Temporary Principal Broker Or Broker-In-Charge

Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR), section 16-99-3(o) reads, “Prior to the time the principal broker or the broker in charge is absent from the principal place of business for more than thirty calendar days, and no other broker in charge is registered with the principal place of business, the principal broker shall submit to the commission a signed, written notification of the absence designating a temporary principal broker or temporary broker in charge, who shall acknowledge the temporary designation by signing the notification. In case of prolonged illness or death where the principal broker or broker in charge is unable to act, another broker shall be designated as the temporary principal broker or broker in charge within thirty days of the illness or death with appropriate notification to the commission. A temporary principal broker or broker in charge arrangement shall not exceed a period of six months, with the right to extend prior to expiration for another six months for good cause and with the approval of the commission.”

The intent of this rule is to assist a brokerage in maintaining its day-to-day real estate activities should its principal broker be absent thirty or more days, or if an illness or death should affect the principal broker. Although not required, principal brokers should prepare for unexpected events which may affect the operations of the entity. There should be at least one broker in charge in the brokerage. Having a designated broker in charge will allow the brokerage to function despite the absence of the principal broker for thirty or more days.

For the many small brokerages, of 2-5 agents, as an example, this is not often possible to have a broker in charge in place. Still, it’s best to be prepared should anything unexpected occur. For sole proprietorships, this is an even more difficult situation. The sole proprietor may have associating licensees, however, should anything happen to the sole proprietor, say a sudden death or debilitating accident, the associating licensees are faced with no principal broker, no way for the sole proprietorship to continue, as it is tied to the individual’s license, and the prospect of going involuntarily inactive.

The designation of a temporary principal broker or broker in charge is NOT for circumstances where a principal broker is leaving a brokerage. The above rule operates with the assumption that the principal broker is returning. The rule is not to be used if a brokerage has not decided who a new principal broker will be, but has decided they do not want the current principal broker to continue in that position.

The Change Form (“CF”) must be used to designate a temporary principal broker or broker in charge BEFORE the absence of the principal broker occurs. If no CF is filed, there will be no documentation that a licensee has been designated a temporary principal broker or broker in charge.

Note that when a principal broker initially designates a temporary principal broker, the time frame indicated may be up to 6 months in length. If the initial appointment is for 1 month, and PRIOR TO THE EXPIRATION of the appointment time frame, the time frame is extended, there is no requirement for Commission approval. In cases of illness, and the appointment period is extended beyond the first 6 months, a doctors note must accompany the CF, and the matter must go before the Commission for approval.
The Chair’s Message

Recently, we witnessed firsthand the application of Hawaii’s Owner-Occupant Law in the less than a 2-day “sell out” of the owner-occupant designated units at the One Ala Moana condominium project. Buyers waited in line before the break of dawn and for hours at the project’s sales office to have an opportunity to acquire one of the designated owner-occupant units in the project.

Hawaii’s Owner-Occupant Law was promulgated in 1980 by our legislature in response to growing public concern at what was then viewed as rampant speculation by investors in the condominium presale market. Essentially, developers were offering investor buyers first priority to purchase units in their projects, resulting in resale prices unaffordable for residential buyers.

Accordingly, as a consumer protection measure, the Owner-Occupant Law was enacted. Today, the Owner-Occupant Law is codified as Part V, Subpart B of the Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 514B.1

Generally, except for a few exceptions discussed below, a developer of a condominium project containing residential units is required to designate at least fifty percent of the total residential units in the project for sale to prospective owner-occupants.2 An “owner-occupant” is defined by law as “any individual in whose name sole or joint legal title is held in a residential unit that, simultaneous to such ownership, serves as the individual’s principal residence, as defined by the department of taxation, for a period of not less than three hundred sixty-five consecutive days; provided that the individual shall retain complete possessory control of the premises of the residential unit during this period.”3 The law further clarifies that the individual shall not be deemed to have “complete possessory control of the premises” if the individual rents, leases, or assigns the premises to another person; however conveyance to a trust for estate planning purposes is permissible if the premises continues to be used as the individual’s principal residence.4

The designation of the units for sale to prospective owner-occupants must constitute a “proportionate representation” of all the residential units in the project with regard to factors such as square footage, number of bedrooms and bathrooms, floor level, and whether or not the unit has a lanai.5 The designated units shall be set forth in either a chronological system or a public lottery system.

Under the chronological system, for thirty days following the date of the first published owner-occupant announcement, the developer or its broker shall offer the designated residential units to prospective buyers chronologically in the order in which the buyers submit to the developer or its broker a completed owner-occupant affidavit (a specimen form is available from the Commission), an executed sales contract, and an earnest money deposit.6 The developer, its employees, agents and real estate licensees are prohibited, either directly or through any other person, from releasing any information or informing any prospective owner-occupant about the announcement, including the date it is to appear and when the chronological system will be initiated, until after the announcement is published.7

In the public lottery system, from the date of the first published owner-occupant announcement until five calendar days after the last published announcement, the developer or its project broker shall compile and maintain a list of all prospective owner-occupants who have submitted a duly executed owner-occupant affidavit.8 All prospective owner-occupants on the list shall be included in a public lottery, to be held on the date, time, and location set forth in the published announcement. The lottery shall be conducted no later than the thirtieth day following the date of the first published announcement.9 Prospective owner-occupants eligible for the lottery must be allowed to attend the lottery.10 After the public lottery, each prospective owner-occupant buyer, in the order in which they are selected in the lottery, shall be given the opportunity to select one of the designated residential units, execute a sales contract, and submit an earnest money deposit.11

With both systems, the developer or its real estate broker must maintain at all times a sufficient number of sales contracts and owner-occupant affidavits for prospective owner-occupants to execute. Prospective qualifying buyers that did not have the opportunity to select a unit under either system must be placed on a backup reservation list.
Regardless of the method utilized by the developer to sell residential units to prospective owner-occupants, the buyer must submit a completed owner-occupant affidavit to the developer. The owner-occupant affidavit must include a statement by the buyer affirming that the buyer will notify the Commission immediately upon any decision to cease being an owner-occupant.\textsuperscript{14}

There are several types of residential condominium projects that are exempt from the requirements of the Owner-Occupant Law. These include smaller condominium projects consisting of two or fewer units, condominium projects where the developer conveys all of the residential units in the project to a spouse, or family members related by blood, descent or adoption, and other certain types of government approved housing projects.\textsuperscript{15} Further, the Hawaii Administrative Rules provide an exemption for residential condominium projects built in county zoned or designated hotel and resort areas in Waikiki.\textsuperscript{16}

There are also extenuating circumstances which may occur which can affect an owner-occupant's ability to comply with the Owner-Occupant Law, such as unforeseeable job or military transfer, serious illness of any owner-occupant, and/or unforeseeable change in marital or parental status. The Commission may consider such extenuating circumstances and based on its finding, may cease any action for enforcement of the Owner-Occupant Law on the owner-occupant.\textsuperscript{17}

Non-compliance with the owner-occupant requirements may result in the Commission conducting an investigation into the matter and an injunctive action being brought by the Commission enjoining the developer from continuing any violation or performing any acts in furtherance of such violation.\textsuperscript{18} Further, in the event that a person who executes an owner-occupant affidavit violates or fails to comply with any of the provisions of the Owner-Occupant Law, such person shall be subject to a civil penalty of whichever is the greater of $10,000, or fifty percent of the net proceeds received or to be received by the person from the sale or other transfer of the residential unit which the violation relates.\textsuperscript{19} A developer, employee, agent of the developer, or real estate licensee who violates or fails to comply with the Owner-Occupant Law is also subject to a civil penalty up to $10,000, with each violation constituting a separate offense.\textsuperscript{20}

With increasing condominium development and the rising demand for condominium units in Honolulu, buyers, developers and real estate licensees should review and be familiar with the requirements of Hawaii’s Owner-Occupant Law. Understanding the entire process is necessary for developers to ensure compliance with the presale notice and selling requirements and is critical for buyers’ agents, whose clients will rely on their real estate agent to ensure they are best positioned in an owner-occupant offering to have an opportunity to purchase a residential unit.

* * *

The information provided herein is provided for informational purposes and does not offer any specific legal advice or counsel on any issue discussed herein.

\[\text{(s) Nikki T. Senter, Chair}\]

\textsuperscript{1} HRS, Sections 514B-95 to 99.5.
\textsuperscript{2} HRS, Section 514B-96.
\textsuperscript{3} HRS, Section 514B-95.
\textsuperscript{4} HRS, Section 514B-95.
\textsuperscript{5} HRS, Section 514B-96(a).
\textsuperscript{6} HRS, Section 514B-96.
\textsuperscript{7} HRS, Section 514B-95.5.
\textsuperscript{8} HRS, Section 514B-96.5(a)(1).
\textsuperscript{9} HRS, Section 514B-96.5(a)(3).
\textsuperscript{10} HRS, Section 514B-96.5(b)(1).
\textsuperscript{11} HRS, Section 514B-96.5(b)(2).
\textsuperscript{12} HRS, Section 514B-96.5(b)(2).
\textsuperscript{13} HRS, Section 514B-96.5(b)(4).
\textsuperscript{14} HRS, Section 514B-97(b).
\textsuperscript{15} HRS, Section 514B-99.5(a).
\textsuperscript{16} HAR, Section 16-107-28.
\textsuperscript{17} This section, however, references the former HRS, Chapter 514A.
\textsuperscript{18} HRS, Section 514B-98.5(b).
\textsuperscript{19} HRS, Section 514B-98.5.
\textsuperscript{20} HRS, Section 514B-99(a).
\textsuperscript{21} HRS, Section 514B-99(b).
The rule-making process is a long and tedious one. The Real Estate Commission has begun the rule-making journey and announced the suggested rule-amendments in the February 2011 issue of the Bulletin. One of the proposed changes is to Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR) section 16-99-11(e)(2) and (3). The proposed changes will read, “All advertising and promotional materials that refer to the individual licensee’s name, including but not limited to business cards, shall: . . . (2) Identify the licensee with the licensee’s associating or employing brokerage firm; and the font size of the name of the brokerage firm shall be at least the same sized font as the licensee’s name; and (3) Include the licensee’s license number as issued by the commission.” (The underscored material is the proposed language to be added to the rules.)

Word of the proposed rule to include the licensee’s license number in all advertising has made its way to the masses. “Rumors” spread quickly, and unfortunately, the fact of the matter is often distorted or totally lost.

The proposed changes are just that at this time, PROPOSED. No changes have been made to the existing rules regarding advertisements. **There is no requirement to include the licensee’s license number AT THIS TIME.**

The EXISTING RULES require that real estate licensees “Specify that the licensee is a broker (B), or salesperson (S), or if a current member of the Hawaii Association of Realtors, Realtor (R) or Realtor-Associate (RA).” This rule is PROPOSED FOR DELETION.

However, at this time, the rule is existing and currently in effect.

IF the proposed changes are approved, licensees will have to include their license number as issued by the Commission. Do you know what your license number is? Real estate brokers have a license suffix of RB, while salespersons have a suffix of RS. There may be between four to six digits following the suffix. Do not confuse your real estate license number with your board of REALTORS® member number. They are DIFFERENT.

DO NOT PANIC. When the new rules are approved, there will, more than likely, be a period of time for licensees to comply.

REMEMBER: all rules for advertising apply to ALL FORMS OF ADVERTISING. This may include your business card, your letterhead, your website, your signage, etc.

---

**Scott C. Arakaki Confirmed as Commissioner**

The Senate confirmed the appointment of Scott C. Arakaki to the Real Estate Commission on Monday, March 11, 2013. Mr. Arakaki has been an interim member since August 1, 2012, as a County of Honolulu public member. His term will end on June 30, 2016.

Mr. Arakaki is an attorney specializing in the areas of real estate and commercial transactions and law, and personal injury litigation. He received his Juris Doctor degree from the University of Notre Dame, and his Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Hawaii – Manoa.

He is an instructor of real estate continuing education, has co-authored real estate continuing education courses, as well as articles which have appeared in several publications.
Factual Findings: On 10/14/98, a hearing was held before the Professional Standards and Arbitration Committee (“PSAC”) of the Honolulu Board of Realtors in Case No. 08-18(E), filed by the Complainant against Tom Mukai, alleging ethical violations in the sale of the Complainant’s real property.

On 10/27/08, a decision was issued determining that Respondent Mukai violated Article 9 of the National Association of Realtors Code of Ethics based on his failure to ensure that all agreements were in writing and furnished to the Complainant.

Respondent Mukai did not provide the Complainant with a fully executed listing agreement that had the price or terms of listing filled in.

Respondent Benton, as a broker in charge for Respondent Prudential, was delegated the supervision duty for this matter and signed off on the Exclusive Right-to-Sell Listing Agreement.

Respondent Lindemann had no involvement in this transaction.

Respondent Mukai acknowledged that his conduct violated HAR §§16-99-3(f), (i) and (l). Based on the PSAC decision, the Hearings Officer concludes that Respondent Mukai violated HRS § 436B-19(9). The Hearings Officer also concludes that Respondent Mukai’s conduct constituted a violation of HRS § 467-14(20).

RICO also alleged that Respondents Benton and Lindemann, as the broker in charge and principal broker, respectively, for Respondent Mukai and Respondent Prudential should be held responsible for the violations committed by Respondent Mukai. The Hearings Officer found that Respondent Benton, as the designated broker in charge, and who signed off on the Exclusive Right-to-Sell Listing Agreement, is also liable for the violations of HRS §§ 467-14(20), 436B-19(9) and HAR §§ 16-99-3(f), (i) and (l). With respect to Respondent Lindemann, the Hearings Officer finds that she should not be held responsible for the violations committed by Respondent Mukai, since Respondent Benton, as the broker in charge, was delegated the supervision duty for this transaction. Respondent Prudential can only act as a real estate licensee through its principal broker who, in this case, delegated her responsibility over this transaction to Respondent Benton. The Hearings Officer concludes that Respondent Prudential is also responsible for the violations of HRS §§ 467—14(20), 436B-19(9) and HAR §§ 16-99-3(f), (i) and (l) and all charges against Respondent Lindemann be dismissed.

On 7/5/11, RICO filed exceptions to the Recommended Decision. On 7/20/11, Respondents filed a statement in support of the Recommended Decision. On 8/5/11, Respondents filed exceptions to the Recommended Decision. On 8/5/11, the Hawaii Association of Realtors and the Honolulu Board of Realtors filed briefs of amici curiae. On 11/18/11, RICO filed a Motion to Strike the amici curiae briefs. On 11/22/11, Respondents filed a Memorandum In Opposition to Petitioner’s Motion to Strike the amici curiae briefs. On 11/23/11, the Commission allowed the parties to present oral argument. On 12/16/11, the Commission issued its Proposed Final Order (“PFO”) stating the Petitioner is entitled to an order concluding that Respondents Mukai, Benton, and Prudential violated §§ 16-99-3(f), (i), and (l), HAR. On 12/29/11, Petitioner filed exceptions to the Commission’s PFO and request ed oral argument. On 1/3/12, the Hearings Office scheduled oral argument on 2/24/12. On 1/13/12, Respondents filed a statement in support of the Commission’s PFO. Oral arguments were held on 2/24/12 from Mr. Kelly (RICO) and Mr. Imanaka (Respondents).

On 3/23/12, the Commission issued its second PFO, proposing that Petitioner is entitled to an order concluding that Respondents Mukai, Benton, and Prudential violated HAR §§ 16-99-3(f), (i) and (l). In addition, the Commission proposed the conclusion that Respondents Mukai, Benton, and Prudential violated HRS §§ 467-14(20) (failure to maintain a reputation for or record of competency, honesty, truthfulness, financial integrity, and fail dealing) and 436B-19(9) (conduct or practice contrary to recognized standards of ethics for the licensed profession or vocation).

Regarding Respondent Lindemann, the Commission proposed to deny Petitioner’s Motion for Summary Judgment and remand this portion of the case to the Hearings Officer for appropriate action.

On 5/9/12, Respondents Mukai, Benton, Lindemann, and Prudential filed exceptions to the Commission’s Second PFO dated
Tom Mukai, Brian Benton, Helen Lindemann, and Prudential Locations, LLC
Broker-RB 11789
Broker-RB 17903
Broker-RB 9039
Broker-RB 17095
Case No. REC 2008-215-L
Dated 12/21/12
(cont.)

3/23/12, and requested oral argument. On 7/27/12, the Commission heard oral arguments from counsel. On 10/10/12, the Commission issued its Final Order concluding that Respondents Mukai, Benton, and Prudential violated HAR §§ 16-99-3(f), (i) and (l). However, the Commission concluded that there were no violations of HRS §§ 467-14(20) and 436B-19(9) by Respondents Mukai, Benton, and Prudential and, therefore, dismissed these charges. On 10/17/12, Petitioner filed a Motion for Reconsideration of Commission’s Final Order filed 10/11/12, and Request For Oral Argument (“Motion for Reconsideration”). On 10/24/12, Respondents filed its Reply to Petitioner’s Motion For Reconsideration and Request For Oral Argument (“Reply”).

On 10/26/12, the parties appeared before the Commission. After hearing oral argument from the parties, the Commission informed the parties that the Commission voted to rescind the Commission’s Final Order dated 10/10/12. The Commission also voted to issue a new order. On 10/29/12, Respondents filed a Supplemental Memorandum In Opposition To Petitioner’s Motion For Reconsideration Of Commission’s Final Order Filed 10/11/12. On 11/7/12, the Commission issued a Minute Order reflecting its decisions on 10/26/12.

The Commission denies Petitioner’s Motion for Reconsideration. The Commission adopts the Hearings Officer’s recommended Findings of Fact in her Recommended Decision. The Commission concludes that the conduct of Respondents Mukai, Benton, and Prudential constituted grounds for disciplinary action pursuant to HAR §§ 16-99-3(f), (i) and (l). Thus, the Commission grants Petitioner’s Motion for Summary Judgment against these parties with respect to these three rules.

Regarding the alleged violations of HRS §§ 467-14(20) and 436B-19(9), the Commission denies Petitioner’s Motion for Summary Judgment against Respondents Mukai, Benton, Lindemann, and Prudential. The facts do not support the Hearings Officer’s recommended conclusion that Respondent’s failed to “maintain a reputation for or record of competency, honesty, truthfulness, financial integrity, and fair dealing” pursuant to HRS § 467-14(20). Instead, the record shows that “Respondent Mukai did not provide the Complainant with a fully executed listing agreement that had the price or terms of listing filled in.”

The Commission further exercises its collective expertise in concluding that the facts of this particular case do not support the Hearings Officer’s recommended conclusion that Respondents’ acts and omissions are “conduct or practice contrary to recognized standards of ethics for the licensed profession” pursuant to HRS § 437B-19(9). Petitioner argues that Respondent Mukai admitted to violating the ethical standards set forth in HAR §§ 16-99-3(f), (i) and (l).

The record also reflects a finding that a third party organization, the Professional Standards and Arbitration Committee (“PSAC”) of the Honolulu Board of Realtors, concluded that Respondent Mukai violated Article 9 of the National Association of Realtors Code of Ethics. The Commission neither accepts nor rejects PSAC’s opinion and concludes that under all the circumstances of this case, the conduct of Respondents Mukai, Benton, Lindemann and Prudential does not constitute grounds for disciplinary action pursuant to HRS § 436B-19(9). Whether a third party organization’s opinion supports or does not support grounds for disciplinary action is also a highly fact-specific determination which the Commission will consider on a case-by-case basis.

The Commission asserts its authority to adopt, modify, or reverse, “in whole or in part, the hearings officer’s recommended decision.” The Commission rejects and reverses the Hearings Officer’s recommended conclusions that Respondents Mukai, Benton, Lindemann, and Prudential violated HRS §§ 467-14(20) and 436B-19(9). The Commission dismisses the alleged violations of HRS §§ 467-14(20) and 436B-19(9).

Regarding the alleged violations of HRS § 467-1.6, the Commission concludes that this statute is inapplicable to Respondents Mukai and Prudential because they are not principal brokers. To the extent Petitioner’s Motion for Summary Judgment alleges a violation of HRS § 467-1.6 against Respondents Mukai and Prudential, the Commission denies and dismisses such charges.

Regarding the alleged violations of HRS § 467-1.6, the Commission concludes that this statute is inapplicable to Respondents Mukai and Prudential because they are not principal brokers. To the extent Petitioner’s Motion for Summary Judgment alleges a violation of HRS § 467-1.6 against Respondents Mukai and Prudential, the Commission denies and dismisses such charges.
Commission notes that Respondent Lindemann’s affidavit dated 7/19/11, attesting that Respondent Benton was authorized to act as broker-in-charge for Respondent Prudential was first submitted with Respondents’ Statement in Support of the Hearings Officer’s Recommended Decision filed on 7/20/12. It appears that this information – as well as other information submitted with post-hearing pleadings – may not have been before the Hearings Officer when she issued her Recommended Decision dated 6/21/11. The Commission instructs the Hearings Officer to consider information pertaining to Respondents Lindemann and Benton submitted in post-hearing pleadings.

The Commission also notes the Hearings Officer had informed the parties by letter dated 11/18/10, that she was granting Petitioner’s Motion for Summary Judgment and that a “hearing on 12/8/10, would only involve testimony regarding mitigating/aggravating circumstances relating to the sanctions . . . .” Contrary to her decision, the Hearings Officer in her Recommended Decision found that Respondent Lindemann “should not be held responsible for the violations committed by Respondent Mukai, since Respondent Benton, as broker-in-charge, was delegated the supervision duty for this transaction.” The Hearings Officer recommended “that all charges against Respondent Lindemann be dismissed.” Given the inconsistent recommendations of the Hearings Officer and in accordance with HAR § 16-201-39, the Commission remands this portion of the case for taking of further evidence as to whether Respondent Lindemann’s or Benton’s conduct constitutes grounds for disciplinary action pursuant to HRS § 467-1.6, and for recommended findings of fact and conclusions of law not inconsistent with this order. Sanctions, if any, against Respondents Lindemann and Benton shall depend upon the Hearings Officer’s recommendations and the Commission’s subsequent deliberations.

Regardless of whether the conduct of Mukai, Benton and Prudential constituted grounds for disciplinary action, the Commission in each of its previous orders in this matter has consistently determined that their conduct warranted payment of a fine for Respondents Mukai, Benton, and Prudential, and successful completion of an education course or courses for Respondents Mukai and Benton.

Hearings Officer’s Recommended Order: $5,000 fine – Mukai. $5,000 fine to be paid jointly by Benton and Prudential.

Mukai and Benton are required to take and complete an education course or courses to be determined by the REC.

Violations: HRS §§ 436B-19(9) and 467-14(20), HAR §§ 16-99-3(f), 3(i) and 3(l). Benton also violated: HRS §§ 467-1.6(b)(2) and (b)(3).

Final Order: $5,000 fine – Mukai. $5,000 fine Benton and Prudential.

Mukai and Benton are required to take and complete an education course or courses to be determined by the REC.

Violations: HAR §§ 16-99-3(f), 16-99-3(i), 16-99-3(l)
Administrative Actions  (cont. from page 7)

January 2013

Heleena D. Oliveira aka Heleena D. Hawkins  
Salesperson–RS 70971  
Case No: REC 2011-27-L  
Dated 1/25/13

**Allegation:** On or about 11/25/09, Respondent pled no contest in the District Court of the Second Circuit, State of Hawaii, for the crime of driving under the influence. Respondent disclosed the conviction in writing to the Commission as part of the renewal process.

**Sanction:** Pay a $500.00 administrative fine

**Violations:** HRS §§436B-19(12), (14) and (17)

Michael D. Styring, Hawaii Realty International, LLC & Paul Adams  
Salesperson – RS 62171  
Broker–RB 20334  
Broker–RB 20304  
Case No: REC 2012-102-L  
Dated 1/25/13

**Allegation:** Respondent Styring’s license expired on 12/31/10. Respondent Styring promptly restored his license upon learning it had expired. Respondent Styring conducted real estate activity while his license was expired. Respondents Hawaii Realty International, LLC and Paul Adams failed to ensure Respondent Styring’s license was renewed timely.

**Sanction:** Styring – pay a $500.00 fine; Adams and Hawaii Realty International, LLC pay a $500.00 fine

**Violations:** HRS §467-7; HRS §467-1.6(b)(7)

Premier Resorts International, Inc.  
Broker–RB 17152  
Case No: REC-2010-205-L  
Dated 1/25/13

**Factual Findings:** In or about 2009, Respondent entered into 15 management contracts for apartments in the Whaler’s Cove condominium located at 2640 Puuholo Road in Koloa, Kauai. The management contracts called for Respondent to act as rental agent for the unit owners in exchange for a percentage of the rental proceeds. The unit owners were issued accounting statements for August and September 2009. However, no rental proceeds were paid to the owners for those months. Respondent improperly withheld a total of $95,051.90 in rental proceeds for August and September 2009 from the 15 unit owners.

**Correction:** The February 2013 issue reflected sanctions against both Premier Resorts International, Inc. and Steven E. Jackson. The resulting sanction reflected a Partial Settlement Agreement against only Steven E. Jackson. The Factual Findings reflected above is against Premier Resorts International, Inc.

**Order:** License Revocation

**Violations:** HRS §§467-14(7), (8), (16) and (20); HRS §436B-19(7), (11)

February 2013

Denis Fuster, Jessica Hall, David W. Deweese and Aloha Coast Realty, LLC.  
Broker–RB 20748  
Broker–RB 18796  
Broker–RB 19470  
Broker–RB 19604  
Case No: REC 2010-329-L  
Dated 2/22/13

**Allegations – Jessica Hall:** Sometime in 2010 the Respondent, along with licensee Denis Fuster (“Fuster”) served as agents for an owner who listed for sale his property in Pahoa, Hawaii that year. Respondent and Fuster were affiliated with Aloha Coast Realty, LLC at the time. Pursuant to the terms of a valid listing agreement, Respondent and Fuster marketed the Pahoa property from 4/20/10 - 7/20/10. On or about 6/18/10, the seller instructed Respondent to reduce the list price of the home from $255,000 to $249,900. On or about 6/20/10, the seller was informed that the change in the list price had been made. Sometime in August of 2010 the seller was informed by Aloha Realty, LLC, that the list price had not been changed until 7/13/10.

**Sanction:** Pay a $500.00 administrative fine.

**Violation:** HAR §16-99-3(i); HRS §467-14(13)
Denis Fuster, Jessica Hall, David W. Deweese and Aloha Coast Realty, LLC.
Broker-RB 20748
Broker-RB 18796
Broker-RB 19470
Broker-RB 19604
Case No: REC 2010-329-L
Dated 2/22/13

**Allegations – Denis Fuster:** Sometime in 2010 the Respondent, along with licensee Jessica Hall (“Hall”) served as agents for an owner who listed his property in Pahoa, Hawaii that year. Respondent and Hall were affiliated with Aloha Coast Realty, LLC at the time. Pursuant to the terms of a valid listing agreement, Respondent and Hall marketed the Pahoa property from 4/20/10-7/20/10. On or about 6/18/10, the seller instructed Hall to reduce the list price of the home from $255,000 to $249,900. On or about 6/20/10, the seller was informed that the change in the list price had been made. Sometime in August of 2010 the seller was informed by Aloha Realty, LLC, that the list price had not been changed until 7/13/10.

(Respondent was licensed as real estate salesperson RS 65475. The license has since been upgraded and Respondent now holds RB 20748)

**Sanction:** Pay a $500.00 administrative fine.

**Violation:** HAR §16-99-3(i); HRS §467-14(13)

Linda Lin Del Piano aka Linda W. Del Piano
Salesperson-RS 61835
Case No: REC 2012-191-L
Dated 2/22/13

**Allegations:** On or about 4/19/12, Respondent pled no contest in the District Court of the Third Circuit, State of Hawaii, for the crime of driving under the influence. The Respondent disclosed the conviction in writing to the Commission on or about 5/30/12. The Respondent fulfilled all court-imposed terms and conditions of the conviction.

**Sanction:** Pay a $500.00 administrative fine.

**Violations:** HRS §§436B-19(12), (14), (17)

Hiromi Farmer
Salesperson-RS 64612
Case No: REC 2012-296-L
Dated 2/22/13

**Allegations:** On or about 6/28/12, Respondent pled no contest in the District Court of the First Circuit, State of Hawaii, to the crime of driving under the influence. The Respondent disclosed the conviction in writing to the Commission on or about 7/26/12. The Respondent fulfilled all court-imposed terms and conditions of the conviction.

**Sanction:** Pay a $500.00 administrative fine.

**Violations:** HRS §§436B-19(12), (14), (17)

Jeff Minster aka Jeff I. Minster
Salesperson-RS 72969
Case No: REC 2012-281-L
Dated 2/22/13

**Allegations:** On or about 9/27/11, Respondent pled no contest in the District Court of the First Circuit, State of Hawaii, for the crime of driving under the influence. The Respondent disclosed the conviction in writing to the Commission on or about 7/5/12. The Respondent fulfilled all court-imposed terms and conditions of the conviction.

**Sanction:** Pay a $500.00 administrative fine.

**Violations:** HRS §§436B-19(12), (14), (17)
Brandon Lee Moore  
Salesperson-RS 69080  
Case No: REC 2011-138-L  
Dated 2/22/13

Factual Findings: On or about 8/17/09, a no contest plea judgment was entered against Respondent in the District Court of the First Circuit, State of Hawaii, for the crime of driving under the influence. Respondent disclosed the conviction in writing to the Commission on his 12/30/10 license renewal application. Respondent fulfilled all court-imposed terms and conditions of the conviction. The address of Respondent on file with the Professional and Vocational Licensing Division of the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs is not current and has not been current for several months. Respondent failed to file in writing with the Commission an address change form within ten days of the change in Respondent’s address. During the investigation of this matter, Petitioner was able to communicate with Respondent via email. Although Petitioner requested that Respondent provide Petitioner with his current address, Respondent failed to do so. As a direct result, Petitioner was forced to serve the petition herein on Respondent by publication at a cost of $587.81.

Order: Pay a $1,500.00 fine together with the costs of publication in the sum of $587.81.

Violations: HRS §§436B-19(14), (17); HAR §16-99-5(a)(1)

Faye C.K. Lee and Golden House Management, Inc.  
Broker-RB 15531  
Broker-RB 19464  
Case No’s: REC 2009-364-L; REC 2010-331-L; REC 2011-111-L; REC 2011-112-L  
Dated 2/6/13

Factual Findings: Golden House Realty & Management Incorporated was licensed as a real estate broker under license number RB 15635. Respondent Lee surrendered license number RB 15635 on 5/31/07. On 2/1/11, Golden House Realty & Management Incorporated’s name was changed to Golden House Management, Inc. On 3/12/07, Golden House Realty Hawaii, Inc. was licensed as a real estate broker under license number RB 19464. On 2/1/11, Golden House Realty Hawaii, Inc. ceased to exist as a legal entity, as it was merged in to Respondent Golden House. Effective 9/20/11, license number RB 19464 was transferred to Respondent Golden House. On 8/13/03, Respondent Lee was convicted of driving under the influence. On 8/29/03, judgment in the amount of $450.00 was entered against Golden House Realty and Management, Inc. in the District Court of the First Circuit, Civil No: ISC03-1-602 relating to Respondent Lee’s failure to return a security deposit. This judgment was satisfied on 8/21/04. Respondent Lee answered “No” to the questions: “Are there now or have there ever been any law suits, unpaid judgments, outstanding tax liens, or any other type of involuntary liens against any owner, corporation, officer of the corporation, major stockholder, partner, manager, or member of the entity?” and “In the past 20 years, has any owner, corporation, officer of the corporation, major stockholder, partner, manager or member of the entity ever been convicted of a crime in which the conviction has not been annulled or expunged?” On 11/4/04, Respondent Lee submitted a renewal application for her real estate license. Respondent Lee answered “No” to the question: “In the past 2 years have you been convicted of a crime in which the conviction has not been annulled or expunged?” On 11/17/05, judgment in the amount of $997.95 was entered against Golden House Realty and Management, Inc. in the District Court of the First Circuit, Civil No: 1SC05-1-1310 relating to Respondent Lee’s failure to return a security deposit. According to Respondent Lee, the judgment was paid on 3/31/06. This judgment was not reported to the (cont. page 11)
Faye C.K. Lee and Golden House Management, Inc.
Broker-RB 15531
Broker-RB 19464
Case No’s: REC 2009-364-L; REC 2010-331-L; REC 2011-111-L; REC 2011-112-L
Dated 2/6/13
(cont.)

Commission. On 9/12/06, Respondent was again convicted of driving under the influence. On 3/12/07, Respondent Lee submitted an application for a real estate license for Golden House Realty Hawaii, Inc. Respondent Lee answered “No” to the questions: “In the past 20 years, have you ever been convicted of a crime in which the conviction has not been annulled or expunged?” and “Are there any pending lawsuits, unpaid judgments, outstanding tax obligations, or any other type of involuntary liens against you?”

Respondent Lee certified that the statements and answers on the application and accompanying documents were true and correct. On 8/2/07, judgment in the amount of $2,081.00 was entered against Golden House Realty and Management, Inc. in the District Court of the First Circuit, Civil No: 1SC07-1-1018 relating to its failure to return a security deposit. Respondent Lee indicates that she paid $1,500.00 of this judgment. This judgment was not reported to the Commission. On 3/30/09, judgment in the amount of $900.01 was entered against Golden House Realty and Management, Inc. in the District Court of the First Circuit, Civil No: 1SC08-1-2062 relating to Respondent’s failure to return a security deposit. A Garnishee Order was placed on the account of Golden House Realty and Management, Inc. for the amount of the judgment, but there was no evidence that the funds were paid to the Plaintiff in the case. This judgment was not reported to the Commission. On 10/1/10, Respondent Lee submitted an application for a beauty operator license. Respondent Lee answered “No” to the question: “In the past 20 years have you been convicted of a crime in which the conviction has not been annulled or expunged?” Respondent certified that the statements, answers and representations made on application were true and correct. On 10/11/10, judgment in the amount of $1,328.75 was entered against Respondent Golden House in the District Court of the First Circuit, Civil No: 1SC10-1-268 relating to Respondent Lee’s failure to return a security deposit. In 2010, Respondent Lee paid $328.75 of the judgment. In May 2012, Petitioner paid $1,000.00 of the judgment. This judgment was not reported to the Commission. On 12/30/10, judgment in the amount of $552.16 was entered against Respondent Golden House in the District Court of the First Circuit, Civil No: 1SC10-1-2079 relating to Respondent Lee’s failure to return a security deposit. The judgment was not paid by Respondents; however, their bank account was garnished. This judgment was not reported to the Commission.

Order: A) Revocation of broker’s license for Golden House Management, Inc.
B) Broker’s license of Lee is placed on probation for five (5) years, subject to the following conditions:
1) Lee shall not be a principal broker, sole proprietor or broker-in-charge.
2) Lee shall not have disbursement authority for funds or property received in trust and shall timely relinquish all such funds or property to Respondent Lee’s supervising principal broker.
3) Lee shall not practice real estate unless she is associated with and under the direct supervision of a principal broker at all times.
4) Lee shall inform her supervising principal broker that Lee’s license is on probation and conditioned, and provide her supervising principal broker with a copy of the Recommended Decision and this Order. Her supervising broker shall acknowledge receipt of a copy of the Recommended Decision and this Order, and accept responsibility for supervising Lee.
5) Any change of association and/or employment by Lee to another supervising principal broker shall be submitted in writing to the Commission with the new principal broker acknowledging receipt of a copy of the Recommended Decision and this Order, and acceptance of responsibility for supervising Lee.
6) Within 45 days of this Order, Lee shall submit the name of her proposed supervising principal broker to the Commission for its approval. Lee shall not practice real estate until the Commission approves of her supervising principal broker.
7) Within 45 days of this Order, Lee shall wind-up and conclude the affairs of Golden House until the Commission approves of her supervising principal broker.
8) Within 30 days of this Order, Lee shall pay a $2,500 fine.
9) Lee shall conduct herself to remain free of judgment, civil or otherwise. Any judgment entered against Lee during her five years of probation may constitute grounds for further disciplinary action against Lee’s license, including but not limited to suspension or revocation.
10) If a judgment of any type is entered against Lee, Lee shall report such judgment to the Commission within thirty (30) days of the date of the judgment. Failure to timely report any judgment to the Commission.
(cont. page 12)
February 2013 (cont.)

Faye C.K. Lee and Golden House Management, Inc.
Broker-RB 15531
Broker-RB 19464
Case No’s: REC 2009-364-L; REC 2010-331-L; REC 2011-111-L; REC 2011-112-L
Dated 2/6/13

Commission shall constitute grounds for further disciplinary action against Lee’s license including, but not limited to, suspension or revocation.

11) Within six (6) months of this Order, Lee shall take and successfully complete, at her own expense, twelve (12) hours of education, three (3) hours of which shall be in property management subject matter. The nine (9) remaining hours shall be fulfilled by successfully completing course or courses to be determined by the Commission.

C) If Lee fails to pay the fine within the time specified or otherwise fails to comply with any aforementioned conditions, upon filing of a declaration by the Petitioner attesting to such failure, Lee’s license shall be automatically suspended.

D) After the five (5) year probation period has expired, Lee shall return to the Commission for its approval if she seeks to have the aforementioned conditions removed.

March 2013

Brandon K.P.T. Wong, aka Brandon Wong
Salesperson-RS 74036
Case No: REC 2012-171-L
Dated 3/22/13

Allegation: On or about 12/5/11, Respondent pled no contest in the District Court of the First Circuit, State of Hawaii, for the crime of driving under the influence. The Respondent disclosed the conviction in writing to the Commission on or about 4/27/12 and fulfilled all court-imposed terms and conditions of the conviction.

Sanction: Pay a $500.00 administrative fine

Violations: HRS §§436B-19(12), (14) and (17)

Prudential Locations, LLC,
Helen Lindemann, Brian Benton, Tom Mukai
Broker-RB 17095
Broker-RB 9039
Broker-RB 17903
Broker-RB 11789
Case No’s:
REC 2011-54-L
REC 2011-61-L
REC 2011-76-L
REC 2011-77-L
Dated 3/22/13

Allegation: RICO alleges that in or around October 2010, each Respondent submitted electronic applications to renew their licenses. Each renewal application contained instructions that the renewal applications are “To be completed by the Licensee”; “Licensee must answer the following questions”; and required the licensee to enter their name on the application. The renewal applications also stated, “By clicking on the “NEXT” button below, I certify that I have read the above statements and that the same are true and correct.” Said renewal applications were submitted with the false answer “No” to the question “Are there any disciplinary actions pending against you in this state or any other jurisdiction?” Said applications were submitted with certifications “I certify that the statements contained in this application are true and correct. I understand that misrepresentation is grounds for board refusal to renew or subsequent suspension or revocation of license.” Respondents PRUDENTIAL LOCATIONS, LLC, LINDEMANN AND BENTON state that they did not complete the renewal applications in 2008 and 2010, did not review those applications before said applications were submitted, and did not intend to mislead anyone. Respondent MUKAI states that there was no attempt to mislead anyone in the renewal of his license and was not aware of the misstatement until after the license renewal was submitted. The following licenses affiliated with Respondent PRUDENTIAL LOCATIONS, LLC were renewed electronically by someone other than the licensee and without the licensee answering and certifying the renewal application:

(Cont. page 13)
Committee Meetings on Kauai

From time to time, the Hawaii Real Estate Commission holds its monthly standing committee meetings on a Neighbor Island. In conjunction with these meetings, the Commission’s Real Estate and Condominium Specialists will set up offices for the day to discuss real estate licensing and condominium concerns with interested parties.

The next such meeting will take place on Wednesday, June 12, 2013, at the Kauai State Office Building, 3060 Eiwa Street, Lihue, 9:30 a.m.

The Laws and Rules Review Committee will convene at 9:30 a.m., and following its adjournment, the Condominium Review Committee will convene, and lastly, following its adjournment, the Education Review Committee will convene.

The Specialists are prepared to discuss questions about licensing laws and rules, license applications, broker experience certificate applications, examination administration, continuing education, new legislation, Commission procedures, educational programs, and related topics.

Other questions that may come up at the sessions concern boards, associations, meetings, managing agents, condominium association registration, condominium hotel operators, fidelity bonding, the condominium property regime statute, public reports, project registration, new legislation, reserves, and other condominium-related topics.

If you have any questions or would like to set up an appointment, you may contact a Real Estate Specialist or Condominium Specialist at (808) 586-2643. You may also write to: Real Estate Commission, 335 Merchant Street, Room 333, Honolulu, HI 96813, or you may email staff at hirec@dcca.hawaii.gov.

The Specialists’ Office for the Day program is funded by the Condominium Education Trust Fund and the Real Estate Education Fund.
Settlement Agreement (Allegations/Sanction): The Respondent does not admit to the allegations set forth by the Regulated Industries Complaints Office (RICO) and denies having violated any licensing law or rule. The respondent enters in a Settlement Agreement as a compromise of the claims and to conserve on the expense of proceeding with a hearing on the matter.

Disciplinary Action (Factual Findings/Order): The respondent is found to have violated the specific laws and rules cited, and the Commission approves the recommended order of the Hearings Officer.

Statutory/Rule Violations

HRS §467-1.6(b)(2) The principal broker shall be responsible for the brokerage firm's records, contracts, and documents.

HRS §467-1.6(b)(3) The principal broker shall be responsible for all real estate contracts of the brokerage firm and its handling by the associated real estate salesperson.

HRS §467-1.6(b)(7) The principal broker shall be responsible ensuring that the licenses of all associated real estate licensees and the brokerage firm license are current and active.

HRS §467-7 Licenses required to act as a real estate broker or salesperson.

HRS §467-14 (3) Pursuing a continued and flagrant course of misrepresentation.

HRS §467-14 (7) Failing to account for moneys belonging to others.

HRS §467-14(8) Conduct constituting fraudulent or dishonest dealings.

HRS §467-14(13) Violating this chapter, chapters 484, 514A, 514B, 514E, or 515, or section §516-71, or the rules adopted pursuant thereto.

HRS §467-14 (16) Converting other people’s moneys to the licensees own use.

HRS §467-14 (20) Failure to maintain a reputation for or record of competency, honesty, truthfulness, financial integrity, and fair dealing.

HRS §467-20 False statement.

HRS §436B-16 Notice of judgments, penalties.

HRS §436B-19(1) Failure to meet or maintain the conditions and requirements necessary to qualify for the granting of a license.

HRS §436B-19(2) Engaging in false, fraudulent, or deceptive advertising, or making untruthful or improbable statements.

HRS §436B-19(5) Procuring a license through fraud, misrepresentation, or deceit.

HRS §436B-19(7) Professional misconduct, incompetence, gross negligence, or manifest incapacity in the practice of the licensed profession or vocation.

HRS §436B-19(9) Conduct or practice contrary to recognized standards of ethics for the licensed profession or vocation.

HRS §436B-19(11) Engaging in business under a past or present license issued pursuant to the licensing laws, in a manner causing injury to one or more members of the public.

HRS §436B-19(12) Failure to comply, observe, or adhere to any law in a manner such that the licensing authority deems the applicant or holder to be an unfit or improper person to hold a license.

HRS §436B-19 (14) Criminal conviction.

HRS §436B-19(17) Violating this chapter, the applicable licensing laws, or any rule or order of the licensing authority.

HAR §16-99-3(f) The licensee, for the protection of all parties with whom the licensee deals, shall see that financial obligations and commitments regarding real estate transactions, including real property rental management agreements, are in writing, express the exact agreements of the parties, and set forth essential terms and conditions, and that copies of those agreements, at the time they are executed, are placed in the hands of all parties involved.

HAR §16-99-3(i) The brokerage firm shall not submit or advertise property without written authorization, and in any offering the price quoted shall not be other than that agreed upon with the owner as the offering price.

HAR §16-99-3(l) A licensee shall not place any sign or advertisement indicating a property is for sale, rent, lease, or exchange without the written authorization of the owner or seller and approval of the principal broker or broker in charge.

HAR §16-99-5(a)(1) Each individual licensee shall file with the commission and shall notify the commission of any change in writing, within ten days of the change... The licensee’s legal name, residence address, and mailing address.
## Prelicense Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abe Lee Seminars</td>
<td>808-942-4472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akahi Real Estate Network LLC</td>
<td>808-331-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Ball School of Real Estate</td>
<td>808-871-8807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldwell Banker Pacific Properties Real Estate School</td>
<td>808-597-5550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dower School of Real Estate</td>
<td>808-735-8838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fahmi School of Real Estate</td>
<td>808-486-4166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii Institute of Real Estate, LLC</td>
<td>808-589-0550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Merchants, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dba All Islands Real Estate School</td>
<td>808-564-5170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProSchools, Inc.</td>
<td>800-452-4879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Foulger’s School of Real Estate</td>
<td>808-239-8881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMI School of Real Estate</td>
<td>808-230-8200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seiler School of Real Estate</td>
<td>808-874-3100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Hawaii Maui College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- OCET Real Estate School</td>
<td>808-984-3231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitousek Real Estate Schools, Inc.</td>
<td>808-946-0505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Continuing Education Providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abe Lee Seminars</td>
<td>808-942-4472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akahi Real Estate Network LLC</td>
<td>808-331-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Ball School of Real Estate</td>
<td>808-871-8807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol M. Egan, Attorney at Law</td>
<td>808-222-9725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charfen Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dba Distressed Properties Institute, LLC</td>
<td>800-482-0335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldwell Banker Pacific Properties Real Estate School</td>
<td>808-597-5550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Ed Express LLC</td>
<td>866-415-8521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dower School of Real Estate</td>
<td>808-735-8838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddie Flores Real Estate Continuing Education</td>
<td>808-951-9888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Building LLC</td>
<td>808-873-2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii Association of Realtors</td>
<td>808-733-7060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii CCIM Chapter</td>
<td>808-528-2246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii Institute of Real Estate, LLC</td>
<td>808-589-0550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii Island Realtors</td>
<td>808-935-0827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu Board of Realtors</td>
<td>808-732-3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Real Estate Management – Hawaii Chapter No. 34</td>
<td>808-536-4736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Real Estate Management – National</td>
<td>312-329-6058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Property Exchange Services, Inc.</td>
<td>808-387-4140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauai Board of Realtors</td>
<td>808-245-4049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Realty School LLC</td>
<td>800-472-3893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorman Business Center, Inc.</td>
<td>715-833-3940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dba Lorman Education Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKissock, LP</td>
<td>800-328-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OnCourse Learning Corporation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dba Career WebSchool</td>
<td>800-532-7649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Merchants, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Real Estate Institute</td>
<td>808-524-1505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProSchools, Inc.</td>
<td>800-299-2207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Foulger's School of Real Estate</td>
<td>808-239-8881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Class, Inc.</td>
<td>808-981-0711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtors Association of Maui, Inc.</td>
<td>808-873-8585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMI School of Real Estate</td>
<td>808-230-8200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ Goode Seminars</td>
<td>808-597-1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shari S. Motooka-Higa</td>
<td>808-457-0156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CE Shop, Inc.</td>
<td>888-827-0777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Seminar Group</td>
<td>206-463-4400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM Education Services</td>
<td>808-268-7473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Hawaii Maui College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- OCET Real Estate School</td>
<td>808-984-3231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitousek Real Estate Schools, Inc.</td>
<td>808-956-2037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiwai Nui, Inc. dba Hawaii Business Training</td>
<td>808-250-2384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hawaii Association of Realtors</td>
<td>808-329-4874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2013 Real Estate Commission Meeting Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laws &amp; Rules Review Committee – 9:00 a.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condominium Review Committee –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upon adjournment of the Laws &amp; Rules Review Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Review Committee – Upon adjournment of the Condominium Review Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, May 8, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, June 12, 2013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, July 10, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, August 7, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, September 11, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 9, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, November 13, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, December 11, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Real Estate Commission – 9:00 a.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday, May 24, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, June 28, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, July 26, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, August 23, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, September 27, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, October 25, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, November 27, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, December 20, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The June 12, 2013 meeting will be held at 9:30 a.m. at the Kauai State Office Building, Room 303, located at 3060 Eiwa Street, Lihue, Kauai.

All meetings will be held in the Queen Liliuokalani Conference Room of the King Kalakaua Building, 335 Merchant Street, First Floor.

Meeting dates, locations and times are subject to change without notice. Please visit the Commission’s website at www.hawaii.gov/hirec or call the Real Estate Commission Office at (808) 586-2643 to confirm the dates, times and locations of the meetings. This material can be made available to individuals with special needs. Please contact the Executive Officer at (808) 586-2643 to submit your request.