the notice and no written request for a hearing has been received.

## FINDINGS OF FACT

&

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

3.

- 3.1 At all times mentioned herein, Leitch was licensed as a property manager doing business under the registered business name of B Dalton Property Management.
- 3.2 On June 19, 2018, the Agency mailed Leitch an initial notice for a Clients' Trust Account reconciliation mail-in review relating to security deposits account ending in #8142 held at Columbia Bank. Leitch failed to respond to the notice. On August 18, 2018, phone contact was attempted by Agency staff but Leitch could not be reached and her phone would not accept messages.
- 3.3 On August 20, 2018, Agency Compliance Coordinator, Deanna Hewitt (Hewitt) left a voicemail for Leitch informing her that a second notice for the reconciliation mail-in review was being issued. Leitch responded to the call explaining she was on vacation and had not seen the previous notice. Leitch implied to Hewitt she would respond to the notice once she had returned from vacation.
  - 3.4 On August 21, 2018, a second notice for the mail in review was issued.

30 ///

 $/\!/\!/$ 

3.5 As of December 6, 2018, Leitch never submitted the requested documents to the Agency in regards to the reconciliation mail-in review.

**Violation:** By failing to respond to the reconciliation mail in review and provide the requested documents Leitch violated ORS 696.301(3) as it incorporates OAR 863-025-0035(2)(a) (1-1-2018 Edition) which states: (2) a property manager must produce records required under section (1) of this rule for inspection by the Agency as follows: (a) when the Agency makes a request for production of property management records, the property manager must provide such records within no less than five banking days. Leitch's actions demonstrated incompetence in violation of ORS 696.301(12) (2017 Edition) which states that a licensee's real estate license may be disciplined if they have demonstrated incompetence or untrustworthiness in performing any act for which the licensee is required to hold a license.

- 3.6 On October 31, 2018, property owner Brad Heil (Heil) emailed the Agency expressing concerns regarding his property manager Leitch.
  - 3.7 On November 1, 2018, the Agency opened an investigation.
- 3.8 Leitch's registered business name B Dalton Property Management was set to expire on October 1, 2018. The Agency's licensing division sent renewal notices to Leitch on September 1<sup>st</sup>, 21<sup>st</sup>, and 28<sup>th</sup>, 2018. Additionally, Agency staff called Leitch on September 27, 2018, and left a voicemail message. Leitch made no effort to contact the Agency or renew her business name. On October 1, 2018, the register business name expired, causing Leitch's property manager license to become inactive. An email notification was sent to Leitch that day and a warning notice advising Leitch not to conduct professional real estate activity was emailed to her on October 2, 2018.
- 3.9 During the Agency investigation Leitch indicated she received the Agency's notices and messages about renewing her business name. She said she had misunderstood and thought it was regarding the Secretary of State business registration. Leitch's Secretary of State business registry was set to expire on November 25, 2018.
- 3.10 Leitch rectified her licensing issues by creating a new registered business name with the Agency and attaching her license to it on November 2, 2018.

 /// ///

3.11 Leitch admitted to conducting professional real estate activity during the thirty day period when her license was inactive. She stated it was, "business as usual."

**Violation:** By engaging in management of rental real estate activity while her license was inactive Leitch violated ORS 696.301(3) as it incorporates OAR 863-024-0065(1) (1-1-2018) which states a property manager licensee whose license is on inactive status may not engage in the management of rental real estate.

3.12 On April 19, 2016, Leitch signed a property management agreement with Heil to manage his property located at 346 Skipanon Drive, Warrenton OR (subject property). The contract was set to expire after one year, on March 30, 2018. Heil stated a new property management agreement was never drawn up or signed. Leitch continued to manage the subject property after the expiration date of March 30, 2018.

**Violation:** By continuing to manage the subject property without an unexpired property management agreement, Leitch violated ORS 696.301(3) as it incorporates OAR 863-025-0020(1) (1-1-2018 Edition) which states a property manager must not engage in the management of rental real estate without a written, unexpired property management agreement between the owner and property manager.

- 3.13 The subject property was part of a homeowners association (HOA) and was subject to HOA fees. Responsibility for paying the HOA fees was not specifically addressed in the property management agreement.
- 3.14 The total amount due each month had been \$36.00 through March 2018, and increased to \$40.00 a month in April 2018.
- 3.15 On April 9, 2018, Heil emailed Leitch about the HOA account informing her that a \$984.00 assessment was due along with another fee. Leitch did not remit this payment.
- 3.16 On October 8, 2018, Heil received notice that the HOA fees were past due for the subject property. No payments had been made from February 2018 through October 2018. Leitch was copied as a recipient on this email.
- 3.17 According to Heil, he said it was Leitch's responsibility to pay the HOA fees and that it had been verbally agreed to.

| ///

**Violation:** By failing to address the HOA fees in the property management agreement Leitch violated ORS 696.301(3) as it incorporates OAR 863-025-0020(2)(b) which requires a property management agreement to include the duties and responsibilities of the property manager and the owner.

- 3.18 Back in November 17, 2016, Heil emailed HOA bookkeeper Teena Adams (Adams) asking that she add Leitch to any emails sent pertaining to the HOA account. Additionally, he authorized Leitch to make payments on his account.
- 3.19 On October 8, 2018, Heil forwarded Leitch a delinquency notice regarding the HOA fees and wrote, "Brenda, I have to get this paid ASAP." Leitch responded to Heil on October 10, 2018. In her message, she wrote, "I will take care of it," and added "This was Paid [sic] a while back along with the assessment. Three checks were written. I will check with my bank first. If not cashed, I will drive over new checks."
- 3.20 Leitch told Agency Investigator/Auditor Frances Hlawatsch (Hlawatsch) that she had not been receiving the HOA statements and "did not know" she needed to pay them. She said all statements were sent to Heil. Leitch said she felt badly about what had happened and had recently issued payment to the HOA for the fees. She said she would take responsibility for any fees, meaning late charges. Leitch indicated she was waiting for Heil to determine how much was due and would send additional payment if he directed her to.
- 3.21 On October 10, 2018, Leitch issued payment of \$3,515.86 for the HOA fees. According to Adams, the moorage dues still had not been paid, and there was still a past due balance of \$1,019 remaining after the October payment.
- 3.22 The emailed documents Adams provided demonstrated that Leitch had been copied as a recipient on numerous attempts to collect the delinquent HOA dues.

**Violation:** By failing to make the HOA payments timely on behalf of the property owner, and causing late charges to be assessed on the account, Leitch violated ORS 696.301(3) as it incorporates ORS 696.890(4)(c), and (f) (2017 Edition), which requires a property manager owes the property owner the following affirmative duties: (c) to exercise reasonable care and diligence; and (f) to be loyal to the owner by not taking action that is adverse or detrimental to the owner's interest.

III

III

///

- 3.23 On October 12, 2018, Heil emailed Leitch, "I'm concerned I can't reach you and have had no response asking you to transfer all my rental funds." His email indicated that Heil had previously directed Leitch to transfer his funds into his personal Wells Fargo account and she had not yet done so. He went on to write that he didn't understand why she was not responding to his calls or request.
- 3.24 Leitch had managed the subject property since May 2016. The subject property had not been vacant during the timeframe Leitch managed it, and the rent due each month was \$1,000.00. Heil estimated that Leitch could be holding as much as \$27,000.00 on his behalf.
- 3.25 Heil never received a disbursement of rental funds or any owner statements during the time Leitch managed the property.

**Violation:** By failing to provide owner statements to Heil Leitch violated ORS 696.301(3) as it incorporates OAR 863-025-0055(4) (1-1-18 Edition) which requires a property manager to report in writing to each owner any change in the owner's ledger. A monthly report showing all receipts and disbursements for the owner's account is sufficient under this section.

- 3.26 The property management agreement states that "disbursed monies are based upon checks clearing in the Trust Account" and a "three-week waiting period upon receipt of rents will be expected."
- 3.27 Prior to October 2018, Heil had never asked for funds to be disbursed and had not complained to Leitch about the lack of disbursement. Leitch stated Heil wanted his owner funds in his account as a "savings" and did not want monthly disbursements. She said this had been a verbal arrangement with Heil.
  - 3.28 As of December 6, 2018, Leitch had not yet disbursed any owner funds to Heil.
- 3.29 The tenants (James and Janye Reuterdhal) had been living in the subject property since October 2017. At the time of the move-in Leitch collected the \$1,000 cash from the tenants, however, Leitch did not have her receipt book with her to provide a receipt for funds collected.

 ///

///

**Violation:** Leitch failed to record the collection of move-in funds received from the tenants in violation of ORS 696.301(3) as it incorporates OAR 863-025-0065(5) (11-15-16 Edition) which requires a property manager to maintain a complete record of all funds or consideration received in the property manager's property management activity. This record must show from whom the funds or other consideration was received, the date of the receipt, the place and date of deposit, and, the final disposition of the funds or other consideration.

**Violation:** By failing to provide tenants with a receipt for the \$1,000 move in funds Leitch violated ORS 696.301(3) as it incorporates OAR 863-025-0060(1) (11-15-16) which requires a property manager to prepare a legible written receipt for any cash funds received under a property management agreement.

3.30 The Reuterdhals said Leitch did not have a lease agreement for them to sign at move-in and assured them she would create one. The tenants stated they requested a lease agreement on more than one occasion but Leitch never brought them one to sign. In her interview with Hlawatsch, Leitch claimed to have created a lease agreement with the tenants but that she had accidentally left the original executed document with the tenants. She claimed to have requested it be returned from the tenants but they never returned it.

**Violation:** By failing to either have tenants sign a lease agreement or failing to maintain a copy of the signed lease agreement Leitch violated ORS 696.301(3) as it incorporates OAR 863-025-0045(1) (11-15-16 Edition) which requires the property manager to file and maintain legible copies of all tenant rental or lease agreements for the time period required under OAR 863-025-0035.

3.31 In early November 2017, Mrs. Reuterdhal contacted Leitch to ask how she wanted them to remit their rent payment. Leitch drove to the subject property to collect the rent and Mrs. Reuterdhal went down to Leitch's car to personally deliver the cash payment and collect a receipt. Leitch informed Mrs. Reuterdhal that she had again forgotten her receipt book and could not provide a receipt. She promised to mail the tenant the receipts for both October and November's rent payments. Leitch never provided a receipt for the November rent payment.

30 | ///

**Violation:** By failing to record the November rent received from the tenant Leitch violated ORS 696.301(3) as it incorporates OAR 863-025-0065(5) (11-15-16 Edition) which requires a property manager to maintain a complete record of all funds or consideration received in the property manager's property management activity. This record must show from whom the funds or other consideration was received, the date of the receipt, the place and date of deposit, and, the final disposition of the funds or other consideration.

**Violation:** By failing to provide tenants with a receipt for November's rent Leitch violated ORS 696.301(3) as it incorporates OAR 863-025-0060(1) (11-15-16) which requires a property manager to prepare a legible written receipt for any cash funds received under a property management agreement.

- 3.32 In early December 2017 Mrs. Reuterdhal reached out to Leitch to arrange payment of rent. On December 11, 2017, Leitch drove to the subject property to pick up the rent payment. Again, she did not have her receipt book or lease with her but made promises to follow through soon.
- 3.33 In January 2018, the Reuterdhals made numerous attempts to contact Leitch by phone and text message to arrange payment of their rent. The Reuterdhals said they did not hear from Leitch for the entire month of January so they held onto their rent money waiting to hear from her.
- 3.34 In February 2018, the Reuterdhals tried to reach Leitch by phone and text as they had \$2,000 in rent that was due (January and February 2018 rent). They did not hear from Leitch until the end of March 2018, when Leitch called Mrs. Reuterdhal and demanded to be paid \$3,000 immediately. When Leitch came by to collect the \$3,000 in cash for the three months of rent (January, February, and March rent), she again did not have her receipt book. Leitch never provided the receipt for the \$3,000 payment of rent.
- 3.35 Mrs. Reuterdhal expressed her frustration to Leitch and asked if there was an easier way to remit rent payment. She asked if they could mail money orders or take cash to Lietch's bank each month. Leitch said she would provide her banking information so the Reuterdhals could make deposits there.

/// ///

/// ///

**Violation:** By failing to properly record the December, January, February and March rents received from the tenants Leitch violated ORS 696.301(3) as it incorporates OAR 863-025-0065(5) (11-15-16 Edition) and (8) (1-1-18 Edition) which requires a property manager to maintain a complete record of all funds or consideration received in the property manager's property management activity. This record must show from whom the funds or other consideration was received, the date of the receipt, the place and date of deposit, and, the final disposition of the funds or other consideration.

**Violation:** By failing to provide tenants with a receipt for the rent paid for December, January, February and March Leitch violated ORS 696.301(3) as it incorporates OAR 863-025-0060(1) (11-15-16, 1-1-2018 Edition) which requires a property manager to prepare a legible written receipt for any cash funds received under a property management agreement.

- 3.36 On April 9, 2018, Leitch sent a text message stating "need cash today," to the Reuterdhals. Leitch suggested the tenants take cash to Wauna Federal Credit Union as they could do "guaranteed funds." They were confused as to what this meant, but assumed Leitch wanted them to deposit cash at the credit union and asked Leitch for an account number. Leitch did not respond or provide any account numbers for them to do this, so they held onto the April rent.
- 3.37 In May 2018, Leitch contacted Mr. Reuterdhal by phone and demanded \$5,000.00. Leitch told him they were 5 months past due on rent and she would be issuing an eviction notice. Mr. Reuterdhal told Leitch they were ready to pay \$2,000.00 and reminded her they had paid \$3,000.00 in March. Leitch initially denied this and suggested that Mrs. Reuterdhal had been lying to her husband about paying rent and perhaps had a gambling problem. He asserted Leitch was wrong and they only owed \$2,000 for April and May. Leitch denied this but eventually said she would "take \$2,000 and call it even."
- 3.38 Mr. Reuterdhal paid the \$2,000 by depositing cash into an account at Columbia Bank as directed by Leitch.

30 ///

III

Violation: By failing to keep an accurate record of rents received and due Leitch demonstrated incompetence in violation of ORS 696.301(12) (2017 Edition) which states a licensee's real estate license may be disciplined if they have demonstrated incompetence or untrustworthiness in performing any act for which the real estate licensee is required to hold a license.

- 3.39 On November 2, 2018, during a phone interview with Hlawatsch, Leitch promised to provide her most recent completed clients' trust and security deposit account reconciliations and supporting documents (Leitch indicated she was behind on reconciling and indicated the last month she had completed was August 2018). She promised the documents would be provided no later than November 5, 2018.
- 3.40 On November 6, 2018, the documents had not been provided, and OREA issued a formal demand for the documents. Leitch was directed to provide her August reconciliations and supporting documents no later than November 13, 2018. The demand was sent to Leitch by email, phone voice mail message and regular mail.
- 3.41 Leitch failed to submit the requested documents by the November 13, 2018 deadline. As of December 6, 2018, Leitch has not submitted the requested documents.

**Violation:** By failing to produce the requested documents, Leitch violated ORS 696.301(3) as it incorporates OAR 863-025-0035(2)(a), (c) (1-1-2018 Edition), which requires a property manager to produce records required under section (1) of this rule for inspection by the Agency as follows: (a) When the Agency makes a request for production of property management records, the property manager must provide such records within no less than five banking days and (c) failure to produce such records within the timelines stated in subsection (a) or (b) of this section is a violation of ORS 696.301. Leitch's actions also demonstrate incompetence in violation of ORS 696.301(12) which states a licensee's real estate license may be disciplined if they have demonstrated incompetence or untrustworthiness in performing any act for which the real estate licensee is required to hold a license.

3.42 Leitch sent several emails to OREA with various reasons why she had been unable to provide the requested documents.

 III

///

///

30 ///

3.43 On November 20, 2018 OREA issued a subpoena for Leach to provide records. Service for the subpoena was attempted on November 21, 2018 at 9:30 am at her main office location (1049 Nautical Drive, Hammond, OR, 97121) for B. Dalton Property Management. In attempting to serve the subpoena to Leitch, it was observed there was no sign identifying the location as a main office. The 1049 Nautical drive location is listed as the main office location for B. Dalton Property Management in the Agency licensing database.

**Violation:** By failing to have a sign designating the main office Leitch violated ORS 696.030 as it incorporates ORS 696.200(1)(c) (2017 Edition) which requires a property manager to designate the main office by a sign that contains the name under which the real estate licensee conducts professional real estate activity.

- 3.44 On November 28, 2018, Leitch was served the subpoena which directed her to provide the requested documents to the Agency no later than December 7, 2018. Leitch never provided the requested documents to the Agency as required by the subpoena.
- 3.45 On November 12, 2018, the Agency received communication relating to another property owner formerly contracted with Leitch. Property manager Carla Sowins (Sowins) forwarded an email (on November 12, 2018) to Hlawatsch containing multiple emails from property owner Polly Buckingham (Buckingham).
- 3.46 In her multiple emails Buckingham was reaching out to her new property manager Sowins expressing frustration about Leitch's failure to respond to the notice or deliver the items requested as follows: owner records, keys, lease agreement and the tenant's security deposit.
- 3.47 The emails indicated that Buckingham gave notice of termination to Leitch effective November 1, 2018. Buckingham wrote that she had sent Leitch the notice around or on September 27, 2018.
- 3.48 In Buckingham's November 12, 2018, email she wrote she had "contacted Brenda a dozen times or more and have not heard back at all."

30 | ///

/// ///

- 3.49 Buckingham's property had been managed by Leitch since 2012. Buckingham initially received disbursements of rental funds directly into her bank account. When the bank closed its Astoria branch Leitch began to mail checks to Buckingham. The payments became very inconsistent with funds only arriving every 4-6 months. Buckingham said she would inquire with Leitch only to be met with delayed response and excuses. Buckingham said waiting months to receive her funds caused financial hardship for her.
- 3.50 Buckingham provided screenshots of texts to and from Leitch over the previous year and a half. The messages presented a pattern of Buckingham requesting rental funds to be disbursed and being met with delayed responses and excuses.

**Violation:** By failing to timely disburse rental income to the property owner Leitch violated ORS 696.301(3) as it incorporates ORS 696.890(4)(c), (e) and (f) (2015 and 2017 Edition) which states (4) a real estate property manager owes the property owner the following affirmative duties: (c) to exercise reasonable care and diligence; (e) to act in a fiduciary manner in all matters relating to trust funds; and (f) to be loyal to the owner by not taking action that is adverse or detrimental to the owner's interest.

3.51 Buckingham said she did recall some documents coming to her at tax time but she had not received her monthly owner statements.

**Violation:** By failing to send monthly owner statements to Buckingham, Leitch violated ORS 696.301(3) as it incorporates OAR 863-025-0055(4) (11-15-16, and 1-1-2018 Edition) which requires a property manager to report in writing to each owner any change in the owner's ledger. A monthly report showing all receipts and disbursements for the account of the owner during the prior monthly period is sufficient under this section.

3.52 Buckingham was unsure if a lease agreement with the tenant was in place for her property managed by Leitch. In November 2013, Leitch had written a statement for Buckingham to use as proof of income as she could not find the lease agreement showing how much rent was being paid. In the statement, Leitch wrote she was "unable to find the copy of current lease."

///

 $/\!/\!\!/$ 

**Violation:** By failing to maintain and/or provide the lease to the property owner, Leitch demonstrated incompetence in violation of ORS 696.301(12) (2013 Edition) which states a licensee's real estate license may be disciplined if they have demonstrated incompetence or untrustworthiness in performing any act for which the real estate licensee is required to hold a license.

3.53 On November 15, 2018, Leitch responded to Buckingham, stating she would "be in touch with the accountant." As of December 6, 2018, Leitch had not provided the documents, keys or funds to Buckingham.

**Violation:** By failing to provide the requested items to the property owner, Leitch demonstrated incompetence in violation of ORS 696.301(12) which states a licensee's real estate license may be disciplined if they have demonstrated incompetence or untrustworthiness in performing any act for which the real estate licensee is required to hold a license.

3.54 All of the above demonstrate Leitch's incompetence in performing any act for which Leitch is required to hold a license.

**Violation:** ORS 696.301(12) (2015-2017 Editions) which states a licensee's real estate license may be disciplined if they have demonstrated incompetence or untrustworthiness in performing any act for which the real estate licensee is required to hold a license.

3.55 Leitch's property management license was reprimanded in 2003. The stipulated order shows violations relating to clients' trust accounts and the notice of the accounts to the bank. In 2010 Leitch's license was reprimanded again and she was required to complete additional continuing education. This latest sanction included similar violations of failing to provide documents to the Agency, failing to produce an owner ledger, and failing to provide an owner with owner statements.

- 4.1 The above violations are grounds for discipline pursuant to ORS 696.301.
- 4.2 Based on these violations, the Agency is revoking Leitch's property manager license. A revocation is appropriate for violations of ORS 696.301(12).

- 4.3 A revocation of Leitch's property manager license is appropriate under ORS 696.396(2)(c)(B) and (D)(2017 Edition). According to ORS 696.396(2)(c)(B) and (D), the Agency may revoke a real estate license if the material facts establish a violation of a ground for discipline under ORS 696.301 that: B) exhibits incompetence in the performance of professional real estate activity; or (D) repeats conduct or an act that is substantially similar to conduct or an act for which the real estate licensee was disciplined previously.
- 4.4 The Agency reserves the rights to investigate or pursue additional complaints that may be received in the future regarding this licensee.

## ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Leitch's property manager license is revoked.

Dated this State day of MARCH , 2019.

OREGON REAL ESTATE AGENCY

Steven Strode

Real Estate Commissioner

Date of Service: 3 5 2019

NOTICE: You are entitled to judicial review of this order. Judicial review may be obtained by filing a petition for review within 60 days from the date of service of this order. Judicial review is pursuant to the provisions of ORS 183.482.