



STATE OF NEVADA

BEFORE THE NEVADA COMMISSION ON ETHICS

**In the Matter of the Request for Opinion
Concerning the Conduct of RONALD LYNCH,
Trustee, Indian Hills General Improvement
District, State of Nevada,**

Request for Opinion No. 10-33C

Subject.

PANEL DETERMINATION

NRS 281A.440(5); NAC 281A.440

Facts and Jurisdiction

The Nevada Commission on Ethics received an Ethics Complaint regarding the conduct of RONALD LYNCH, Trustee, Indian Hills General Improvement District, alleging certain violations of the Ethics in Government Law set forth in NRS 281A . Commission staff presented the Investigatory Panel with the allegations in the Complaint that Lynch violated:

NRS 281A.420(1) and (3) when he failed to disclose his commitment in a private capacity to the interest of his employer, Douglas County, and then participated in a vote to approve the expenditure of funds to construct a water pipeline that affected Douglas County.

At the time of the alleged conduct, Lynch, and still is, a Trustee of the Indian Hills General Improvement District, a public officer as defined in NRS 281A.160. The Commission has jurisdiction over the conduct of public officers pursuant to NRS 281A.280. Therefore, the Commission has jurisdiction in this matter.

Panel Proceeding

On July 8, 2010, pursuant to NRS 281A.440(5), an Investigatory Panel consisting of Commission Chairman John T. "JT" Moran, III and Commissioner Magdalena Groover reviewed the following: 1) Ethics Complaint; 2) Mr. Lynch's response to the Ethics Complaint, 3) the Investigator's Report; and 4) the Executive Director's

Recommendation and Approval of Investigator's Report. The following are the Panel's unanimous findings and conclusions as to each of the allegations:

1. Just and sufficient cause does not exist for the Commission to render an opinion whether Lynch should have disclosed his conflict of interest and his commitment in a private capacity to the interests of his alleged employer, Douglas County, before voting to approve the expenditure of District funds to support a water pipeline in violation of NRS 281A.420(1) and (3). The Complaint contained unsupported allegations regarding Mr. Lynch's employment, and the Commission's investigation revealed uncontroverted evidence that Mr. Lynch is not currently, nor has he ever been, an employee of Douglas County, as alleged in the Complaint.

Each of the allegations in Request for Opinion 10-33C is DISMISSED.

Dated: July 15, 2010

Caren Jenkins
Caren Jenkins, Esq.
Executive Director

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I certify that I am an employee of the Nevada Commission on Ethics and that on this day in Carson City, Nevada, I placed a true and correct copy of the **PANEL DETERMINATION in Request for Opinion No. 10-33C**, in an envelope and caused same to be mailed via certified mail, return receipt requested, through the State of Nevada Mailroom to Ronald Lynch's counsel, T. Scott Brooke, Esq., and a true and correct copy of the **PANEL DETERMINATION in Request for Opinion No. 10-33C** to Ronald Lynch, and the Requester, Dianne Humble, via regular mail through the State of Nevada Mailroom addressed as follows:

T. Scott Brooke, Esq.
Brooke, Shaw, Zumpft
Attorneys at Law
PO Box 2860
Minden, NV 89423

Cert. No. 7010 0780 0001 0973 7536

Ronald Lynch
PO Box 3045
Gardnerville, NV 89410

First Class Mail

Dianne Humble
991 Hilltop Drive
Carson City, NV 89705

First Class Mail

DATED:

07/15/10

Michelle A. Ené
An employee, Nevada Commission on Ethics