



**STATE OF NEVADA**

**BEFORE THE NEVADA COMMISSION ON ETHICS**

In re **Miguel Martinez**, Councilmember,  
Reno City Council,  
State of Nevada,

Ethics Complaint  
Case No. 24-056C

Subject. /

**REVIEW PANEL DETERMINATION**

NRS 281A.730; NAC 281A.440

The Nevada Commission on Ethics (“Commission”) initiated this Ethics Complaint (“Complaint”) on April 30, 2024, regarding the alleged conduct of Subject Miguel Martinez (“Martinez”). On May 1, 2024, the Commission instructed the Executive Director to investigate alleged violations of NRS 281A.400(2) and (9).

Martinez is a public officer as defined in NRS 281A.150, and the Commission has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to NRS 281A.280 because the allegations contained in the Complaint relate to Martinez’s conduct as a public officer and have associated implications under the Ethics Law.

On September 17, 2024, a Review Panel consisting of Commissioner Stan Olsen (Presiding Officer), Commissioner Michael E. Langton, Esq. and Commissioner Terry J. Reynolds considered the following: (1) Ethics Complaint (2) Order Regarding Initiating an Ethics Complaint, Jurisdiction and Investigation; (3) Response to the Complaint; and (4) Executive Director’s Recommendation to the Review Panel with Summary of Investigatory Findings and Relevant Evidentiary Exhibits.<sup>1</sup>

The Review Panel unanimously finds and concludes that the facts do establish credible evidence to support a determination that just and sufficient cause exists for the Commission to render an opinion in the matter regarding the alleged violation of NRS 281A.400(2) and (9). Pursuant to NRS 281A.730, the Review Panel reasonably believes that Martinez’s conduct may be appropriately addressed through corrective action under the terms and conditions of a deferral agreement instead of referring these allegations to the Commission for further proceedings at this time. The deferral agreement must confirm Martinez’s acknowledgment of the following:

- Comply with the Ethics Law from the date of the Panel’s approval of the deferral agreement for a one-year deferral period without being the subject of another complaint arising from an alleged violation of the Ethics Law and for which a review panel determines there is just

<sup>1</sup> All materials provided to the Review Panel, except the Ethics Complaint and the Order on Jurisdiction and Investigation, represent portions of the investigatory file and remain confidential pursuant to NRS 281A.755.

and sufficient cause for the Commission to render an opinion in the matter;

- Receive Ethics training as approved by the Executive Director within 60 days of approval of the deferral agreement;
- Provide evidence to the Executive Director that Martinez is working with City leadership to improve travel training, processes, and procedures to prevent others from inappropriately expending public funds on private interests;
- During the deferral period submit to the Executive Director records for all out-of-state travel by Martinez funded in part or in whole by the City of Reno within 30 days of such travel.

Unless an extension of time is authorized or directed by the Commission Counsel on behalf of the Review Panel, the Executive Director and Martinez shall provide a proposed deferral agreement to the Review Panel through its Commission Counsel on or before October 24, 2024, which deadline may be extended by the Commission Counsel for good cause. If the Review Panel does not approve the deferral agreement or if Martinez declines to enter into a deferral agreement, the Review Panel will issue an order referring this matter to the Commission for further proceedings.

Dated this 18th day of September, 2024.

#### REVIEW PANEL OF THE NEVADA COMMISSION ON ETHICS

By: /s/ Stan Olsen  
Stan Olsen  
Commissioner/Presiding Officer

By: /s/ Terry J. Reynolds  
Terry J. Reynolds  
Commissioner

By: /s/ Michael E. Langton  
Michael E. Langton, Esq.  
Commissioner