

Denise Mosely

From: mark wolfson <mbw1016@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 8, 2026 11:37 AM
To: State Board Equalization
Cc: Kari Skalsky; Adriane Roberts-Larson; Millicent Washington; Briana Johnson
Subject: Fwd: Case File upload - Evidence Irregularity

WARNING - This email originated from outside the State of Nevada. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

As a follow up to the email just sent, I respectfully request that this communication be formally uploaded to the SBE case file in advance of next week's hearing and be incorporated into the official record of this matter.

Thank you

Begin forwarded message:

From: mark wolfson <mbw1016@hotmail.com>
Date: October 8, 2026 at 11:32:48 AM PDT
To: Equalization State Board <stateboard@tax.state.nv.us>
Cc: Kari Skalsky <kskalsky@tax.state.nv.us>, Adriane Roberts-Larson <arlanson@tax.state.nv.us>, Millicent Washington <Millicent.Washington@clarkcountynv.gov>, Briana Johnson <bap@clarkcountynv.gov>
Subject: Case File upload - Evidence Irregularity

I have just completed my review of the case files uploaded late last night by the Clark County Assessor and submitted to the State Board of Equalization in advance of next week's rehearing.

Please be advised that, once again, the County has submitted evidence into the record that was never (1) provided to me in advance, (2) mentioned at the remand hearing on September 3, 2026, or (3) brought to the hearing in the required number of copies for all attendees or otherwise announced as new evidence.

These 58 pages of purported "evidence" appear on Remand pages 1742–1799.

Moreover, at the September 3 hearing, I was given an entire paper box (a 10-ream box) containing documents that had previously been submitted to me electronically. At approximately the 00:34:00 timestamp of the hearing, I specifically asked Ms. Jones whether there was any new evidence in the box. Her response was, "Nothing new."

Below is a cut-and-paste excerpt from the transcript submitted by the County. This exchange appears on Remand page 1824.

There is another troubling irregularity concerning the transcript. At the point where the transcript states “inaudible,” I reviewed the video and audio at that exact moment. I can clearly be seen continuing to speak, and I said, “I was handed this box of paper,” followed by my question, “Is there any new evidence in the box?”

During the completion of that sentence, the microphone went completely dead for approximately three to four seconds. The video clearly shows that I continued speaking during this period. Although I was not directly up against the microphone, I had not moved at all from the first portion of the dialogue, which was clearly audible and included in the transcript.

Fortunately, I followed up with Ms. Jones and requested clarification. She acknowledged that the box contained only the materials uploaded by the County for the September 3, 2026 hearing, which had previously been emailed to me. She further confirmed that the box did not contain anything new.

I therefore request that the Clark County Assessor confirm whether these 58 pages were intentionally included in the County’s most recent submission or were uploaded in error.

If these pages were uploaded in error, I request that they be completely stricken from the record and disregarded by the State Board.

If, on the other hand, these pages were intentionally submitted, the County should be required to explain to the State Board why this evidence was submitted without having been previously provided to me, identified at the September 3, 2026 remand hearing, or otherwise disclosed in accordance with the applicable procedures.

If the submission was intentional, I respectfully request that the State Board take whatever corrective action it is authorized to take to address the improper introduction of this ‘evidence.’

This is particularly concerning because, if intentional, this would be the second instance in this matter in which the County has introduced evidence without providing me a meaningful opportunity to review and respond to it. Under these circumstances, I respectfully request that the State Board consider the procedural prejudice caused by the County’s conduct and rule completely in my favor on each and every issue presented in my Brief.

If the County disagrees with such a ruling, it may pursue whatever appellate or judicial remedies it believes are appropriate, including a Petition for Judicial Review in the District Court.

I respectfully request that the State Board address this matter before considering or relying upon the disputed pages in its decision.

Very truly yours,

Mark Wolfson

Remand Page 1824:

MARK WOLFSON

This has got nothing to do with that. I just want to make sure that — I was handed this box of paper (inaudible).

STEPHANIE JONES

No, that was an actual printout of what was uploaded.

MARK WOLFSON

Nothing new?

STEPHANIE JONES

Nothing new.