E COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

3 4	FRONT SIGHT MANAGEMENT LLC, a Nevada Limited Liability Company,	No.: Electronically File	
4			
		Com 44 0000 04.0	d C = ===
5	Petitioner,	Sep 11 2020 04:3 Dist. Ct. Case No: Ыंव्रुक्फ्र्फ्रा₀%4Brow Clerk of Supreme	n p.m.
6	VS.	Clerk of Supreme	Court
7 8 9 10	THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK; and THE HONORABLE TIMOTHY C. WILLIAMS, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE, Respondents,		
12	Respondents,		
13	and		
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT FUND LLC, a Nevada Limited Liability Company; EB5 IMPACT CAPITAL REGIONAL CENTER LLC, a Nevada Limited Liability Company; EB5 IMPACT ADVISORS LLC, a Nevada Limited Liability Company; ROBERT W. DZIUBLA, individually and as President and CEO of LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT FUND LLC and EB5 IMPACT ADVISORS LLC; JON FLEMING, individually and as an agent of LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT FUND LLC and EB5 IMPACT ADVISORS LLC; LINDA STANWOOD, individually and as Senior Vice President of LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT FUND LLC and EB5 IMPACT ADVISORS LLC; LINDA STANWOOD, individually and as Senior Vice President of LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT FUND LLC and EB5 IMPACT ADVISORS LLC,		

28

Docket 81776 Document 2020-33648

1	PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS, OR ALTERNATIVELY,
2	
3	PROHIBITION
; ;	
; -	PETITIONER'S APPENDIX
	VOLUME IX
2	John P. Aldrich, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 6877 Jamie S. Hendrickson, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 12770 ALDRICH LAW FIRM, LTD. 7866 West Sahara Avenue
	Las Vegas, Nevada 89117 702-853-5490
5	jaldrich@johnaldrichlawfirm.com jamie@johnaldrichlawfirm.com
	Attorneys for Petitioner

CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX

<u>VOLUME I</u>	PAGES
Complaint (09/14/2018)	0001-0028
Amended Complaint (10/04/2018)	0029-0057
Affidavit of Service on Robert W. Dziubla (10/17/2018)	0058
Affidavit of Service on Linda Stanwood (10/17/2018)	0059
Affidavit of Service on EB5 Impact Advisors LLC (10/17/2018)	0060
Affidavit of Service on EB5 Impact Capital Regional Center LLC (10/18/2018)	0061
Affidavit of Service on Las Vegas Development Fund LLC (10/18/2018)	0062
Affidavit of Service on Chicago Title Company (10/22/2018)	0063
Notice of Entry of Order Admitting to Practice (11/15/2018)	0064-0068
Notice of Entry of Order on Plaintiff's Petition for Appointment of Receiver and for an Accounting (11/27/2018)	0069-0074
Notice of Entry of Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Protective Order (11/27/2018)	0075-0079
Notice of Entry of Protective Order (11/27/2018)	0080-0098
Notice of Entry of Order Granting Temporary Restraining Order and Expunging Notice of Default (11/27/2018)	0099-0104
Order Setting Settlement Conference (12/06/2018)	0105-0106
Second Amended Complaint (01/04/2019)	0107-0250

1 2	VOLUME II	<u>PAGES</u>
3	Second Amended Complaint (01/04/2019) (cont'd)	0251-0322
5	Notice of Entry of Order on Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction (01/17/2019)	0323-0327
6 7 8 9	Notice of Entry of Order on Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for an Accounting Related to Defendants Las Vegas Development Fund LLC and Robert Dziubla and for Release of Funds (01/17/2019)	0328-0332
10 11	Notice of Entry of Order on Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint (01/17/2019)	0333-0337
12 13	Notice of Entry of Order on Plaintiff's Motion to Disqualify C. Keith Greer as Attorney of Record for Defendants (01/25/2019)	0338-0343
14 15	Notice of Entry of Disclaimer of Interest of Chicago Title Company and Stipulation and Order for Dismissal (02/05/2019)	0344-0350
16 17 18	Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund LLC's Motion for Appointment of Receiver and Request for Order Shortening Time (02/06/2019)	0351-0378
19 20 21	Declaration of Robert Dziubla in Support of Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund LLC's Motion for Appointment of Receiver [redacted in district court filing] (02/06/2019)	0379-0500
22	VOLUME III	PAGES
23 24 25	Declaration of Robert Dziubla in Support of Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund LLC's Motion for Appointment of Receiver [redacted in district court filing] (02/06/2019) (cont'd)	0501-0558
26 27	Declaration of C. Keith Greer in Support of Defendant's Motion for Receivership (02/06/2019)	0559-0601

1 2 3 4	Motion to Seal and/or Redact Pleadings and Exhibits to Protect Confidential Information, Motion to Amend Paragraph 2.3 of Protective Order, Motion for Order Shortening Time and Order Shortening Time (02/15/2019)	0602-0628
5	Notice of Entry of Order Shortening Time (02/15/2019)	0629-0658
6 7 8	Opposition Memorandum of Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund, LLC to Plaintiff's Motion to Seal and/or Redact Pleadings and Exhibits (02/19/2019)	0659-0669
9 10	Opposition to Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund LLC's Motion for Appointment of Receiver (02/22/2019)	0670-0730
11 12	Errata to Opposition to Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund LLC's Motion for Appointment of Receiver (02/22/2019)	0731-0740
13 14	Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund LLC's Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Appointment of	0741-0750
15	Receiver (02/26/2019)	
15 16	1	<u>PAGES</u>
15	Receiver (02/26/2019)	PAGES 0751-0755
15 16 17 18	Receiver (02/26/2019) VOLUME IV Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund LLC's Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Appointment of	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Receiver (02/26/2019) VOLUME IV Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund LLC's Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Appointment of Receiver (02/26/2019) (cont'd) Supplemental Declaration of Robert W. Dziubla in Support of Defendant LVD Fund's Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to	0751-0755

1 2 3	Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund, LLC's Opposition to Plaintiff's Second Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction (03/19/2019)	0837-0860
4 5 6 7	Supplemental Declaration of Defendant Robert Dziubla in Support of Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund, LLC's Opposition to Plaintiff's Second Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction (03/19/2019)	0861-0875
8	Notice of Entry of Order (03/19/2019)	0876-0881
9 10 11	Errata to Supplemental Declaration of Robert Dziubla in Support of Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Second Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction (03/20/2019)	0882-0892
12 13	Notice of Entry of Order (04/10/2019)	0893-0897
14	Notice of Entry of Order (04/10/2019)	0898-0903
15 16	Notice of Entry of Order (04/10/2019)	0904-0909
17	Notice of Entry of Order (04/10/2019)	0910-0916
18 19	Defendants' Answer to Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint and Counterclaim (04/23/2019)	0917-1000
20 21	VOLUME V	PAGES
22 23	Defendants' Answer to Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint and Counterclaim (04/23/2019) (cont'd)	1001-1083
24	Notice of Entry of Order (05/16/2019)	1084-1089
252627	Reporter's Transcript of Motion (Preliminary Injunction Hearing) (06/03/2019)	1090-1250

1 2	<u>VOLUME VI</u>	<u>PAGES</u>
3 4	Reporter's Transcript of Motion (Preliminary Injunction Hearing) (06/03/2019) (cont'd)	1251-1313
5	Order Setting Settlement Conference (06/04/2019)	1314-1315
6 7 8	Acceptance of Service of Counterclaim on Counterdefendants Front Sight Management, LLC, Ignatius Piazza, Jennifer Piazza, VNV Dynasty Trust I and VNV Dynasty Trust II (06/14/2019)	1316-1317
9	Notice of Entry of Order (06/25/2019)	1318-1324
10	Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Regarding Defendants' Judicial Foreclosure Cause of Action (06/25/2019)	1325-1330
12 13 14	Reporter's Transcript of Preliminary Injunction Hearing (07/22/2019)	1331-1500
15	VOLUME VII	PAGES
16 17	Reporter's Transcript of Preliminary Injunction Hearing (07/22/2019) (cont'd)	1501-1513
18	Reporter's Transcript of Preliminary Injunction (07/23/2019)	1514-1565
19 20	Business Court Order (07/23/2019)	1566-1572
21 22 23	Order Re Rule 16 Conference, Setting Civil Jury Trial, Pre- Trial/Calendar Call and Deadlines for Motions; Discovery Scheduling Order (08/20/2019)	1573-1577
24 25	Notice of Entry of Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Counterdefendants' Motions to Dismiss Counterclaim (09/13/2019)	1578-1584
26 27 28	Notice of Entry of Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction related to Investor Funds and Interest Payments (09/13/2019)	1585-1591

1 2 3	Notice of Entry of Order Staying All Subpoenas For Documents and Depositions which were Served on Non-Parties by Plaintiff (09/13/2019)	1592-1599
5	Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions (09/17/2019)	1600-1643
6	Reporter's Transcript of Hearing (Preliminary Injunction Hearing) (09/20/2019)	1644-1750
8	VOLUME VIII	PAGES
9 10	Reporter's Transcript of Hearing (Preliminary Injunction Hearing) (09/20/2019) (cont'd)	1751-1930
11	Order Scheduling Hearing (09/27/2019)	1931-1932
12 13 14	Counterdefendants VNV Dynasty Trust I and VNV Dynasty Trust II's Answer to Counterclaim (09/30/2019)	1933-1957
15	Counterdefendant Dr. Ignatius Piazza's Answer to Counterclaim (09/30/2019)	1958-1981
17 18	Counterdefendant Front Sight Management LLC's Answer to Counterclaim (09/30/2019)	1982-2000
19	VOLUME IX	PAGES
20 21	Counterdefendant Front Sight Management LLC's Answer to Counterclaim (09/30/2019) (cont'd)	2001-2005
22 23	Counterdefendant Jennifer Piazza's Answer to Counterclaim (09/30/2019)	2006-2029
24 25	Defendant EB5 Impact Advisors LLC's Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions (09/30/2019)	2030-2040
26 27 28	Declaration of Robert Dziubla in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions (09/30/2019)	2041-2044

1 2 3	Reporter's Transcript of Motions (Defendants' Motions to Quash Subpoena to Wells Fargo Bank, Signature Bank, Open Bank and Bank of Hope) (10/09/2019)	2045-2232
5	Reply to Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions (10/18/2019)	2233-2250
6 7	VOLUME X	PAGES
8 9	Reply to Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions (10/18/2019) (cont'd)	2251-2297
10	Notice of Intent to Issue Subpoena to Lucas Horsfall, LLP (10/22/2019)	2298-2378
12	Notice of Intent to Issue Subpoena to Bank of America, N.A. (10/22/2019)	2379-2459
14	Plaintiff's Motion to Quash Subpoenas (10/29/2019)	2460-2478
15 16 17	Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Quash Subpoenas to Third Parties Bank of America and Lucas Horsfall, Murphy & Pindroh, LLP (11/6/2019)	2479-2500
18 19	VOLUME XI	PAGES
20 21	Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Quash Subpoenas to Third Parties Bank of America and Lucas Horsfall, Murphy & Pindroh, LLP (11/6/2019) (cont'd)	2501-2655
222324	Notice of Entry of Order Granting Defendants' Motion to Advance Hearing regarding Plaintiff's Motion to Quash Subpoenas (11/08/2019)	2656-2660
252627	Reply to Opposition to Motion to Quash Subpoenas (11/15/2019)	2661-2750

1 2	VOLUME XII	<u>PAGES</u>
3 4	Reply to Opposition to Motion to Quash Subpoenas (11/15/2019) (cont'd)	2751-2776
5	Notice of Entry of Order Shortening Time (11/15/2019)	2777-2785
6 7 8 9	Notice of Entry of Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Defendants' Motions to Quash Plaintiff's Subpoenas to Non-Parties Empyrean West, Jay Carter and David Keller (12/6/2019)	2786-2793
10 11	Notice of Entry of Order Granting Defendant's Motions to Quash Plaintiff's Subpoenas to Non-Party Banks (12/6/2019)	2794-2800
12 13	Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Regarding Exhibit (12/6/2019)	2801-2816
14 15	Notice of Entry of Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion to Quash Subpoenas to Plaintiff's Bank and Accountant (12/6/2019)	2817-2822
16	Notice of Entry of Order Shortening Time (12/11/2019)	2823-2836
17 18	Notice of Entry of Order (12/18/2019)	2837-2840
19	Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order (12/18/2019)	2841-2846
202122	Notice of Entry of Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion to Quash Subpoenas to Morales Construction, Top Rank Builders and All American Concrete and Masonry (12/19/2019)	2847-2853
232425	Notice of Entry of Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions Related to Defendant EB5IA's Accounting Records (12/19/2019)	2854-2860
26 27 28	Notice of Entry of Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion to Stay Enforcement of Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion to Quash Subpoenas to Bank of America and Lucas Horsfall (01/02/2020)	2861-2866

1		
2	Notice of Entry of Order (01/17/2020)	2867-2874
3	Statement of Undisputed Facts (01/17/2020)	2875-3000
4	VOLUME XIII	PAGES
5 6	Statement of Undisputed Facts (01/17/2020) (cont'd)	3001-3080
7 8 9	Notice of Entry of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order Denying Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund LLC's Motion to Dissolve Temporary Restraining Order and to Appoint a Receiver (01/23/2020)	3081-3091
10 11 12	Notice of Entry of Order on Status Check Regarding Discovery Responses/Plaintiff's Motion to Compel (01/23/2020)	3092-3095
13	Motion for Summary Judgment as to the Counterclaims Against VNV Dynasty Trust I and VNV Dynasty Trust II (01/23/2020)	3096-3143
15	Motion for Summary Judgment as to the Counterclaims Against Jennifer Piazza (01/23/2020)	3144-3166
17 18	Defendant and Counter Claimant LVDF's Objections to Plaintiff and Counter Defendant's Statement of Undisputed Facts (02/03/2020)	3167-3222
19 20 21	Defendant and Counterclaimant LVD Fund's Opposition to Counterdefendant Jennifer Piazza's Motion for Summary Judgment [redacted in district court filing] (02/03/2020)	3223-3239
22 23 24 25	Defendant and Counterclaimant LVD Fund's Opposition to VNV Dynasty Trust I and VNV Dynasty Trust II's Motion for Summary Judgment [redacted in district court filing] (02/03/2020)	3240-3250
26		

1 2	VOLUME XIV	<u>PAGES</u>
3 4 5	Defendant and Counterclaimant LVD Fund's Opposition to VNV Dynasty Trust I and VNV Dynasty Trust II's Motion for Summary Judgment [redacted in district court filing] (02/03/2020) (cont'd)	3251-3256
6 7 8 9	Declaration of C. Keith Greer in Support of Defendant and Counterclaimants' Oppositions to Jennifer Piazza and the VNV Dynasty Trust I and II Motions for Summary Judgment (02/03/2020)	3257-3326
10	Notice of Entry of Order (02/07/2020)	3327-3330
11 12 13 14	Motion to Seal and/or Redact Portions of Defendants' Oppositions to Jennifer Piazza and the VNV Trusts' Motions for Summary Judgment to Protect Confidential Financial Information, Motion for Order Shortening Time and Order Shortening Time (02/11/2020)	3331-3348
15 16	Notice of Entry of Order Shortening Time (02/11/2020)	3349-3368
17 18 19 20	Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund LLC's Opposition to Motion to Seal and/or Redact portions of Defendants' Oppositions to Jennifer Piazza and the NVN Trusts' Motions for Summary Judgment to Protect Confidential Financial Information (02/14/2020)	3369-3380
21 22	Notice of Entry of Order Regarding February 5, 2020 Status Check (02/19/2020)	3381-3385
23 24	Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Resetting Hearings and Briefing Schedule (02/25/2020)	3386-3391
25 26	Response to Defendant LVDF's Objections to Statement of Undisputed Facts and Countermotion to Strike (02/28/2020)	3392-3411
27 28	Notice of Entry of Order (03/02/2020)	3412-3416

2	Notice of Entry of Order (03/03/2020)	3417-3421
3	Notice of Entry of Order (03/12/2020)	3422-3429
4	Notice of Entry of Order (04/01/2020)	3430-3436
5	Notice of Entry of Order (04/01/2020)	3437-3441
7 8 9	Defendant and Counterclaimant Las Vegas Development Fund, LLC's Notice of Motion and Motion for Leave to Amend the Countercomplaint [redacted in district court filing] (04/03/2020)	3442-3500
10	VOLUME XV	PAGES
12 13 14	Defendant and Counterclaimant Las Vegas Development Fund, LLC's Notice of Motion and Motion for Leave to Amend the Countercomplaint [redacted in district court filing] (04/03/2020) (cont'd)	3501-3640
15 16 17	Declaration of C. Keith Greer in Support of Las Vegas Development Fund, LLC's Motion for Leave to Amend the Countercomplaint (04/04/2020)	3641-3645
18 19	Opposition to Motion for Leave to Amend Counterclaim (04/17/2020)	3646-3692
20212223	Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order to Replace Exhibit "A" to Defendant's Motion for Leave to Amend the Countercomplaint [redacted in district court filing] (04/20/2020)	3693-3750
24	<u>VOLUME XVI</u>	PAGES
25262728	Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order to Replace Exhibit "A" to Defendant's Motion for Leave to Amend the Countercomplaint [redacted in district court filing] (04/20/2020) (cont'd)	3751-3891

1	Notice of Entry of Order (04/28/2020)	2002 2006
2	Notice of Entry of Order (04/28/2020)	3892-3896
3	Reply in Support of Defendant and Counterclaimant Las Vegas	3897-4000
4	Development Fund, LLC's Motion for Leave to Amend the Counterclaim [redacted in district court filing] (04/29/2020)	
5	VOLUME XVII	PAGES
7	Reply in Support of Defendant and Counterclaimant Las Vegas Development Fund, LLC's Motion for Leave to Amend the	4001-4006
8	Counterclaim [redacted in district court filing] (04/29/2020)	
9	(cont'd)	
10	Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund, LLC's Motion for	4007-4016
11	Clarification on Order Shortening Time (05/01/2020)	4007-4010
12		
13	Opposition to Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund LLC's Motion for Clarification on Order Shortening Time	4017-4045
14	(05/11/2020)	
15		1016 10 - 6
16	Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order to Extend Discovery Deadlines and Continue Trial (Second Request) (05/13/2020)	4046-4056
17	Deadinies and Continue That (Second Request) (03/13/2020)	
18	Amended Order Setting Jury Trial (05/13/2020)	4057-4061
19	Notice of Entry of Order Granting Las Vegas Development	4062-4067
20	Fund, LLC's Motion to Compel Production of Documents or, in	
21	the Alternative, Motion for Preliminary Injunction to Address Front Sight's Continuing Violation of Section 5.10 of the	
22	Construction Loan Agreement and Request for Limited Relief	
23	From the Protective Order (05/18/2020)	
24	Notice of Entry of Order Granting Defendant and	4068-4072
25	Counterclaimant Las Vegas Development Fund, LLC's Notice	
26	of Motion and Motion for Leave to Amend the Countercomplaint (06/04/2020)	
27		

1 2 3	Defendants' Answer to Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint; and First Amended Counterclaim [redacted in district court filing] (06/04/2020)	4073-4250
5	VOLUME XVIII	PAGES
6 7	Defendants' Answer to Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint; and First Amended Counterclaim [redacted in district court filing] (06/04/2020) (cont'd)	4251-4262
8 9 10	Notice of Entry of Order Granting Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund, LLC's Motion for Clarification on Order Shortening Time (06/05/2020)	4263-4268
11 12 13 14	Notice of Entry of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order Denying Plaintiff Front Sight Management, LLC's Motion to Extinguish LVDF's Deed of Trust, or Alternatively to Grant Senior Debt Lender Romspen a First Lien Position, and Motion to Deposit Funds Pursuant to NRCP 67 (06/08/2020)	4269-4275
15 16 17	Notice of Entry of Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion to Quash Subpoenas to Summit Financial Group and US Capital Partners, Inc. (06/08/2020)	4276-4281
18 19 20	Notice of Entry of Order Denying Counter Defendants VNV Dynasty Trust I and VNV Dynasty Trust II's Motion for Summary Judgment (06/08/2020)	4282-4287
21 22	Notice of Entry of Order Denying Counter Defendant Jennifer Piazza's Motion for Summary Judgment (06/08/2020)	4288-4293
23	Notice of Entry of Order Shortening Time (06/12/2020)	4294-4305
2425	Affidavit of Service – Michael G. Meacher (06/16/2020)	4306-4308
26	Affidavit of Service – Top Rank Builders Inc. (06/16/2020)	4309-4311
27 28	Affidavit of Service – All American Concrete & Masonry Inc. (06/16/2020)	4312-4314

2	Affidavit of Service – Morales Construction, Inc. (06/16/2020)	4315-4317
3	Notice of Entry of Order Denying Front Sight Management	4318-4327
4	LLC's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment With Findings of	
5	Fact and Conclusions of Law (06/22/2020)	
6	Notice of Entry of Order Granting in Part Motion for Sanctions	4328-4333
7	and/or to Compel Actual Responses to Plaintiff's First Sets of Interrogatories to Defendants (06/22/2020)	
8	Notice of Entry of Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and	4334-4342
9	Order Granting In Part and Denying In Part Defendants' Motion	7337-7372
10	for Protective Order Regarding Discovery of Consultants and	
11	Individual Investors Confidential Information (07/06/2020)	
12	Notice of Entry of Order Denying Without Prejudice Plaintiff's	4343-4349
13	Motion for Sanctions for Violation of Court Orders Related to Defendants Responses to Plaintiffs Requests for Production of	
14	Documents to Defendants (07/06/2020)	
15	Nation of Francis of Onlan Counting Default and Mation for	1250 1250
16	Notice of Entry of Order Granting Defendants' Motion for Protective Order Regarding the Defendants' Private Financial	4350-4356
17	Information (07/10/2020)	
18	Acceptance of Service on Behalf of Efrain Rene Morales-	4357-4359
19	Moreno (07/23/2020)	1337 1337
20	Counterdefendant Jennifer Piazza's Answer to First Amended	4360-4386
21	Counterclaim (08/21/2020)	4300-4360
22	M: (00/26/2020)	4207 4200
23	Minutes of the Court (08/26/2020)	4387-4389
24	Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order to Extend Discovery	4390-4403
25	Deadlines (09/02/2020)	
26		
27		

ALPHABETICAL INDEX

1

3		Volume(s)	Pages
4 5 6 7	Acceptance of Service of Counterclaim on Counterdefendants Front Sight Management, LLC, Ignatius Piazza, Jennifer Piazza, VNV Dynasty Trust I and VNV Dynasty Trust II (06/14/2019)	VI	1316-1317
8 9	Acceptance of Service on Behalf of Efrain Rene Morales-Moreno (07/23/2020)	XVIII	4357-4359
10 11	Affidavit of Service on Chicago Title Company (10/22/2018)	I	0063
12 13	Affidavit of Service on EB5 Impact Advisors LLC (10/17/2018)	I	0060
14 15	Affidavit of Service on EB5 Impact Capital Regional Center LLC (10/18/2018)	I	0061
16 17	Affidavit of Service on Las Vegas Development Fund LLC (10/18/2018)	I	0062
18 19	Affidavit of Service on Linda Stanwood (10/17/2018)	I	0059
20 21	Affidavit of Service on Robert W. Dziubla (10/17/2018)	I	0058
22 23	Affidavit of Service – All American Concrete & Masonry Inc. (06/16/2020)	XVIII	4312-4314
24 25	Affidavit of Service – Michael G. Meacher (06/16/2020)	XVIII	4306-4308
26 27 28	Affidavit of Service – Morales Construction, Inc. (06/16/2020)	XVIII	4315-4317

1 2	Affidavit of Service – Top Rank Builders Inc. (06/16/2020)	XVIII	4309-4311
3 4	Amended Complaint (10/04/2018)	I	0029-0057
5	Amended Order Setting Jury Trial (05/13/2020)	XVII	4057-4061
6 7	Business Court Order (07/23/2019)	VII	1566-1572
8	Complaint (09/14/2018)	I	0001-0028
9 10	Counterdefendant Dr. Ignatius Piazza's Answer to Counterclaim (09/30/2019)	VIII	1958-1981
11 12	Counterdefendant Front Sight Management LLC's Answer to Counterclaim (09/30/2019)	VIII / IX	1982-2005
13 14	Counterdefendant Jennifer Piazza's Answer to Counterclaim (09/30/2019)	IX	2006-2029
15 16	Counterdefendant Jennifer Piazza's Answer to First Amended Counterclaim (08/21/2020)	XVIII	4360-4386
17 18 19	Counterdefendants VNV Dynasty Trust I and VNV Dynasty Trust II's Answer to Counterclaim (09/30/2019)	VIII	1933-1957
20212223	Declaration of C. Keith Greer in Support of Defendant and Counterclaimants' Oppositions to Jennifer Piazza and the VNV Dynasty Trust I and II Motions for Summary Judgment (02/03/2020)	XIV	3257-3326
24 25 26	Declaration of C. Keith Greer in Support of Defendant LVD Fund's Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Appoint Receiver (02/26/2019)	IV	0762-0769
27 28	Declaration of C. Keith Greer in Support of Defendant's Motion for Receivership (02/06/2019)	III	0559-0601
	· ·		

1	Declaration of C. Keith Greer in Support of Las	XV	3641-3645
2	Vegas Development Fund, LLC's Motion for Leave		
3	to Amend the Countercomplaint (04/04/2020)		
4	Declaration of Robert Dziubla in Opposition to	IX	2041-2044
5	Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions (09/30/2019)		
6	Declaration of Robert Dziubla in Support of	II / III	0379-0558
7	Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund LLC's	117 111	0317 0330
8	Motion for Appointment of Receiver [redacted in		
9	district court filing] (02/06/2019)		
10	Defendant and Counter Claimant LVDF's	XIII	3167-3222
11	Objections to Plaintiff and Counter Defendant's Statement of Undisputed Facts (02/03/2020)		
12	Statement of Chaispated Lacts (02/03/2020)		
13	Defendant and Counterclaimant Las Vegas	XIV / XV	3442-3640
14	Development Fund, LLC's Notice of Motion and Motion for Leave to Amend the Countercomplaint		
15	[redacted in district court filing] (04/03/2020)		
16	Defendant and Counterclaimant LVD Fund's	XIII	3223-3239
17	Opposition to Counterdefendant Jennifer Piazza's		0220 0209
18	Motion for Summary Judgment [redacted in district court filing] (02/03/2020)		
19	court juingj (02/03/2020)		
20	Defendant and Counterclaimant LVD Fund's	XIII / XIV	3240-3256
21	Opposition to VNV Dynasty Trust I and VNV Dynasty Trust II's Motion for Summary Judgment		
22	[redacted in district court filing] (02/03/2020)		
23	Defendant EB5 Impact Advisors LLC's Opposition	IX	2030-2040
24	to Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions (09/30/2019)		2020 2010
25	Defendant Las Vegas Develonment Fund LLC's	II	0351-0378
26	Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund LLC's Motion for Appointment of Receiver and Request for	11	0331-0376
27	Order Shortening Time (02/06/2019)		

1 2	Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund, LLC's Motion for Clarification on Order Shortening Time	XVII	4007-4016
3	(05/01/2020)		
4	Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund LLC's	XIV	3369-3380
5	Opposition to Motion to Seal and/or Redact portions	711 (3307 3300
6	of Defendants' Oppositions to Jennifer Piazza and		
7	the NVN Trusts' Motions for Summary Judgment to Protect Confidential Financial Information		
8	(02/14/2020)		
9	Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund, LLC's	IV	0837-0860
10	Opposition to Plaintiff's Second Motion for	1 V	0037-0000
11	Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary		
12	Injunction (03/19/2019)		
13	Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund LLC's	III / IV	0741-0755
14	Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Appointment of Receiver (02/26/2019)		
15	Defendants' Answer to Plaintiff's Second Amended	IV / V	0917-1083
16	Complaint and Counterclaim (04/23/2019)	1, ,	0717 1005
17	D-C14-2 A4- D1-:4:502- C1 A1-1	3/3/11 /	4072 4262
18	Defendants' Answer to Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint and First Amended Counterclaim	XVII / XVIII	4073-4262
19	[redacted in district court filing] (06/04/2020)		
20	Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to	X / XI	2479-2655
21	Quash Subpoenas to Third Parties Bank of America	$\mathbf{A} / \mathbf{A} \mathbf{I}$	2419-2033
22	and Lucas Horsfall, Murphy & Pindroh, LLP		
23	(11/6/2019)		
24	Errata to Opposition to Defendant Las Vegas	III	0731-0740
25	Development Fund LLC's Motion for Appointment		
26	of Receiver (02/22/2019)		
27			

1 2 3 4	Errata to Supplemental Declaration of Robert Dziubla in Support of Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Second Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction (03/20/2019)	IV	0882-0892
5	Minutes of the Court (08/26/2020)	XVIII	4387-4389
6 7	Motion for Summary Judgment as to the Counterclaims Against Jennifer Piazza (01/23/2020)	XIII	3144-3166
8 9 10	Motion for Summary Judgment as to the Counterclaims Against VNV Dynasty Trust I and VNV Dynasty Trust II (01/23/2020)	XIII	3096-3143
11 12 13 14	Motion to Seal and/or Redact Pleadings and Exhibits to Protect Confidential Information, Motion to Amend Paragraph 2.3 of Protective Order, Motion for Order Shortening Time and Order Shortening Time (02/15/2019)	III	0602-0628
15 16 17 18 19	Motion to Seal and/or Redact Portions of Defendants' Oppositions to Jennifer Piazza and the VNV Trusts' Motions for Summary Judgment to Protect Confidential Financial Information, Motion for Order Shortening Time and Order Shortening Time (02/11/2020)	XIV	3331-3348
202122	Notice of Entry of Disclaimer of Interest of Chicago Title Company and Stipulation and Order for Dismissal (02/05/2019)	II	0344-0350
23 24 25 26 27	Notice of Entry of Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Order Granting In Part and Denying In Part Defendants' Motion for Protective Order Regarding Discovery of Consultants and Individual Investors Confidential Information (07/06/2020)	XVIII	4334-4342

1 2 3 4	Notice of Entry of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order Denying Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund LLC's Motion to Dissolve Temporary Restraining Order and to Appoint a Receiver (01/23/2020)	XIII	3081-3091
5 6 7 8 9	Notice of Entry of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order Denying Plaintiff Front Sight Management, LLC's Motion to Extinguish LVDF's Deed of Trust, or Alternatively to Grant Senior Debt Lender Romspen a First Lien Position, and Motion to Deposit Funds Pursuant to NRCP 67 (06/08/2020)	XVIII	4269-4275
10	Notice of Entry of Order (03/19/2019)	IV	0876-0881
12	Notice of Entry of Order (04/10/2019)	IV	0893-0897
13 14	Notice of Entry of Order (04/10/2019)	IV	0898-0903
15	Notice of Entry of Order (04/10/2019)	IV	0904-0909
16	Notice of Entry of Order (04/10/2019)	IV	0910-0916
17 18	Notice of Entry of Order (05/16/2019)	V	1084-1089
19	Notice of Entry of Order (06/25/2019)	VI	1318-1324
20	Notice of Entry of Order (12/18/2019)	XII	2837-2840
21 22	Notice of Entry of Order (01/17/2020)	XII	2867-2874
23	Notice of Entry of Order (02/07/2020)	XIV	3327-3330
24 25	Notice of Entry of Order (03/02/2020)	XIV	3412-3416
26	Notice of Entry of Order (03/03/2020)	XIV	3417-3421
27 28	Notice of Entry of Order (03/12/2020)	XIV	3422-3429

1 2	Notice of Entry of Order (04/01/2020)	XIV	3430-3436
3	Notice of Entry of Order (04/01/2020)	XIV	3437-3441
4	Notice of Entry of Order (04/28/2020)	XVI	3892-3896
5 6	Notice of Entry of Order Admitting to Practice (11/15/2018)	I	0064-0068
7	Notice of Entry of Order Denying Counter	XVIII	4288-4293
8 9	Defendant Jennifer Piazza's Motion for Summary Judgment (06/08/2020)	21 111	1200 1255
10			
11	Notice of Entry of Order Denying Counter Defendants VNV Dynasty Trust I and VNV Dynasty	XVIII	4282-4287
12	Trust II's Motion for Summary Judgment (06/08/2020)		
14	Notice of Entry of Order Denying Front Sight Management LLC's Motion for Partial Summary	XVIII	4318-4327
15 16	Judgment With Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law (06/22/2020)		
17			
18	Notice of Entry of Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions Related to Defendant EB5IA's	XII	2854-2860
19	Accounting Records (12/19/2019)		
20	Notice of Entry of Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion	VII	1585-1591
21	for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary	V 11	1303-1391
22	Injunction related to Investor Funds and Interest		
23	Payments (09/13/2019)		
24	Notice of Entry of Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion	XII	2847-2853
25	to Quash Subpoenas to Morales Construction, Top Rank Builders and All American Concrete and		
26	Masonry (12/19/2019)		
27			

1			
2	Notice of Entry of Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion	XII	2817-2822
	to Quash Subpoenas to Plaintiff's Bank and Accountant (12/6/2019)		
3	Accountant (12/0/2019)		
4	Notice of Entry of Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion	XVIII	4276-4281
5 6	to Quash Subpoenas to Summit Financial Group and US Capital Partners, Inc. (06/08/2020)		
7	Notice of Entry of Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion	XII	2861-2866
8	to Stay Enforcement of Order Denying Plaintiff's		
9	Motion to Quash Subpoenas to Bank of America and Lucas Horsfall (01/02/2020)		
10			
11	Notice of Entry of Order Denying Without Prejudice Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions for Violation of	XVIII	4343-4349
12	Court Orders Related to Defendants Responses to		
13	Plaintiffs Requests for Production of Documents to		
14	Defendants (07/06/2020)		
15	Notice of Entry of Order Granting Defendant and	XVII	4068-4072
16	Counterclaimant Las Vegas Development Fund,		
17	LLC's Notice of Motion and Motion for Leave to Amend the Countercomplaint (06/04/2020)		
18	<u>-</u>		
19	Notice of Entry of Order Granting Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund, LLC's Motion for	XVIII	4263-4268
20	Clarification on Order Shortening Time (06/05/2020)		
21	Notice of Entry of Order Granting Defendant's	XII	2794-2800
22	Motions to Quash Plaintiff's Subpoenas to Non-	AII	219 1 -2000
23	Party Banks (12/6/2019)		
24	Notice of Entry of Order Granting Defendants'	XVIII	4350-4356
25	Motion for Protective Order Regarding the Defendants' Private Financial Information		
26	(07/10/2020)		
27			

1 2	Notice of Entry of Order Granting Defendants'	XI	2656-2660
3	Motion to Advance Hearing regarding Plaintiff's Motion to Quash Subpoenas (11/08/2019)		
4	Notice of Entry of Order Granting in Part and	VII	1578-1584
5	Denying in Part Counterdefendants' Motions to Dismiss Counterclaim (09/13/2019)		
6	Distinss Counterclaim (07/13/2017)		
7	Notice of Entry of Order Granting in Part and	XII	2786-2793
8	Denying in Part Defendants' Motions to Quash Plaintiff's Subpoenas to Non-Parties Empyrean		
9	West, Jay Carter and David Keller (12/6/2019)		
10	Notice of Entry of Order Granting in Part Motion for	XVIII	4328-4333
12	Sanctions and/or to Compel Actual Responses to Plaintiff's First Sets of Interrogatories to Defendants		
13	(06/22/2020)		
14	Nation of Entry of Order Counting Los Vages	XVII	4062-4067
15	Notice of Entry of Order Granting Las Vegas Development Fund, LLC's Motion to Compel	AVII	4002-4007
16	Production of Documents or, in the Alternative, Motion for Preliminary Injunction to Address Front		
17	Sight's Continuing Violation of Section 5.10 of the		
18	Construction Loan Agreement and Request for Limited Relief From the Protective Order		
19	(05/18/2020)		
20	Notice of Entry of Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion	I	0075-0079
21	for Protective Order (11/27/2018)	1	0075-0077
22	Notice of Feture of Onder Counting Towns one	T	0000 0104
23	Notice of Entry of Order Granting Temporary Restraining Order and Expunging Notice of Default	I	0099-0104
24	(11/27/2018)		
25	Notice of Entry of Order on Defendants' Motion to	II	0333-0337
26	Dismiss Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint		
27	(01/17/2019)		
28			

1 2	Notice of Entry of Order on Plaintiff's Motion for	II	0323-0327
	Preliminary Injunction (01/17/2019)		
3 4	Notice of Entry of Order on Plaintiff's Motion to	II	0338-0343
5	Disqualify C. Keith Greer as Attorney of Record for Defendants (01/25/2019)		
6		_	0000
7	Notice of Entry of Order on Plaintiff's Petition for Appointment of Receiver and for an Accounting	I	0069-0074
8	(11/27/2018)		
9	Notice of Entry of Order on Plaintiff's Renewed	II	0328-0332
10	Motion for an Accounting Related to Defendants Las	11	0320-0332
11	Vegas Development Fund LLC and Robert Dziubla and for Release of Funds (01/17/2019)		
12	and for Release of Fands (01/17/2017)		
13	Notice of Entry of Order on Status Check Regarding Discovery Responses/Plaintiff's Motion to Compel	XIII	3092-3095
14	(01/23/2020)		
15	N. CE. CO. I. D. T. E. I. 5	3/13 /	2201 2205
16	Notice of Entry of Order Regarding February 5, 2020 Status Check (02/19/2020)	XIV	3381-3385
17	Nation of Entry of Order Chartening Time	111	0629-0658
18	Notice of Entry of Order Shortening Time (02/15/2019)	III	0029-0038
19	Nation of Fortune of Outlood Shoutening Time	VII	2777 2795
20	Notice of Entry of Order Shortening Time (11/15/2019)	XII	2777-2785
21			
22	Notice of Entry of Order Shortening Time (12/11/2019)	XII	2823-2836
23			
24	Notice of Entry of Order Shortening Time	XIV	3349-3368
25	(02/11/2020)		
26	Notice of Entry of Order Shortening Time	XVIII	4294-4305
27	(06/12/2020)		
28			

2	Notice of Entry of Order Staying All Subpoenas For Documents and Depositions which were Served on Non-Parties by Plaintiff (09/13/2019)	VII	1592-1599
3	Non-Fattles by Flamuii (09/13/2019)		
5	Notice of Entry of Protective Order (11/27/2018)	I	0080-0098
6	Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order (12/18/2019)	XII	2841-2846
7			
8	Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Regarding Defendants' Judicial Foreclosure Cause of Action	VI	1325-1330
9	(06/25/2019)		
10			
11	Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Regarding Exhibit (12/6/2019)	XII	2801-2816
12			
13	Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Resetting Hearings and Briefing Schedule (02/25/2020)	XIV	3386-3391
14			
15	Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order to Extend Discovery Deadlines (09/02/2020)	XVIII	4390-4403
16	Biscovery Beatimes (05/102/2020)		
17	Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order to Extend Discovery Deadlines and Continue Trial (Second	XVII	4046-4056
18 19	Request) (05/13/2020)		
19	Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order to Replace	VV / VVI	3693-3891
20	Exhibit "A" to Defendant's Motion for Leave to	XV / XVI	3093-3891
21 22	Amend the Countercomplaint [redacted in district court filing] (04/20/2020)		
23	Notice of Intent to Issue Subpoena to Bank of America, N.A. (10/22/2019)	X	2379-2459
۷٦	111101100, 11.11. (10/22/2017)		
25	Notice of Intent to Issue Subpoena to Lucas Horsfall,	X	2298-2378
26	LLP (10/22/2019)		
27			

1 2 3 4	Opposition Memorandum of Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund, LLC to Plaintiff's Motion to Seal and/or Redact Pleadings and Exhibits (02/19/2019)	III	0659-0669
5 6 7	Opposition to Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund LLC's Motion for Appointment of Receiver (02/22/2019)	III	0670-0730
8 9	Opposition to Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund LLC's Motion for Clarification on Order Shortening Time (05/11/2020)	XVII	4017-4045
10 11 12	Order Re Rule 16 Conference, Setting Civil Jury Trial, Pre-Trial/Calendar Call and Deadlines for Motions; Discovery Scheduling Order (08/20/2019)	VII	1573-1577
13 14	Order Scheduling Hearing (09/27/2019)	VIII	1931-1932
15	Order Setting Settlement Conference (12/06/2018)	I	0105-0106
16	Order Setting Settlement Conference (06/04/2019)	VI	1314-1315
17 18	Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions (09/17/2019)	VII	1600-1643
19	Plaintiff's Motion to Quash Subpoenas (10/29/2019)	X	2460-2478
20212223	Plaintiff's Second Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction, Motion for Order Shortening Time, and Order Shortening Time (03/01/19)	IV	0770-0836
242526	Reply in Support of Defendant and Counterclaimant Las Vegas Development Fund, LLC's Motion for Leave to Amend the Counterclaim [redacted in district court filing] (04/29/2020)	XVI / XVII	3897-4006
27 28	Reply to Opposition to Motion to Quash Subpoenas (11/15/2019)	XI / XII	2661-2776

1 2	Reply to Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions (10/18/2019)	IV / X	2233-2297
3 4 5	Reporter's Transcript of Hearing (Preliminary Injunction Hearing) (09/20/2019)	VII / VIII	1644-1930
6	Reporter's Transcript of Motion (Preliminary Injunction Hearing) (06/03/2019)	V / VI	1090-1313
8 9 10	Reporter's Transcript of Motions (Defendants' Motions to Quash Subpoena to Wells Fargo Bank, Signature Bank, Open Bank and Bank of Hope) (10/09/2019)	IX	2045-2232
11 12	Reporter's Transcript of Preliminary Injunction Hearing (07/22/2019)	VI / VII	1331-1513
13 14	Reporter's Transcript of Preliminary Injunction (07/23/2019)	VII	1514-1565
15 16 17	Response to Defendant LVDF's Objections to Statement of Undisputed Facts and Countermotion to Strike (02/28/2020)	XIV	3392-3411
18 19	Second Amended Complaint (01/04/2019)	I / II	0107-0322
20	Statement of Undisputed Facts (01/17/2020)	XII / XIII	2875-3080
21222324	Supplemental Declaration of Defendant Robert Dziubla in Support of Defendant Las Vegas Development Fund, LLC's Opposition to Plaintiff's Second Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction (03/19/2019)	IV	0861-0875
25262728	Supplemental Declaration of Robert W. Dziubla in Support of Defendant LVD Fund's Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Appointment of Receiver (02/26/2019)	IV	0756-0761

TWENTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

This answering Counterdefendant did not commit any acts of oppression, fraud or malice, express or implied.

TWENTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

This answering Counterdefendant alleges on information and belief that it has performed each and every one of its obligations, if any, under its written agreement with Counterclaimant. Nevertheless, to the extent that this answering Counterdefendant is found to have failed to fulfill any of its obligations under the written agreement with Counterclaimant, this answering Counterdefendant is informed and believes that such obligations were impossible to perform at the time it was to have performed them because Counterclaimant made material misstatements and material omissions to this answering Counterdefendant that prevented it from performing its obligations under the written agreement.

TWENTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

This answering Counterdefendant alleges on information and belief that it has performed each and every one of its obligations, if any, under its written agreement with Counterclaimant. Nevertheless, to the extent that this answering Counterdefendant is found to have failed to fulfill its obligations under the written agreement, this answering Counterdefendant is informed and believes that Counterclaimant's material misstatements and material omissions have operated to excuse this answering Counterdefendant's performance under the Doctrine of Frustration of Purpose.

///

22 | ///

23 | ///

TWENTY-SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant failed to perform its obligations under the agreement at issue and breached his obligations thereunder, thereby discharging this answering Counterdefendant's obligations to perform.

TWENTY-SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

It has been necessary for this answering Counterdefendant to retain the services of an attorney to defend this action and it is entitled to a reasonable sum as and for attorneys' fees.

TWENTY-EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's claims are barred by Counterclaimant's own fraudulent acts, fraud, fraudulent inducements, constructive fraud, omissions and misrepresentations whether intentional, negligent, or constructive.

TWENTY-NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's alter-ego claim is barred as the requisite unity of interest and ownership required by Nevada law is lacking.

THIRTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's civil conspiracy claim is barred as Nevada does not recognize conspiracy between a corporation and its agents since agents and employees of a corporation cannot conspire with the corporate principal where they act in their official capacities on behalf of the corporation.

THIRTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's civil conspiracy claim is barred since there is no combination of two or more persons who, by some concerted action, intended to accomplish some unlawful objective for the purpose of harming another which resulted in damages to Counterclaimant.

THIRTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's concert of action is barred as Nevada does not recognize such a cause of action and, thus, this claim is not cognizable under any set of circumstances.

THIRTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

This answering Counterdefendant is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that if any contract, obligations, or amendments, as alleged in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim on file herein, have been entered into, any duty or performance of this answering Counterdefendant is excused by reason of failure of consideration, waiver, breach of condition precedent, breach by the Counterclaimant, impossibility of performance, material breach by the Counterclaimant, prevention by Counterclaimant, frustration of purpose, and/or acceptance by Counterclaimant.

THIRTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The contract and/or contracts existing between the Counterclaimant and this answering Counterdefendant are unconscionable.

THIRTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's material misstatements and material omissions require rescission of the contract(s), if any, between this answering Counterdefendant and Counterclaimant.

THIRTY-SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

At all times relevant to this action, this answering Counterdefendant has acted in good faith under the terms of any written agreement that may exist or have existed between either of this answering Counterdefendant and Counterclaimant.

THIRTY-SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Pursuant to Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure, all possible affirmative defenses may not have been alleged herein insofar as sufficient facts were not available after reasonable inquiry

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

upon the filing of this Answer and, therefore, this answering Counterdefendant reserves the right to amend this Answer to allege additional Affirmative Defenses if subsequent investigation warrants.

THIRTY-EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

As applicable, this answering Counterdefendant asserts the affirmative defenses referenced in NRCP 8(c).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, as to Defendant's Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant prays for judgment as follows:

- 1. That Defendant takes nothing by way of its Counterclaim;
- 2. For costs of suit incurred herein;
- 3. For reasonable attorneys' fees incurred herein; and
- 4. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated this 30th day of September, 2019.

ALDRICH LAW FIRM, LTD.

/s/ John P. Aldrich
John P. Aldrich, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 6877
Catherine Hernandez, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 8410
Matthew B. Beckstead, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 14168
7866 West Sahara Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89117
Telephone: (702) 853-5490
Facsimile: (702) 227-1975

Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counterdefendants

1	<u>CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE</u>			
2	I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 30 th day of September, 2019, I caused the foregoing			
3	COUNTERDEFENDANT FRONT SIGHT MANAGEMENT LLC'S ANSWER TO			
4	COUNTERCLAIM to be electronically filed and served with the Clerk of the Court using			
5	Wiznet which will send notification of such filing to the email addresses denoted on the			
6	Electronic Mail Notice List, or by U.S. mail, postage prepaid, if not included on the Electronic			
7	Mail Notice List, to the following parties:			
8	Anthony T. Case, Esq.			
9	Kathryn Holbert, Esq. FARMER CASE & FEDOR			
10	2190 E. Pebble Rd., Suite #205 Las Vegas, NV 89123			
11	Attorneys for Defendants LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT FUND LLC, EB5IMPACT CAPITAL REGIONAL CENTER LLC,			
12	EB5 IMPACT ADVISORS LLC, ROBERT W. DZIUBLA, JON FLEMING and LINDA STANWOOD			
13	C. Keith Greer, Esq.			
14	Attorneys for Defendants LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT FUND LLC, EB5IMPACT CAPITAL REGIONAL CENTER LLC,			
15				
16	EB5 IMPACT ADVISORS LLC, ROBERT W. DZIUBLA, JON FLEMING and LINDA STANWOOD			
17				
18				
19	/s/ T. Bixenmann An employee of ALDRICH LAW FIRM, LTD.			
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				

Electronically Filed 9/30/2019 10:20 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1	ANS	Deuns. 2	4
2	John P. Aldrich, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 6877		
2	Catherine Hernandez, Esq.		
3	Nevada Bar No. 8410 Matthew B. Beckstead, Esq.		
4	Nevada Bar No. 14168		
5	ALDRICH LAW FIRM, LTD. 7866 West Sahara Avenue		
	Las Vegas, NV 89117		
6	Telephone: (702) 853-5490 Facsimile: (702) 227-1975		
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counterdefendants		
8	EIGHTH JUDICIAL D		
9	CLARK COUNT	Y, NEVADA	
10	FRONT SIGHT MANAGEMENT LLC, a	CASE NO. A 10 701004 B	
10	Nevada Limited Liability Company,	CASE NO.: A-18-781084-B DEPT NO.: 16	
11	Plaintiff,		
12	VS.	<u>COUNTERDEFENDANT</u>	
13	LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT FUND LLC, a	JENNIFER PIAZZA'S ANSWER TO COUNTERCLAIM	
14	Nevada Limited Liability Company; et al.,	COUNTERCLAIM	
	Defendants.		
15			
16	AND ALL RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.		
17			
18	COMES NOW Counterdefendant JEN	NIFER PIAZZA (hereinafter "answering	
19	Counterdefendant"), by and through her attorneys	of record, John P. Aldrich, Esq., Catherine	
20	Hernandez, Esq., and Matthew B. Beckstead, Esq., of the Aldrich Law Firm, Ltd., and for her		
21	Answer to Counterclaim on file herein, denies, admits, and alleges as follows:		
22	///		
23	///		
24			

GENERAL DENIAL

This answering Counterdefendant has made an effort to respond to each and every allegation. However, to the extent any allegation was overlooked or not responded to, this answering Counterdefendant denies said allegations.

ANSWER TO COUNTERCLAIM

1. Answering Paragraph 1 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.

I.

PARTIES

- 2. Answering Paragraph 2 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 3. Answering Paragraph 3 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 4. Answering Paragraph 4 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 5. Answering Paragraph 5 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.

6. Answering Paragraph 6 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.

- 7. Answering Paragraph 7 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 8. Answering Paragraph 8 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that the allegations contained therein constitute conclusions of law and thus require no answer; however, to the extent they contain allegations of fact, this answering Counterdefendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 9. Answering Paragraph 9 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that the allegations contained therein constitute conclusions of law and thus require no answer; however, to the extent they contain allegations of fact, this answering Counterdefendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 10. Answering Paragraph 10 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.

Π.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 11. Answering Paragraph 11 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 12. Answering Paragraph 12 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer

these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.

- 13. Answering Paragraph 13 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 14. Answering Paragraph 14 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 15. Answering Paragraph 15 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 16. Answering Paragraph 16 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 17. Answering Paragraph 17 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.

18. Answering Paragraph 18 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.

BORROWER'S BREACHES AND DEFAULT UNDER THE CLA

A. Breach Number 1: Improper Use of Loan Proceeds – CLA § 1.7(e)

- 19. Answering Paragraph 19 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 20. Answering Paragraph 20 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 21. Answering Paragraph 21 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.

B. Breach Number 2: Failure to Provide Government Approved Plans – CLA § 3.2(b)

22. Answering Paragraph 22 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.

///

///

C. Breach Number 3: Failure to Timely Complete Construction – CLA § 5.1

- 23. Answering Paragraph 23 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 24. Answering Paragraph 24 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 25. Answering Paragraph 25 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.

D. Breach Number 4: Material Change of Costs, Scope or Timing of Work – CLA § 5.2

- 26. Answering Paragraph 26 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 27. Answering Paragraph 27 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.

23 ///

E. Breach Number 5: Refusal to Comply Regarding Senior Debt – CLA §5.27

28. Answering Paragraph 28 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.

F. Breach Number 6: Failure to Provide Monthly Project Costs – CLA § 3.2(a)

29. Answering Paragraph 29 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.

G. Breach Number 7: Failure to Notify of Event of Default – CLA § 5.10

30. Answering Paragraph 30 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.

H. Breach Number 8: Refusal to Allow Inspection of Records – CLA § 5.4

- 31. Answering Paragraph 31 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 32. Answering Paragraph 32 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer

5

10

12

11

13 14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24 these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.

- 33. Answering Paragraph 33 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 34. Answering Paragraph 34 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.

Breach Number 9: Refusal to Allow Inspection of the Project – CLA § 3.3

- 35. Answering Paragraph 35 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 36. Answering Paragraph 36 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 37. Answering Paragraph 37 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.

- 38. Answering Paragraph 38 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 39. Answering Paragraph 39 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.

K. Breach Number 12[sic]: Transferring Assets to Related Parties – CLA § 5.18

- 40. Answering Paragraph 40 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 41. Answering Paragraph 41 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 42. Answering Paragraph 42 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 43. Answering Paragraph 43 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.

4

5

3

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

22

21

23 24

44. Answering Paragraph 44 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.

Breach Number 11: Non Payment of Default Interest - CLA § 1.2

- 45. Answering Paragraph 45 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 46. Answering Paragraph 46 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.

M. Breach Number 12: Non Payment of Legal Fees – CLA § 8.2

47. Answering Paragraph 47 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.

N. **Breach Number 13: Wrongfully Encumbering the Property**

- 48. Answering Paragraph 48 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 49. Answering Paragraph 49 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer

these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.

- 50. Answering Paragraph 50 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 51. Answering Paragraph 51 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Breach of Contract Against Front Sight)

52-59. Counterclaimant's First Cause of Action has been dismissed as against all Counterdefendants pursuant to this Court's Order filed September 13, 2019.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Contractual Breach of the Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing Against Front Sight)

60-66. Counterclaimant's Second Cause of Action has been dismissed as against all Counterdefendants pursuant to this Court's Order filed September 13, 2019.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Intentional Interference with Contractual Relationships Against Ignatius Piazza, Jennifer Piazza, and VNV Trust Defendants)

67. Answering Paragraph 67 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant repeats and realleges, and incorporates herein by reference, each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 66 of the Counterclaim as though fully set forth herein.

///

///

///

- 68. Answering Paragraph 68 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 69. Answering Paragraph 69 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 70. Answering Paragraph 70 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 71. Answering Paragraph 71 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 72. Answering Paragraph 72 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 73. Answering Paragraph 73 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 74. Answering Paragraph 74 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Conversion Against Front Sight, Ignatius Piazza and Jennifer Piazza)

- 75. Answering Paragraph 75 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant repeats and realleges, and incorporates herein by reference, each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 74 of the Counterclaim as though fully set forth herein.
- 76. Answering Paragraph 76 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 77. Answering Paragraph 77 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 78. Answering Paragraph 78 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION (Civil Conspiracy Against all Counterdefendants)

- 79. Answering Paragraph 79 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant repeats and realleges, and incorporates herein by reference, each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 78 of the Counterclaim as though fully set forth herein.
- 80. Answering Paragraph 80 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 81. Answering Paragraph 81 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 82. Answering Paragraph 82 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 83. Answering Paragraph 83 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.

- 84. Answering Paragraph 84 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 85. Answering Paragraph 85 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION (Judicial Foreclosure Against Front Sight)

- 86. Answering Paragraph 86 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant repeats and realleges, and incorporates herein by reference, each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 85 of the Counterclaim as though fully set forth herein.
- 87. Answering Paragraph 87 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 88. Answering Paragraph 88 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 89. Answering Paragraph 89 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 90. Answering Paragraph 90 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer

these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.

- 91. Answering Paragraph 91 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 92. Answering Paragraph 92 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 93. Answering Paragraph 93 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.
- 94. Answering Paragraph 94 of the Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant states that there are no allegations against her in this paragraph, and thus she need not answer these allegations, but nevertheless, she is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and, therefore, denies the same.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION (Waste Against All Counterdefendants)

95-102. Counterclaimant's Seventh Cause of Action has been dismissed against this answering Counterdefendant pursuant to this Court's Order filed September 13, 2019.

///

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

This answering Counterefendant asserts the following Affirmative Defenses to the Counterclaim, and the claims asserted therein, and this answering Counterdefendant specifically incorporates into her Affirmative Defenses her answers to the preceding paragraphs of the Counterclaim as if fully set forth herein.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, and all of the claims for relief alleged therein, fails to state a claim against this answering Counterdefendant upon which relief can be granted.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the doctrine of unclean hands.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by Counterclaimant's bad faith in bringing this action including, but not limited to, its wrongful conduct as set forth more fully in the Complaint on file in this action.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant has not been damaged directly, indirectly, proximately or in any manner whatsoever by any conduct of this answering Counterdefendant.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

This answering Counterdefendant is not in breach of any agreement with Counterclaimant, and, thus, is not in default under the terms of any agreement with Counterclaimant. If any party is in breach of any agreement, it is Counterclaimant for the reasons set forth more fully in the Complaint on file in this action.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by doctrine of waiver.

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by doctrines of promissory, equitable, and/or contractual estoppel.

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's claims are barred, in whole or in part, on the ground that this answering Counterdefendant has fully complied with any and all agreements between the parties.

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the doctrine of laches and/or the applicable statute of limitations.

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

To the extent any agreement exists between Counterclaimant and this answering Counterdefendant, Counterclaimant failed to perform its obligations under said agreements and breached its obligations there under.

ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The damages, if any, which Counterclaimant has suffered were caused, in whole or in part, by the acts or omissions of Counterclaimant or its agents and representatives, or were caused by the acts or omissions of a third party over whom this answering Counterdefendant has no control.

TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant has failed to mitigate its damages.

23 | ///

THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by Counterclaimant's own bad faith, fraudulent acts, omissions and misrepresentations, whether intentional, negligent, or constructive.

FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's claims are barred, in whole or in part, as a result of its own conduct.

FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant is involved in conduct which, if carried to its fruition, would materially alter the parties understanding, thereby releasing this answering Counterdefendant from any obligation under any alleged agreement.

SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's claims, to the extent they are asserted against this answering Counterdefnedant, are barred, in whole or in part, by the fiduciary shield doctrine and, as a consequence thereof, this Court lacks jurisdiction over these individuals and any and all claims asserted in this action against them should be dismissed with prejudice.

SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant, with full knowledge of all the facts connected with or relating to the transaction alleged in the Counterclaim, ratified and confirmed in all respects the acts of this answering Counterdefendant.

EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The claims, and each of them, are barred, in whole or in part, by the failure of the Counterclaimant to plead those claims with particularity.

23 | ///

NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

This answering Counterdefendant is not the alter-ego of the other or that of the Counterdefendants to this action and, as a consequence thereof, this Court lacks jurisdiction over said Counterdefendants. Consequently, to the extent any claim asserted in the Counterclaim is based upon Counterclaimant's alter-ego claim, any and all such claims should be dismissed with prejudice as to all, or any one, of this answering Counterdefendant.

TWENTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant has failed to mitigate damages and is therefore barred from recovering alleged damages.

TWENTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The damages, if any, suffered by Counterclaimant were proximately caused or contributed to by Counterclaimant's own negligence, and such negligence was greater than the negligence, if any, of this answering Counterdefendant.

TWENTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

This answering Counterdefendant alleges that it has performed each and every one of its obligations, if any, under the written agreement. Nevertheless, to the extent that this answering Counterdefendant is found to have failed to perform any of its obligations under its agreement with Counterclaimant, this answering Counterdefendant is informed and believes that it has done so only because Counterclaimant prevented this answering Counterdefendant's performance by, among other things, making material misstatements and material omissions to this answering Counterdefendant, in violation of Counterclaimant's contractual agreement with this answering Counterdefendant.

23 ///

TWENTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

This answering Counterdefendant did not commit any acts of oppression, fraud or malice, express or implied.

TWENTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

This answering Counterdefendant alleges on information and belief that it has performed each and every one of its obligations, if any, under its written agreement with Counterclaimant. Nevertheless, to the extent that this answering Counterdefendant is found to have failed to fulfill any of its obligations under the written agreement with Counterclaimant, this answering Counterdefendant is informed and believes that such obligations were impossible to perform at the time it was to have performed them because Counterclaimant made material misstatements and material omissions to this answering Counterdefendant that prevented it from performing its obligations under the written agreement.

TWENTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

This answering Counterdefendant alleges on information and belief that it has performed each and every one of its obligations, if any, under its written agreement with Counterclaimant. Nevertheless, to the extent that this answering Counterdefendant is found to have failed to fulfill its obligations under the written agreement, this answering Counterdefendant is informed and believes that Counterclaimant's material misstatements and material omissions have operated to excuse this answering Counterdefendant's performance under the Doctrine of Frustration of Purpose.

21 | ///

22 | ///

23 | ///

TWENTY-SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant failed to perform its obligations under the agreement at issue and breached his obligations thereunder, thereby discharging this answering Counterdefendant's obligations to perform.

TWENTY-SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

It has been necessary for this answering Counterdefendant to retain the services of an attorney to defend this action and it is entitled to a reasonable sum as and for attorneys' fees.

TWENTY-EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's claims are barred by Counterclaimant's own fraudulent acts, fraud, fraudulent inducements, constructive fraud, omissions and misrepresentations whether intentional, negligent, or constructive.

TWENTY-NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's alter-ego claim is barred as the requisite unity of interest and ownership required by Nevada law is lacking.

THIRTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's civil conspiracy claim is barred as Nevada does not recognize conspiracy between a corporation and its agents since agents and employees of a corporation cannot conspire with the corporate principal where they act in their official capacities on behalf of the corporation.

THIRTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's civil conspiracy claim is barred since there is no combination of two or more persons who, by some concerted action, intended to accomplish some unlawful objective for the purpose of harming another which resulted in damages to Counterclaimant.

THIRTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's concert of action is barred as Nevada does not recognize such a cause of action and, thus, this claim is not cognizable under any set of circumstances.

THIRTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

This answering Counterdefendant is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that if any contract, obligations, or amendments, as alleged in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim on file herein, have been entered into, any duty or performance of this answering Counterdefendant is excused by reason of failure of consideration, waiver, breach of condition precedent, breach by the Counterclaimant, impossibility of performance, material breach by the Counterclaimant, prevention by Counterclaimant, frustration of purpose, and/or acceptance by Counterclaimant.

THIRTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The contract and/or contracts existing between the Counterclaimant and this answering Counterdefendant are unconscionable.

THIRTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's material misstatements and material omissions require rescission of the contract(s), if any, between this answering Counterdefendant and Counterclaimant.

THIRTY-SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

At all times relevant to this action, this answering Counterdefendant has acted in good faith under the terms of any written agreement that may exist or have existed between either of this answering Counterdefendant and Counterclaimant.

THIRTY-SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Pursuant to Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure, all possible affirmative defenses may not have been alleged herein insofar as sufficient facts were not available after reasonable inquiry

1	upon the filing of this Answer and, therefore, this answering Counterdefendant reserves the right
2	to amend this Answer to allege additional Affirmative Defenses if subsequent investigation
3	warrants.
4	THIRTY-EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
5	As applicable, this answering Counterdefendant asserts the affirmative defenses
6	referenced in NRCP 8(c).
7	PRAYER FOR RELIEF
8	WHEREFORE, as to Defendant's Counterclaim, this answering Counterdefendant prays
9	for judgment as follows:
10	1. That Defendant takes nothing by way of its Counterclaim;
11	2. For costs of suit incurred herein;
12	3. For reasonable attorneys' fees incurred herein; and
13	4. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.
14	Dated this 30 th day of September, 2019.
15	ALDRICH LAW FIRM, LTD.
16	/s/ John P. Aldrich
17	John P. Aldrich, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 6877
18	Catherine Hernandez, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 8410
19	Matthew B. Beckstead, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 14168
20	7866 West Sahara Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89117
21	Telephone: (702) 853-5490 Facsimile: (702) 227-1975
22	Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counterdefendants
23	
24	

1	<u>CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE</u>
2	I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 30 th day of September, 2019, I caused the foregoing
3	COUNTERDEFENDANT JENNIFER PIAZZA'S ANSWER TO COUNTERCLAIM to be
4	electronically filed and served with the Clerk of the Court using Wiznet which will send
5	notification of such filing to the email addresses denoted on the Electronic Mail Notice List, or
6	by U.S. mail, postage prepaid, if not included on the Electronic Mail Notice List, to the
7	following parties:
8 9 10	Anthony T. Case, Esq. Kathryn Holbert, Esq. FARMER CASE & FEDOR 2190 E. Pebble Rd., Suite #205 Las Vegas, NV 89123 Attorneys for Defendants LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT FUND
11 12	LLC, EB5IMPACT CAPITAL REGIONAL CENTER LLC, EB5 IMPACT ADVISORS LLC, ROBERT W. DZIUBLA, JON FLEMING and LINDA STANWOOD
13141516	C. Keith Greer, Esq. 16855 West Bernardo Drive, Suite 255 San Diego, CA 92127 Attorneys for Defendants LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT FUND LLC, EB5IMPACT CAPITAL REGIONAL CENTER LLC, EB5 IMPACT ADVISORS LLC, ROBERT W. DZIUBLA, JON FLEMING and LINDA STANWOOD
17	
18	/s/ T. Bixenmann
19	An employee of ALDRICH LAW FIRM, LTD.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

Electronically Filed 9/30/2019 11:05 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT OPP/MTN 1 ANTHONY T. CASE, ESQ. 2 Nevada Bar No. 6589 tcase@farmercase.com 3 KATHRYN HOLBERT, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 10084 4 kholbert@farmercase.com FARMER CASE & FEDOR 5 2190 E. Pebble Rd., Suite #205 Las Vegas, NV 89123 Telephone: (702) 579-3900 6 Facsimile: (702) 739-3001 7 Attorneys for Defendants 8 LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT FUND LLC, EB5 IMPACT CAPITAL REGIONAL CENTER LLC. EB5 IMPACT ADVISORS LLC, ROBERT W. DZIUBLA, JON FLEMING and LINDA STANWOOD 10 EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT 11 **CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA** 12 FRONT SIGHT MANAGEMENT LLC, a) CASE NO.: A-18-781084-B 13 Nevada Limited Liability Company, DEPT NO.: 16 14 Plaintiff, **DEFENDANT EB5 IMPACT ADVISORS** LLC'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S 15 VS. **MOTION FOR SANCTIONS** LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT FUND LLC, 16 Hearing Date: October 23, 2019 et al., Time: 9:00 a.m. 17 Defendants. 18 19 AND ALL RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 DEFENDANT EB5 IMPACT ADVISORS' OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS

Case Number: A-18-781084-B

Defendants EB5 IMPACT ADVISORS LLC, a Nevada Limited Liability Company (":EB5IA"), by and through its attorneys Keith Greer, Esq. and Catherine Holbert, Esq., hereby file this Opposition to Plaintiff FRONT SIGHT MANAGEMENT, LLC's ("Front Sight" or "Plaintiff") Motion for Sanctions. This Opposition is based on the pleadings and papers on file, this Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the Declaration of Robert Dziubla filed herewith, and such other and further oral or written evidence as may be presented at the time of the hearing of this Motion for Sanctions.

I. INTRODUCTION

As a threshold issue, Plaintiff's motion lacks clarity as to exactly what sanctions are sought, but appears to ask this court to skip the discovery and trial process and either: (1) strike the answer and counterclaim (Plaintiff's Motion at 9:12 - 14:12 - 15:7); (2) alternatively, require an adverse inference at trial; or (3) award monetary sanctions equal to the total amount of money paid by Plaintiff to Defendants. ² (Id. at 12:3-12). The Motion appears to be based on alternative theories relating to the claimed deficiencies in the accounting provided by EB5IA and alleged spoliation of evidence relating to certain underlying receipts and expense documentation. (Id. at 12:13 - 14:11 and 5:16 -12:2).

Contrary to Plaintiff's assertions, Plaintiff's motion is based on a fundamentally flawed premise and is factually incorrect and misleading. First, Plaintiff's motion is based on the flawed premise that Defendant was required to specifically account for all funds expended by EB5IA; it was not. Second, Plaintiff ignores the simple fact that Defendant has provided the original

25

26

27

²¹

Plaintiff never clearly identifies the adverse inference that it requests, merely stating obliquely as an aside at the end of its motion that "The inference should include an instruction to the jury that had the records, receipts, invoices, travel information, etc., been maintained, those records would have shown Defendants' misuse of funds and would have supported Front Sight's claims of fraud, misrepresentation, concealment, conversion, breach of contract, and civil conspiracy." (Mot at 15 9-13)

² Front Sight requests unspecified amounts for "attorney's fees and costs for having to bring this Motion, as well as the other motions related to compelling an accounting from Defendant EB5IA.") (Mot at 12:8-9) as well as "an amount equal to the amount of money Defendant EB5IA took from Plaintiff". (Mot at 12:10-11).

ledgers and accounting records that account for every dollar received and spent by EB5IA.

Plaintiff also complains that certain back up documentation was discarded contemporaneously before litigation was contemplated, in the ordinary course of business.

As discussed in detail below, Plaintiff's motion should be denied for the very simple reasons that: (1) Defendant EB5IA has provided an accounting which details how every single dollar received by EB5IA was spent; and (2) any backup documents which were allegedly discarded were discarded contemporaneously in the ordinary course of business, which was before litigation was contemplated. Moreover, Defendant was not obligated to retain "every scrap of paper." *Danis v. USN Commc'ns, Inc.*, No. 98 C 7482, 2000 WL 1694325, at *32 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 20, 2000) ("To be sure, the duty to preserve does not require a litigant to keep every scrap of paper in its file."); accord, *In re Old Banc One Shareholders Sec. Litig.*, No. 00 C 2100, 2005 WL 3372783, at *3 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 8, 2005).

II. ARGUMENT

A. There Is No Basis for Sanctions Because Defendant Has Provided a Proper Accounting.

Defendant EB5IA has provided a complete accounting of every dollar received and every dollar spent by providing a complete unredacted accounting ledger. Plaintiff's motion blurs the distinction between an accounting and an audit, but those instrumentalities are different concepts and require different documentation. An accounting is the method used to keep track of monetary transactions. The general ledger is the central component of the accounting process. The general ledger provides a record of each financial transaction which takes place during the accounting period. The general ledger holds account information that is needed to prepare the company's financial statements, and transaction data is segregated by type into accounts for assets, liabilities, owner's equity, revenues, and expenses. In other words, the general ledger contains all of the information necessary to have a complete understanding of the financial transactions of a company.

Production of the general ledger is production of the complete accounting records. That

is what Defendant has done here and this is a complete accounting.

An audit on the other hand is a verification of the accuracy of the accounting records. The auditor may examine the "audit trail." The general ledger is the central record necessary to the "audit process." *See, Trustees of Carpenters for S. Nevada Health & Welfare Tr. v. Better Bldg. Co.*, 101 Nev. 742, 746, 710 P.2d 1379, 1382 (1985) ("appellants were refused access to the general ledger or cash disbursement journal. Without access to those records, no accurate determination could be made of whether Better Building had fully reported").

Plaintiff's Motion dismissively refers to the documents produced as "summary QuickBooks ledgers" (Plaintiff's Motion at 10:9) and as "an alleged copy of EB5IA's QuickBooks transaction ledger" (Id. at 4:11). Plaintiff claims "Defendant EB5IA's accounting is vague, questionable, suspicious, and grossly incomplete[.]" (Id. at 14:6-7). This is a complete mischaracterization of the general ledger which provides line item detail for every dollar spent by EB5IA under penalty of perjury. In fact, the selected references claimed by Plaintiff as improprieties reveal the line item level of detail provided by the printout of the general ledger. *See, e.g.* id. at 13:12-13 ("On January 2, 2015, Defendant EB5IA paid money to the Las Vegas Justice Court on Dziubla's behalf for Citation #X01053227.") This level of detail certainly would not be included in a "summary," "vague" and "incomplete" accounting.

In the present case, Defendant has produced the complete and unredacted general ledger for EB5IA. This is, virtually by definition, a full and complete accounting. Thus, Defendant has fully complied with the order to produce an accounting.

B. There Is No Basis for Sanctions for Spoliation of Evidence

1. The Legal Standard for a Spoliation Sanction Award

"When evidence is willfully suppressed, NRS 47.250(3) creates a rebuttable presumption that the evidence would be adverse if produced. Other courts have determined that willful or intentional spoliation of evidence requires the intent to harm another party through the destruction and not simply the intent to destroy evidence. We agree. Thus, before a rebuttable presumption that willfully suppressed evidence was adverse to the destroying party applies, the

party seeking the presumption's benefit has the burden of demonstrating that the evidence was destroyed with intent to harm." *Bass-Davis v. Davis*, 122 Nev. 442, 448 (2006).

"[I]n cases based on negligently lost or destroyed evidence, an adverse inference instruction is tied to a showing that the party controlling the evidence **had notice that it was relevant at the time when the evidence was lost or destroyed**. In other words, when presented with a spoliation allegation, the threshold question should be whether the alleged spoliator was under any obligation to preserve the missing or destroyed evidence." *Bass-Davis v. Davis*, 122 Nev. 442, 449–50.[emphasis added] "[T]he prelitigation duty to preserve evidence is imposed once a party is on "notice" of a potential legal claim. While few courts have expounded on the concept of notice, those that have conclude that a party is on notice when litigation is reasonably foreseeable." *Id.* "Accordingly, '[a] party's duty to preserve specific types of documents does not arise unless the party controlling the documents has notice of those documents' relevance.' [Citation omitted.] This notice ordinarily comes from discovery requests or from the complaint itself." *In re Kmart Corp.*, 371 B.R. 823, 842 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 2007); See also *Champion Foodservice, LLC v. Vista Food Exch.*, Inc., No. 1:13-CV-1195, 2016 WL 6642228, at *16 (N.D. Ohio Aug. 23, 2016) ("The burden of proof is on plaintiff to prove all of the elements of its spoliation claim by a preponderance of the evidence.")

Here, Plaintiff cannot show that Defendant knew the relevance of a document prior to the contemplation of litigation. Moreover, Defendant has not and cannot show that discarding documents during the normal course of business, before litigation, was a willful act to hurt Plaintiff. Accordingly, Defendant did not spoliate evidence, nor did Plaintiff satisfy its burden proving spoliation by Defendant.

2. Defendant Is Not Required to Maintain "Every Scrap of Paper"

"The obligation to preserve evidence arises when the party has notice that the evidence is relevant to litigation or when a party should have known that the evidence may be relevant to future litigation." Identifying the boundaries of the duty to preserve involves two related inquiries: when does the duty to preserve attach, and what evidence must be preserved?"

3

4 5

6

8

10

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

Zubulake v. UBS Warburg LLC, 220 F.R.D. 212, 216 (S.D.N.Y. 2003). Here, neither of these inquiries supports a finding of spoliation.

Defendant is only required to maintain documents where Defendant is on notice that the documents may be relevant to future litigation. Defendant is not required to maintain every scrap of paper. Danis v. USN Communications, 2000 WL 1694325, at *30, *32 (N.D.Ill. Oct.20, 2000) ("[T]he duty to preserve potentially discoverable information does not require a party to keep every scrap of paper.); Wm. T. Thompson Co. v. Gen. Nutrition Corp., 593 F. Supp. 1443, 1454 (C.D. Cal. 1984) ("litigant is under no duty to keep or retain every document in its possession once a complaint is filed.") Instead, a party is required to keep relevant evidence over which it had control of and reasonably knew or could foresee that it was material to the litigation. See Marrocco v. General Motors Corp., 966 F.2d 220, 224 (7th Cir.1992)." In re Old Banc One Shareholders Sec. Litig., No. 00 C 2100, 2005 WL 3372783, at *3 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 8, 2005); Danis v. USN Commc'ns, Inc., No. 98 C 7482, 2000 WL 1694325, at *32 (N.D. III. Oct. 20, 2000);

In the present case, analogous to the aforementioned cases, Defendant was not obligated to preserve every receipt or invoice for every expense incurred years prior to litigation. There was no reason to believe that such documents would be relevant or material to future litigation which was not contemplated at the time the documents were destroyed.

3. Defendant's Disposition of Certain Records Was Prior to the "Trigger Date" and Pursuant to a Proper Document Retention Policy

"[W]hen presented with a spoliation allegation, the threshold question should be whether the alleged spoliator was under any obligation to preserve the missing or destroyed evidence." Bass-Davis v. Davis, 122 Nev. 442, 449–50 (2006). "[T]he parties, obliged to proceed before the MCAD, incur obligations under the Federal Rules, to preserve evidence relevant to the plaintiffs claims and to be ready to turn such evidence over should formal litigation commence. Jamie S. Gorelick et al., Destruction of Evidence, §§ 3.8-3.12 (1989) Π (one prerequisite of the imposition of sanctions for destruction of evidence is the occurrence of the act either after suit

has been filed, or, if before, when filing of the suit is fairly perceived as imminent)." *McGuire v. Acufex Microsurgical, Inc.*, 175 F.R.D. 149, 153 (D. Mass. 1997).

"Defendants engage in spoliation of documents as a matter of law **only if they had**'some notice that the documents were potentially relevant' to the litigation before they were destroyed." *United States v. Kitsap Physicians Serv.*, 314 F.3d 995, 1001 (9th Cir. 2002)

[emphasis added]. There is no "spoliation" if "the documents were kept and destroyed in the normal course of business." *Id.*; *State of Idaho Potato Comm'n v. G & T Terminal Packaging, Inc.*, 425 F.3d 708, 720 (9th Cir. 2005) (no spoliation if documents destroyed in accordance with the business' document retention policy).

Here, the evidence proffered by Plaintiff in support of its motion for sanctions makes clear that any documents that were not retained, were discarded prior to there being an obligation to preserve such evidence.

"Q. Have you disposed of any receipts, invoices, or underlying documentation for expenses from EB-5IA since it was dissolved? A. No."

(Tr. June 3, 49, 17-20.)

The EB5IA dissolution was filed with the Nevada Secretary of State on August 6, 2018. (SAC Exh 29). This action was not filed until over a month later on September 14, 2018. Plaintiff did not send a "document preservation" letter until February 8, 2019, six months **after** EB5IA was dissolved.

Moreover, the evidence is undisputed that no **receipts, invoices, or underlying documentation for expenses** was disposed of after EB5IA was dissolved. Thus, the absolute latest that any documents were disposed of was August 5, 2018, This date is prior to the "trigger date" which would impose any obligation to maintain the records.

As set forth in the accompanying Declaration of Robert Dziubla, the custodian of records for EB5IA, EB5IA utilized QuickBooks accounting software in order to keep its accounting books and records. The general practice and policy of EB5IA was to retain invoices of a material

magnitude (which were produced as part of the accounting provided by EB5IA), and to discard cash register receipts of what were considered immaterial amounts after the individual charges were entered into the QuickBooks software general ledger. (Dziubla Decl. ¶5). The computer generated accounting general ledger attached as Exhibit B to his April 3, 2019 Declaration is a complete line by line item detail of all transactions for EB5IA. (Id. ¶6) This is the most complete accounting available and was the accounting relied upon by EB5IA for all purposes. (Id.). Moreover, at the time individual invoices were discarded consistent with the EB5IA document retention policy and practice, Mr. Dziubla did not have any reason to believe that there would be any future litigation between Front Sight and EB5IA and certainly had no reason to believe that any individual invoices would be relevant or necessary for such litigation. (Id. ¶7) Many of those documents were discarded years prior to the commencement of this lawsuit. (Id.). And most importantly, no documents have been discarded since the commencement of this lawsuit in September 2019 or after Plaintiff's counsel sent a document retention demand in February 2019. (Id. ¶8).

"It defies logic to expect the plaintiffs to have collected and preserved documents from board members before the reason why those documents are relevant (their disassociation) had occurred." *Greater New York Taxi Ass'n v. City of New York*, No. 13CIV3089VSBJCF, 2017 WL 4012051, at *3 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 11, 2017). Similarly, it defies logic, to sanction Defendant for following its normal business practices relating well before there was any reason to anticipate that such documents would be relevant to future litigation that was not even contemplated at the time.

4. Imposition of the Severe Sanctions Requested Is Not Appropriate

"Generally, sanctions may only be imposed where there has been willful noncompliance with a court order or where the adversary process has been halted by the actions of the unresponsive party." *GNLV Corp. v. Serv. Control Corp.*, 111 Nev. 866, 869 (1995), *citing Fire Ins. Exchange v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 103 Nev. 648, 651, 747 P.2d 911, 913 (1987). "Fundamental notions of fairness and due process require that discovery sanctions be just and

Defendants submit there has not been any non-compliance, either intentional or negligent, and that an award of sanctions is inappropriate in this case. Moreover, the sanctions requested by Plaintiff are draconian and wholly disproportionate.

Plaintiff seeks extremely severe sanctions of striking the Defendant's Answer and Counterclaim, imposing an adverse evidentiary inference, and ordering monetary sanctions equal to the entire amount of money paid by Front Sight to Defendant (approximately \$336,000). Before the court may impose such severe sanctions "a somewhat heightened standard of review should apply." *Young v. Johnny Ribeiro Bldg., Inc.*, 106 Nev. 88, 92 (1990). Any such severe sanction order must "be supported by an express, careful and preferably written explanation of the court's analysis of the pertinent factors." *Id.*; *Foster v. Dingwall*, 126 Nev. 56, 65, 227 P.3d 1042, 1048 (2010)("heightened standard of review applies where the sanction strikes the pleadings . . . Under this somewhat heightened standard, the district court abuses its discretion if the sanctions are not just and do not relate to the claims at issue in the discovery order that was violated.")

Plaintiff's request for monetary sanctions equal to the amount of money paid by Plaintiff to Defendant is also improper. The case of *Nevada Power Co. v. Fluor Illinois*, 108 Nev. 638, 646 (1992) is instructive. In that case, the Nevada Supreme Court reversed a sanctions award finding that the "district court abused its discretion in awarding respondents all of their attorneys' fees and costs from the inception of the suit, more than \$5.2 million." *Id.* "NRCP 37(b)(2) limits an award of attorney's fees to those incurred because of the alleged failure to obey the particular order in question" *Id* at 646-647.

The *Nevada Power* court held that "sanctions, in the form of all of respondents' attorneys' fees and costs from the inception of the suit" were an abuse of discretion. "It is difficult for us to understand how the appellants' alleged violation 'caused' all of these fees and costs. We thus conclude that the district court abused its discretion in awarding all attorneys' fees and costs;

instead, under NRCP 37(b)(2), a district court should, if it properly finds that a party has violated 1 2 a discovery order, determine only those fees and costs associated with the violation of the 3 discovery order." Nevada Power Co. v. Fluor Illinois, 108 Nev. 638, 647 (1992). Applying these principles to the present motion, even assuming arguendo that Plaintiff's 4 allegations have any merit, which they don't, the sanctions sought are ridiculously 5 disproportionate to the handful of Starbucks and gas receipts that are no longer available, yet are 6 described in detail and appear to the penny in the ledgers that were produced. Thus the request 8 for sanctions should be denied. III. 9 **CONCLUSION** 10 As set forth above, Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions should be denied because: (1) 11 Defendant has provided a proper accounting; and (2) Plaintiff has not established a spoilation of 12 evidence required for imposition of sanctions. Dated: September 30, 2019 FARMER CASE & FEDOR 13 2190 E. Pebble Rd., Suite #205 14 Las Vegas, NV 89123 Telephone: (702) 579-3900 15 Facsimile: (702) 739-3001 16 /s/Kathryn Holbert 17 Kathryn Holbert, Esq. Attorney for Defendants 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 10 DEFENDANT EB5 IMPACT ADVISORS' OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE and/or MAILING
2	Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of Farmer Case & Fedor, and that on this date, I caused true and correct copies of the following document(s):
3	DEFENDANT EB5 IMPACT ADVISORS LLC'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS
4	
5	to be served on the following individuals/entities, in the following manner,
6	John P. Aldrich, Esq. Attorneys for Plaintiff Catherine Hernandez, Esq. FRONT SIGHT MANAGEMENT, LLC
7	ALDRICH LAW FIRM, LTD. 1601 S. Rainbow Blvd., Suite 160 Las Vegas, Nevada 89146
9	210 (6,00, 2 (6,000 0) 2 (6
10	By:
	■ ELECTRONIC SERVICE: Said document(s) was served electronically upon all eligible
11	electronic recipients pursuant to the electronic filing and service order of the Court (NECRF 9).
12	Dated: September 30, 2019
13	/s/ Kathryn Holbert An Employee of FARMER CASE & FEDOR
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	DEFENDANT EB5 IMPACT ADVISORS' OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS

Electronically Filed 9/30/2019 11:05 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT 1 OPP/MTN ANTHONY T. CASE, ESQ. 2 Nevada Bar No. 6589 tcase@farmercase.com KATHRYN HOLBERT, ESO. Nevada Bar No. 10084 kholbert@farmercase.com FARMER CASE & FEDOR 5 2190 E. Pebble Rd., Suite #205 Las Vegas, NV 89123 Telephone: (702) 579-3900 6 Facsimile: (702) 739-3001 7 Attorneys for Defendants 8 LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT FUND LLC, EB5 IMPACT CAPITAL REGIONAL CENTER LLC. 9 EB5 IMPACT ADVISORS LLC, ROBERT W. DZIUBLA, JON FLEMING and LINDA STANWOOD 10 EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT 11 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 12 FRONT SIGHT MANAGEMENT LLC, a) CASE NO.: A-18-781084-B 13 Nevada Limited Liability Company, **DEPT NO.: 16** 14 Plaintiff, **DECLARATION OF ROBERT DZIUBLA IN** 15 OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION vs. FOR SANCTIONS 16 LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT FUND LLC, Hearing Date: October 23, 2019 et al., 17 Time: 9:00 a.m. Defendants. 18 19 AND ALL RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 DZIUBLA DECLARATION IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS

Case Number: A-18-781084-B

Affiant, hereby states and declares as follows:

- I, Robert W. Dziubla, am an individual and a resident of the State of California,
 County of San Diego.
- 2. I was the founder and an officer of EB5 Impact Advisors ("EB5IA") from its founding through and including its dissolution in August 2018. I am currently the designated officer of EB5IA for "winding up" matters post dissolution.
- 3. I make this Declaration of my personal knowledge and the matters stated herein are true and correct. If called as a witness herein, I could, and would, testify competently thereto.
 - 4. At all times relevant hereto I was, and am, the custodian of records for EB5IA.
- 5. EB5IA utilized QuickBooks accounting software in order to keep its accounting books and records. The general practice and policy of EB5IA was to retain invoices of a material magnitude (which were produced as part of the accounting provided by EB5IA), and to discard cash register receipts of what were considered immaterial amounts after the individual charges were entered into the QuickBooks software general ledger.
- 6. The computer generated accounting general ledger attached as Exhibit B to my April 3, 2019 Declaration is a complete line by line item detail of all transactions for EB5IA. This is the most complete accounting available and was the accounting relied upon by EB5IA for all purposes.
- 7. At the time individual invoices were discarded consistent with the EB5IA document retention policy and practice, I did not have any reason to believe that there would be any future litigation between Front Sight and EB5IA and certainly had no reason to believe that any individual invoices would be relevant or necessary for such litigation. Many of those documents were discarded years prior to the commencement of this lawsuit.

8. Importantly, no documents have been discarded since the commencement of this lawsuit in September 2019 or after Plaintiff's counsel sent a document retention demand in February 2019.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Nevada and the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this Declaration was executed on September 30, 2019 at Escondido, California.

Robert Dziu

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE and/or MAILING 1 2 Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of Farmer Case & Fedor, and that on this date, I caused true and correct copies of the following document(s): 3 DECLARATION OF ROBERT W. DZIUBŁA IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR SANCTIONS 4 to be served on the following individuals/entities, in the following manner, 5 John P. Aldrich, Esq. Attorneys for Plaintiff 6 FRONT SIGHT MANAGEMENT, LLC Catherine Hernandez, Esq. 7 ALDRICH LAW FIRM, LTD. 1601 S. Rainbow Blvd., Suite 160 8 Las Vegas, Nevada 89146 9 By: ■ ELECTRONIC SERVICE: Said document(s) was served electronically upon all eligible 10 electronic recipients pursuant to the electronic filing and service order of the Court (NECRF 9). 11 [] U.S. MAIL: I deposited a true and correct copy of said document(s) in a sealed, postage prepaid envelope, in the United States Mail, to those parties and/or above named 12 individuals which were not on the Court's electronic service list. 13 Dated: September 30, 2019 14 /s/ Kathryn Holbert An Employee of FARMER CASE & FEDOR 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 DZIUBLA DECLARATION IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS

```
CASE NO. A-18-781084-B
   DOCKET U
 2
   DEPT. XVI
 3
 4
 5
                         DISTRICT COURT
 6
 7
                      CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
 8
                           * * * * *
 9
   FRONT SIGHT MANAGEMENT LLC,
10
               Plaintiff,
11
         vs.
   LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT FUND LLC,
12
               Defendant.
13
14
15
                    REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT
                               OF
16
                            MOTIONS
17
18
       BEFORE THE HONORABLE JUDGE TIMOTHY C. WILLIAMS
                     DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
19
20
               DATED WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2019
21
22
23
24
   REPORTED BY: PEGGY ISOM, RMR, NV CCR #541
25
```

```
APPEARANCES:
 1
   FOR THE DEFENDANT:
 2
 3
           FARMER, CASE & FEDOR
 4
           BY: KATHRYN HOLBERT, ESQ.
 5
           2510 WIGWAM PARKWAY
 6
           SUITE 206
 7
           HENDERSON, NV 89074
 8
           (702) 579-3900
 9
           KHOLBERT@FARMERCASE.COM
10
11
   PRO HAC VICE:
12
13
           GREER & ASSOCIATES
14
           BY: KEITH GREER, ESQ.
15
           17150 VIA DEL CAMPO
16
           SUITE 100
17
           SAN DIEGO, CA 92127
18
           (858) 613-6677
19
           (858) 613-6680 Fax
20
           KEITH.GREER@GREERLAW.BIZ
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
   APPEARANCES CONTINUED:
 2
   FOR THE PLAINTIFF:
 3
 4
 5
           ALDRICH LAW FIRM
           BY: JOHN ALDRICH, ESQ.
 6
 7
           1601 SOUTH RAINBOW AVENUE
 8
           SUITE 160
 9
           LAS VEGAS, NV 89146
10
           (702) 853-5490
11
           (702)227-1975 Fax
12
           JALDRICH@JOHNALDRICHLAWFIRM.COM
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
        LAS VEGAS, NEVADA; WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2019
                          1:27 P..M.
2
                    PROCEEDINGS
3
 4
5
            THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon.
 6
7
            IN UNISON: Good afternoon, your Honor.
            THE COURT: And let's go ahead and place our
8
9
   appearances on the record.
10
            MR. ALDRICH: Good afternoon, your Honor.
  John Aldrich on behalf of plaintiff.
11
12
            MS. HOLBERT: Good afternoon, your Honor.
   Kathryn Holbert on behalf of defendants.
13
14
            MR. GREER: Keith Greer on behalf of
   defendants.
                Also here with Robert Dziubla.
15
            THE COURT: All right. And before we get
16
17
   started, there's one issue I just wanted to kind of
   address and decide what to do with it.
18
            Mr. Aldrich, I have your ex parte motion for
19
   an order shortening time on plaintiff's motion to
20
   extinguish the LVDF's deed of trust or in the
21
22
   alternative grant senior debt lender Romspen a first
  lien position.
23
24
            And the reason why I'm only bringing it up,
25
  what should we do with this? Because this is a motion
```

```
for order shortening time. It's my understanding don't
   we have it pending also? Has it been filed yet?
2
            MS. HOLBERT: It has been filed and, I
3
   believe, it was set for hearing on November 5.
5
            THE COURT: That's my question. And so it's
   like having two -- you can't have two filings. Do you
6
   want -- do you want to potentially advance one or what
   do you want to do?
8
            MR. ALDRICH: I'm not sure what the Court
9
   means by I have two files. We filed the motion.
10
11
            THE COURT: Right.
12
            MR. ALDRICH: And then I sent it down with an
   order shortening time asking to move the hearing date
13
14
   from when it is set. I don't remember if it was
   November 5th or the 15th, but it was -- I want to say
15
   it was five weeks from when it went out there.
16
            THE COURT: Right.
17
            MR. ALDRICH: So we would like to have it
18
   heard sooner than that. We already have a hearing on
19
   the 23rd.
20
            THE COURT: Well, that's my question.
21
                                                    And we
22
   can maybe deal with that administratively now.
            And this is kind of -- this is what I do with
23
   issues like that. I think -- because one of the things
24
25
  you want to do is you want to make sure you have
```

```
consistency.
 1
            So once something is set, I don't move it;
 2
           If you want to file a motion to advance it, you
   right?
 3
   can do that. But I think once it's set, I don't think
   the Court can sua sponte start moving stuff around.
 5
   don't do that. I never have.
 6
 7
            So -- so the -- and the only reason why I
   brought it in today, maybe it should be advanced to the
 8
          I don't know. But I don't think an ex -- I
   23rd.
   think an order shortening time after the fact is kind
10
   of having the Court advance the things and move the
11
12
   calendar around, without the input of adverse counsel.
13
            MR. ALDRICH: So is the Court saying that I
   should move for an order shortening time before I file
14
15
   the motion?
            THE COURT: No, it would have -- well,
16
17
   probably because that's how things are typically run,
   right?
18
            MS. HOLBERT:
                          Right.
19
            THE COURT: You get your order shortening
20
          I sign it. I give you a date, and we set it.
21
   time.
22
   But see, once it's set, it's set.
            And I think procedurally the best way to
23
   handle that would be like a motion to advance, but
24
25
   since you're here, I said I'd bring it up, and maybe
```

```
there's no opposition to just put it -- move it to the
   23rd.
2
            MR. ALDRICH: Okay.
                                 I just wasn't going to --
3
   the reason I did it that way is because --
5
            THE COURT: Well, it doesn't matter.
   doesn't matter.
6
7
            MR. ALDRICH: I know some things changed, but
  what I've had happen is when I sent down an order
   shortening time and the motion hadn't been filed yet,
   it gets sent back to me saying send me a file stamped
10
   copy. Well, when I do it, I guess, maybe what I need
11
12
   to do is not request a hearing when I file it.
13
            THE COURT:
                        Right.
                                Yeah.
14
            MR. ALDRICH: Okay. So I'll do that in the
            That's fine.
15
   future.
            I mean, certainly I'd love to have it heard on
16
   the 23rd. It was filed last Friday.
17
18
            THE COURT: Is there any opposition to that?
            MR. GREER: Your Honor, we do. We're going to
19
   need time to respond. This whole thing with now the
20
21
   timing -- like our motion is due ten days after you get
22
   them or 14 days?
23
            THE COURT: Ten days.
24
            MS. HOLBERT: Right. And it's ten straight
25
   days now, which makes it, you know, like, five
```

```
calendar -- five business days.
 1
            MR. ALDRICH: Which makes it due next Monday.
 2
            THE COURT REPORTER:
                                 I need one at a time.
 3
 4
            THE COURT: One at a time.
 5
            MR. GREER: So Monday is a Court holiday, so
   due Tuesday; right?
 6
 7
            MR. ALDRICH: If Monday is a Court holiday,
   then it would be Tuesday.
 8
            THE COURT: So next Tuesday as well.
 9
                  (A discussion was held off record.)
10
            MR. ALDRICH: I don't think that's a state
11
12
   court holiday.
            MR. GREER: Not here in Nevada. So we're
13
   going to be jammed.
14
15
            THE COURT: So if it's due on the 14th, why
   couldn't we hear it the next following week?
16
17
            MR. GREER: Here's -- I may have a conflict,
   your Honor, is a problem. We'll be starting trial on
18
   the 15th. And so the 23rd is going to be a challenge
19
   for me. The 5th I should be done by. That's an
20
21
   important motion.
22
            Your Honor, also it's -- that should be --
23
            THE COURT: But, you know what, this is why I
   do everything in open court. Right?
24
25
            MR. GREER:
                        Right.
```

```
1
            MS. HOLBERT:
                          Right.
            MR. GREER: Here's -- we think that this
 2
   really is relevant to the pending motion to appoint a
 3
   receiver, and for relief from the preliminary
   injunction. And so we'd actually like to have that
 5
   resolved relatively quickly.
 6
 7
            I'm just concerned the 23rd is not going to
   work for me.
 8
            MR. ALDRICH: We have two hearings set on that
 9
10
   day already.
11
            MR. GREER: So is that -- those are -- what do
12
   we have, motion to squash?
            MS. HOLBERT: I think motion for sanction,
13
   motion to compel; right?
14
15
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          That's right.
            MR. GREER: So that would be --
16
            MS. HOLBERT: Yeah, well --
17
                  (A discussion was held off record.)
18
            MR. GREER: I won't know until Friday when the
19
   Court -- we have trial call. And when the Court sets
20
21
   this up.
22
            And then I may be fortunate to get a courtroom
   to start on that date for trial, in which case I'm -- I
23
   don't have to even worry about, but I don't know until
24
25
   Friday.
```

```
1
            THE COURT: Okay. Should we go back on the
 2
   record?
                       You want to put it on the 23rd?
 3
            MR. GREER:
   And -- because if I'm going to have to move, I'm going
   to have to move everything.
 5
            THE COURT: How about that, Mr. Aldrich?
 6
 7
            MR. GREER: Yeah.
            THE COURT: We'll just put it on the 23rd.
 8
   And if -- we'll know Friday if it has to be moved or
        If it has to be moved because of trial and that
10
   that type of stuff, we will just move it.
11
12
            MR. ALDRICH: So I have no problem with the
   23rd.
          That's great. I just want to point out, and
13
   I -- I understand Mr. Greer's schedule, so -- and I
14
   understand how that works because I have the same
15
   issues sometimes.
16
17
            THE COURT: Yes.
18
            MR. ALDRICH: But I just want to note that the
   Court has expressed concern that this is taking a long
19
   time and has expressed a desire to have us try the case
20
   in January or thereabouts, which I'm sure we'll talk
21
22
   about in a minute.
23
            THE COURT: January or February. Sometime
   after the first of the year.
24
                          Sooner than October or whatever
25
            MR. ALDRICH:
```

```
it's set for.
 1
 2
            THE COURT: Yes. It could be June maybe, but
   sooner than October.
 3
 4
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          That would still be a lot
 5
   sooner.
            THE COURT:
                        Yes.
 6
 7
            MR. ALDRICH: I just want to make sure that
   there's an understanding here that these are important
 8
   motions for me and for getting discovery that are going
   to be heard on the 23rd. So I understand if they have
10
   to get moved, they have to get moved. But that cannot
11
12
   count against me as we're trying to move forward.
13
            MR. GREER: Your Honor, he's already got two
   months against him.
                       I'll take a week.
14
15
            THE COURT: All right.
            Mr. Aldrich, I don't think -- I can't think of
16
17
   any reason why I would count that against you. I mean,
18
   really. I mean, because this case -- let's keep it how
   it is.
19
20
            This case is very unique. There's a lot of
   unique issues. We're in a very unique procedural
21
22
   posture. We can all agree; right?
23
            And I can't sit back and say anyone involved
   in this litigation has even a scintilla of dilatory
24
25
   conduct.
             In fact, it's been very aggressive, you know.
```

```
So that's a nonissue. It really isn't.
            So -- but just as important, too,
 2
   historically, I do get that we can't circumvent due
 3
   process. I understand that aspect too.
 5
            All I'm trying to figure out on some level,
   efficiency; right? That's, really and truly, what it
 6
   all comes down to. Because we have spent a lot of time
   together. I can't think of any case I've ever had
 8
   other than -- I mean, yeah, I have had some complex
10
   cases that have gone to trial where we've had maybe a
   month of pretrial motions. I've had that in a few
11
12
   cases.
13
            But I can't think of any cases where I've
   had -- and this isn't meant in a negative way -- where
14
   I've had prolonged serial law and motion like I have in
15
               If you understand what I mean.
16
   this case.
17
            MR. GREER: Yeah. So we have no objection
18
   putting it on the 23rd.
                          Okay.
19
            MR. ALDRICH:
20
            MR. GREER: And hopefully we can get here on
   the 23rd.
21
22
            THE COURT: Yeah.
            MR. GREER: We'd like to have this heard as
23
24
   quickly as possible.
25
            THE COURT:
                        Okay.
                               That's what we'll do.
                                                       You
```

```
can see why I handled it the way I do handle it.
   kind of do that because it just seems to me from a
 2
   judicial philosophical perspective, I do -- I do
 3
   everything in open court, even when I have unopposed
   motions. I don't grant anything until I'm in open
 5
   court. I find that that saves time.
                                          It just does.
 6
 7
            And think about it, I just saved a lot of time
   here today by handling it the way I did.
 8
            MR. ALDRICH: And I -- my client appreciates
 9
10
   it and we appreciate the accommodation to have it heard
   on the 23rd.
11
12
            THE COURT:
                        Right.
                                Right. So what we'll do
   then, and I just want to make sure we have the --
13
14
   because this has been filed, it's my understanding.
15
   And what date is that set for?
            MS. HOLBERT: Your Honor, I just
16
17
   double-checked. It actually was set for 10-13.
            MR. ALDRICH:
18
                          11-13.
            MR. GREER:
                       11-13.
19
20
                          11-13, sorry.
            MS. HOLBERT:
21
            THE COURT: 11-13. Oh, yeah, there you go.
22
            So what we'll do as far as plaintiff's motion
   to extinguish the LVDF deed of trust, et al, we'll go
23
   ahead and we'll move that to the 23rd. And what we'll
24
25
   do today if you remind me, we can have a status check,
```

```
say maybe Friday 1:00 telephonically, just to see where
 2
   you're at and you can let us know. And we can handle
                 That way we don't have to -- we want
   it that way.
 3
   efficiency.
            MR. GREER: Very good.
 5
            THE COURT: That's all I'm looking for.
 6
 7
   remind me to set -- maybe we'll set that right now
   before we forget.
 8
            What do we have Friday? We're in trial;
 9
10
   right?
11
            THE COURT CLERK: Starting at 9:30, all day.
12
            THE COURT:
                       Okay. What do you -- what would
   be a good time to have a telephonic status check on
13
14
   that?
15
            MR. GREER: Probably late afternoon.
   Los Angeles, you go on the wheel, you don't know where
16
17
   you're going to wind up. It takes sometimes the better
18
   time of the day to get a Court.
            THE COURT: Would 4:00 o'clock be safe?
19
20
            MR. GREER: 4:00 would be fine.
            MR. ALDRICH: I'm around, that's fine.
21
22
            THE COURT: And you don't have to come down
23
   for it.
            We'll have you call in on CourtCall.
            MR. ALDRICH:
24
                          Sure.
25
            THE COURT: Because I should be on day two in
```

```
jury selection at the time.
            So we'll put that at 4:00, and we'll put it on
 2
   calendar. And so what we'll do is -- do we have the
 3
   CourtCall information?
            THE COURT CLERK: We do.
 5
            THE COURT: We'll use CourtCall. We'll make
 6
 7
   sure you get copies of everything.
            MS. HOLBERT:
 8
                          Thank you.
            MR. GREER: Your Honor, just a question on
 9
   that, then, too, because right now I don't know if the
10
   Court -- is the Court planning on ruling today on the
11
12
   pending motion for receiver and relief from the
   preliminary injunction? Because if the Court isn't, I
13
14
   think that the issues that are presented here with this
   alleged any financing and the concessions that Front
15
   Sight is asking LVD Fund to make and to make this
16
17
   happen, it all -- we believe it ties together and
18
   supports the need for a receiver. So what I'd like to
   ask is that -- we put that on calendar for -- maybe for
19
   further hearing. Would that work? On the 23rd?
20
            Unless the Court is prepared today to say,
21
22
   Yes, let's put a receiver on board, in which case we
   won't need it.
23
            THE COURT: Mr. Aldrich?
24
25
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          I mean, we are -- we argued the
```

```
motion for receiver already, but --
            THE COURT: Maybe there is something I need to
 2
   hear in your motion that would help guide me.
 3
 4
            MR. ALDRICH: I mean, we're going to be here.
 5
   So, I guess, I would call it a soft objection, but
   really what is it? If it's going to come up anyway,
 6
   it's going to come up, anyway. So I'm here.
            THE COURT: I'll delay -- I'll defer the
 8
   ruling until after I hear your motion.
 9
            MR. ALDRICH:
10
                          Okay.
11
            THE COURT: Is that what you want, sir?
12
            MR. GREER: Actually after you hear our
   opposition.
13
14
            THE COURT: Yeah.
15
            MR. GREER: Because --
            THE COURT: Motion and opposition. And we'll
16
17
   just move it to that day so you don't have to be here.
18
            MR. ALDRICH: There is not necessarily
   opposition maybe.
19
20
                  (A discussion was held off record.)
            MR. GREER: Yes, your Honor.
21
22
            THE COURT: Sir.
23
            MR. GREER: Just -- was the Court going to
   issue a ruling today on that?
24
25
            THE COURT:
                        No.
```

```
1
            MR. GREER: Good.
                                Thank you.
            You're in hot water.
 2
            THE COURT: No. All right.
 3
 4
            This is the case that keeps on going.
            So where do we need to continue from?
 5
                                                   Where
   do we start off at?
 6
 7
            MR. ALDRICH:
                           Today we have defendant's motion
   to bifurcate. We have -- both sides have motions to
 8
   quash subpoenas to third parties.
 9
            We've got a discussion of the Rule 65(a)(2)
10
            And a supplemental Rule 16 conference, I
11
  notice.
12
   guess, related to the counter-defendants.
            MS. HOLBERT:
13
                           Yeah. And there is actually a
   status check regarding setting continued preliminary
14
   injunction hearing.
15
            THE COURT: There's a lot.
16
17
            MS. HOLBERT: But all of that relates to
18
   calendaring things.
            THE COURT: Yes.
19
20
            MR. ALDRICH: So there was some discussion
21
   among counsel before.
                           There was some concern about how
22
   long those subpoena -- motions to quash the subpoenas
23
   may take.
24
            So if it pleases the Court, we can start with
25
   the motion to bifurcate and then have a discussion
```

```
about the Rule 65(a)(2) notice. And then handle the
   rule -- supplemental Rule 16 conference before we do
 2
   the motions to quash.
 3
 4
            Does that seem fair?
 5
            MR. GREER: Yes.
            MS. HOLBERT: Yeah.
 6
 7
            THE COURT: All right. That's what we'll do.
            And that's for Friday at 4:00. That's the
 8
   CourtCall instructions so both of you have that.
 9
10
            MR. GREER:
                        Thank you.
11
            THE COURT: So we're dealing with the motion
12
   to bifurcate right now; is that correct?
            MR. ALDRICH: Yes.
13
14
            MR. GREER:
                       Yes, your Honor.
15
            THE COURT:
                        Okay. I got you.
                  (Brief pause in proceedings.)
16
17
            THE COURT: I'm ready when you are.
18
            MR. GREER: Yes, your Honor.
            THE COURT:
                        Yes.
19
20
            MR. GREER: Our argument here, your Honor,
21
   very short, concise. We've laid it out in our papers.
22
   I have little to add.
23
            This case involves two separate contracts:
24
   The February 2013 engagement letter, the October 2016
25
   construction loan agreements.
```

```
1
            Different parties involved with each.
   loan agreement involving Las Vegas Development Fund
 2
   solely. EB5 Impact Capital Advisors being the
 3
   principal defendants in the engagement letter case.
            So we have different contracts. Different
 5
             Because of the contractual provisions of the
 6
   parties.
   construction loan agreement, all issues relating to
   that are to be heard by your Honor as both parties
 8
   waived jury.
 9
            Conversely, there's no such provision in the
10
11
   engagement letter. Remember the engagement letter
12
   involves allegations of fraudulent inducements,
   misrepresentation -- misspending of funds,
13
14
   misallocation of funds, et cetera; whereas, the
   construction loan agreement very, very simple.
15
   Borrower lender arrangement.
16
17
            Las Vegas Development Fund got the money to
   Front Sight. Front Sight breached every single
18
   provision as we've laid out in the construction loan
19
   agreement, including the monetary breaches.
20
                                                 We just
   gave your Honor today supplemental notice of default.
21
22
   Notice of default that was filed by Las Vegas
23
   Development Fund to -- sent to Front Sight a few days
   ago confirming that they are, again, in monetary
24
25
   default for failing to make the interest payment for
```

1 this month.

We have EB5 investors that are involved in the construction loan case. Time is of the essence for them. You know, this process is set up so that lenders that are secured and construction loans can quickly resolve the matter and not be dragged out, all the typical type of things that distract the litigants in traditional business litigation.

By bifurcating the two cases, we allow the construction loan case to go forward quickly, hopefully winding up eventually with relief from the preliminary injunction and a nonjudicial foreclosure, or in the alternative, perhaps at this time the loan -- proposed loan agreement with Front Sight is actually real. Perhaps a resolution of the case between the parties, but either way it just makes sense to bifurcate at this point in time.

The key element the Court, I think, should consider that was attached as Exhibit 1 to my declaration is the May 12, 2016, email from Robert Dziubla to the principals at Front Sight, laying out, saying, Hey, we're not going to make the amounts of money that was anticipated. 70 million is not going to come. 50 million is not going to come. We have a decision to make now. Do we walk away from each other?

```
Give the money back to the investors? Do we sell the
resource center to you, you go on your own? Or do we
get rid of the limits that were set previously and
let's just lend the money that is there and move
forward knowing that the expectations from the past are
not going to be met.

At that time Front Sight decided to go
```

forward. That is the perfect place to put the dividing line between these two cases. From that point forward, there are no misrepresentations even alleged because all of the statements in the past about what was going to be achieved and what money was going to be raised ended as of May 12, 2016. The parties went through with no expectations at that point in time.

Just knowing that LVD Fund was going to lend the money. Front Sight was going to be the borrower. And from that point forward, the monies that were going to be paid to LVD Fund for raising the funds were going to be progress payments, such that whenever LVD Fund was able to get an investor to put money into the escrow. When that money was released from the escrow to Front Sight, Front Sight would pay the fee.

That was it. It was a paid-in-place situation at that point in time. And there's just the two very, very distinct cases, different lives and different

```
interests in both sides. And the compelling interest
   here is that the construction loan agreement is just
 2
   that: A construction loan agreement to -- it involves
 3
   EB5 investors where time is of the essence.
 5
            Remember, the completion date for this project
   was October 4. So we're now done with the project.
 6
   We're done with -- the time to complete it is done.
   And according to Mr. Piazza's testimony on the stand,
 8
   they haven't even prepared plans for the vertical
   structures.
10
11
            So we really need to get things rolling on the
12
   construction lending side and not with these EB5
   investors in jeopardy.
13
14
            I will note that the case, Mr. Aldrich brings
   it up, Front Sight has brought forth some hearsay
15
   evidence recently alleging that there have been enough
16
   jobs created already, such that EB5 investors don't
17
18
   matter.
            They should be filing their papers now.
            Well, looking at the law, this is what we
19
   don't allow hearsay where hearsay shouldn't be allowed.
20
   The problem there is that there's a fundamental fact
21
22
   that Mr. Evans, Front Sight's economist, relied upon,
23
   which doesn't exist here. And that is the only way
   that Front Sight can get credit for jobs created from
24
25
   the date they chose, which was the date of the
```

```
engagement letter back in 2011, is if there was a
   bridge loan.
 2
            A bridge loan is used to create the jobs and
 3
   do the construction prior to the time that the EB5
  monies is received. The builder, the investors, can
 5
   get credit for that. There is no bridge loan here.
 6
   There's no evidence of a bridge loan, and that's why
   the economy -- the economist report from Mr. Evans is
 8
   just worthless in this case.
            So it's ridiculous to think that if the EB5
10
   investors were in a situation where they could get
11
12
   their cards, they would have done so already.
   Mr. Dziubla, that his responsibility to say on top of
13
   that; the investors' responsibility to file the
14
   paperwork. But there's just no evidence before the
15
   Court that's admissible that supports Front Sight's
16
17
   contention that EB5 doesn't matter anymore.
18
            THE COURT:
                        Thank you, sir.
            MR. ALDRICH: Good afternoon, your Honor.
19
20
            I also set forth my position in the pleadings,
   and I'm sure the Court has reviewed those. I've got a
21
22
   couple of comments based on what Mr. Greer said, and
23
   I'll highlight some of the things in my brief.
24
            The first is, is that Mr. Greer made the
25
   statement today that Front Sight had not made its
```

```
payment for October. I did not ask my client for proof
   of that today, and I can get it if I need it, but my
 2
   understanding is the payment was made for October.
 3
 4
            MR. GREER:
                        Hold.
                                Time out.
                                           Time -- now,
                I misread -- I misread the record.
   your Honor.
 5
                                                     They
   have -- they made the regular interest. They didn't
 6
   make the default interest.
            MR. ALDRICH: Okay.
 8
            MR. GREER: I stand corrected.
 9
   corrected.
10
11
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          There we go.
12
            THE COURT: And I understand that's in
   dispute.
13
14
            MR. ALDRICH: Correct. The default interest
   amount is in dispute.
15
            And I will note at the last hearing we asked
16
   for the calculation of the default interest and hadn't
17
18
   received it. I've sent two emails and made a phone
   call -- actually Mr. Greer called me. We talked about
19
        And today I still don't have it.
                                           I have no
20
21
   calculation of what that default interest is. I asked
22
   for June, July, and August, and I don't have it.
23
            So, anyway, it goes to a lot of other things
   we've been asking for, but we'll talk about that on the
24
   23rd.
25
```

1 Now, with regard to the motion to bifurcate, for good reason the defendants are asking the Court to 2 ignore the fraud allegations. There's a good reason 3 Because there isn't -- there aren't two distinct agreements here. I mean, there are two 5 agreements, but they're not unrelated. They're 6 absolutely related. 8 Mr. Greer says they're separate parties, except that Mr. Dziubla owns -- he's the CEO and owner 9 of all the entities involved. EB5 IA, EB5 Impact 10 Capital, the regional center, Las Vegas Development 11 12 Fund, he's the underlying piece. 13 Interestingly enough, we have -- while I'm 14 still going to continue to complain that I don't have 15 all the evidence I need from the other side, we do have some testimony because we've been here several days. 16 17 Among the things that Mr. Dziubla said was that once 18 the construction loan agreement was signed, Las Vegas Development Fund assumed primary role of marketing, but 19 20 the problem with that is that he continued to take money from Front Sight through EB5 IA, the alleged 21 22 marketing entity, for a long time after October of 2016. Well, then we also learned that Mr. Dziubla 23 stopped marketing the project all together at the end 24 25 of 2017, yet continued to accept tens of thousands of

```
dollars from Front Sight allegedly for marketing well
   into 2018.
 2
            How is that not continuing fraud? And that --
 3
   I mean, I could go on, but that's -- that's the easy
   low-hanging fruit.
 5
            We also heard from Dr. Piazza when he was here
 6
 7
   to testify about this May 12 of 2016 email that the
   defendants point to as being the smoking gun, except
 8
   that Dr. Piazza explained what happened there.
            They had a meeting a few days later.
10
   Mr. Dziubla and Mr. Fleming came hat in hand looking
11
12
   like homeless people begging for more money and saying,
   We need to remove the minimum raise, but once we do
13
   they're all lined up. We're ready to go.
14
15
            That's additional fraudulent inducement well
   beyond that May 12 of 2016 email.
16
17
            I could go on.
                            I won't belabor it too much
   right now, but those facts show that this is a
18
   continuing fraud.
19
20
            Now, there are the causes of action.
                                                   The
   plaintiff has causes of action for fraud and
21
22
   intentional misrepresentation, conversion, civil
23
   conspiracy, breach of contract, breach of the implied
   covenant of good faith and fair dealing, intentional
24
25
   interference with prospective economic advantage, and
```

```
negligent misrepresentation.
                                  There are also
   counterclaims that are for intentional interference
 2
   with contractual relationships, conversion, civil
 3
   conspiracy, judicial foreclosure, and waste.
 5
            Now, I've walked through in my brief and
   talked about bifurcating the claim. It's our position
 6
   that bifurcating this case is going to cause
   essentially two trials to happen, duplicative evidence,
   all those different things. However, if the Court
   wants to bifurcate this trial and it chooses to do so,
10
   I've also outlined exactly how that has to go.
11
12
            The fraud in the inducement claims have to go
   first. Because that would -- if the contract is deemed
13
   void, rescinded, whatever it turns out to be because of
14
   the fraud in the inducement, all the rest of the claims
15
   go away and the Court doesn't have to try the rest of
16
17
   the case.
18
            I walked through --
            THE COURT: So what you're saying is this.
19
   You're saying, Look, Judge, if there's fraud in the
20
   inducement, there can't be a breach of the construction
21
22
   loan agreement.
            MR. ALDRICH:
23
                          Correct.
            THE COURT: I understand.
24
25
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          And so if there's going to be a
```

```
bifurcation, those have to go first.
            Then if the Court finds that there's not
 2
   fraud, then we can fight about how the agreement went
 3
   down and who's in breach and all those different
            And I walked through these cases.
   things.
 5
            THE COURT: And I want to make sure I'm clear
 6
 7
   on this. Are there any remaining equitable claims?
            MR. ALDRICH: That's a good question.
 8
            Because -- I don't think I have a second
 9
   amended complaint with me.
10
11
            We certainly have -- could amend once we have
12
   all the evidence, too, to assert some equitable claims,
   rescission, or something like that. As I stand here
13
   today, your Honor, I can't remember if we have an
14
   asserted rescission as a possible remedy in the second
15
   amended complaint. I don't remember.
16
17
            But certainly the fraud claims are either
   common law based. I think they're probably ripe for a
18
          I will say this, there is --
19
20
            THE COURT: And you know why I asked that
   question, because if it's at law, the jury decides, or
21
   the ultimate fact finder.
22
            MR. ALDRICH: Correct.
23
24
            THE COURT: If it's an equitable claim, the
   trial court decides.
25
```

```
1
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          The Court does. I understand
 2
   that.
            We do have, I guess, an issue as to whether a
 3
   jury is appropriate here or not. The construction loan
   agreement says that there's a waiver of that jury
 5
           The defendants actually filed a request or
 6
   trial.
   demand for jury trial. And when they did, so did we.
            And so, I mean, our position, I guess, would
 8
   be with those claims that are appropriate before a
10
   jury, they should be put there because they've been
   waived, or that that waiver of a jury trial regardless
11
12
   has been waived because the defendants filed a demand.
   We filed it too.
13
14
            THE COURT: That's an interesting issue.
            MR. ALDRICH: It is interesting.
15
            THE COURT: Before I comment on that, before I
16
17
   make a decision, unless there was an agreement, I'd ask
18
   for full briefing on that because that's a fascinating
   issue.
19
20
                         And your Honor probably doesn't
            MR. ALDRICH:
   remember because this was a long time ago, but I argued
21
22
   this issue in front of the Court many years ago on
   another trial I had in front of the Court. And that's
23
   what the Court made us do in this instance as well.
24
25
            THE COURT:
                        I never rush to judgment,
```

```
Mr. Aldrich.
            MR. ALDRICH: Understood. I -- it came up, so
 2
   I just raised that issue.
 3
 4
            THE COURT:
                        Yeah.
 5
            MR. ALDRICH: But --
            THE COURT: Well, at least I'm consistent;
 6
 7
   right?
            MR. ALDRICH: That is correct.
 8
            THE COURT: Yes.
 9
            MR. ALDRICH: But the bottom line, back to the
10
  motion to bifurcate, I cited the Awada case. I walked
11
12
   through that. I won't read the Court the quotes, but
   it makes it pretty clear fraud in the inducement comes
13
14
   first. The only case that was cited by defendants in
   their brief was a federal court case. And they -- they
15
   did bifurcate in that, but they bifurcated fraud claims
16
17
   related to a separate sales agreement versus the other
   issue involved.
18
            So in this instance, as I said before, it's
19
   really one continuous fraud, and it should be tried --
20
   really it should be tried together. But if the Court
21
22
   is going to bifurcate, the fraud claims should go
   first.
23
24
            Does the Court have more questions for me?
25
            THE COURT:
                        No, sir.
```

```
1
            MR. ALDRICH: All right. Thank you for your
   time.
 2
                             -000-
 3
                            (Recess)
 4
                             -000-
 5
            THE COURT:
                        All right. Mr. Greer.
            MR. GREER:
                        Yes, your Honor.
 6
 7
            Mr. Aldrich stated that this is an ongoing
   continuous fraud because -- in part because Las Vegas
 8
   Development Fund continued to accept money for
   marketing, even after May 2015.
10
11
            But what is disingenuous about that is prior
12
   to May of 2016, monies coming from Front Sight were
13
   given to EB5 Impact Capital Advisors in order to do
14
   specific things like set up a resources -- a regional
   resources center, set up a team of brokers and agents,
15
   establish the infrastructure for EB5 fundraising
16
17
   operations.
18
            After May 2012 the rules changed because
   there's a new agreement, and the agreement at that
19
   point in time is there's no money given, just checks
20
   cut over to Las Vegas Development Fund with them having
21
22
   the discretion to then go out and spend it on marketing
23
   and then, you know, report to Front Sight in someway.
24
            No, at that point in time Front Sight said, In
25
   light of the fact that we're not going to make all the
```

```
money that we thought we're going to make sure, I guess
   haven't achieved the goals that we were aspiring to,
 2
   from now on out, we're not going to pay up unless you
 3
   give us money.
 5
            And so at that point in time, after the
   May 2016, every bit of money that Mr. Piazza and
 6
   Mr. Aldrich are saying were for marketing, that was for
   performance. Checks weren't given to -- if there were
 8
   some given to the Capital Advisors and Impact Advisors;
10
   some were given to LVD Fund. But they were all after
   monies were released from escrow to Front Sight, then
11
12
   the performance payment was given.
13
            So that's -- that's, again, a reason to
   bifurcate because there is no issue of how that money
14
   was to be spent. Front Sight had no control over how
15
   that money was to be spent. Las Vegas Development Fund
16
17
   had no obligation to tell Front Sight how it was
18
   spending that money. All that Las Vegas Development
   Fund had to do was go out, get capital, give it to
19
   Front Sight, and get paid for doing so.
20
21
            So it also shows how it's disingenuous to say
22
   that Front Sight -- that LVD Fund stopped marketing at
23
   that point in time because LVD Fund kept getting
24
   capital, knew EB5 investors were coming in. They were
```

putting their money in the escrow, and that money was

25

```
being given to Front Sight. Front Sight, then, in
2
  return paid the progress payments, the performance
  payments.
3
4
            So, again, very, very separate and distinct
   contract, separate and distinct relationship.
5
            This argument coming up, again, about some
 6
   fraud in the inducements, alleviating Front Sight from
   the obligation to pay the loan. I still have yet to
8
   figure out how that fits in.
                                 I don't think fraud in
   the inducement is going to be any legal basis to not
10
11
  pay the interest and be -- and comply with the
   construction loan because it's the EB5 investor's
12
           They are the persons who are putting up the
13
   money.
   capital.
            They're the ones that need to be protected
14
          They're innocent third parties, and we know
15
   here.
          We've supplied the Court with the law.
16
17
   unclean hands doctrine does not apply to this situation
   where to do so would affect innocent third parties.
18
            Lastly, on the issue of the jury, we put up --
19
   we did a jury demand just to protect the rights, the
20
   ability to do so later. We still have the ability to
21
22
   waive that, I believe, and withdraw it.
            THE COURT: What's the impact for the
23
   construction loan agreement and the provisions pursuant
24
25
   to the contract where there's a waiver of the right to
```

```
I mean -- and understand, that's not
   la jury trial?
  being briefed today. I'm not going to decide that
2
   issue.
3
 4
            But here's my thought. And one of the things
   as a trial judge -- and, I mean, I don't know where
5
   we're going to, ultimately, end up with this case,
6
   whether it's going to be a bench trial, jury trial, or
   whatever. I mean, I don't know because it hasn't been
8
   fully vetted and briefed, and I will not decide that
   issue until I'm sure; right? And that's how I do it.
10
11
            But one of the things I always contemplate and
12
   I spent a lot of time on -- for example, tomorrow we're
   having a jury come in; right? We'll have about 100
13
14
   panel members. And I actually conduct a very extensive
   voir dire of the panel. And there's -- there's two
15
   focuses for me. And one is I just want to make sure
16
17
   the jury understands why they're there; right?
18
   go through this whole litany of discussions regarding
   the history of this nation.
19
20
            But I have another series of questions
   regarding the process itself. And the -- and I want to
21
22
   make sure the jury will follow the instructions of the
   Court, even if they disagree. Right? Because it's
23
   very important we don't have jury nullification.
24
25
            But there's another focus I give, and it's on
```

```
the "you can't rush to judgment," and it's so, so
   important. It really and truly is. Even as a trial
2
   judge, I have to sit back and make sure I hear all the
3
   facts and those types of things. Because when I
   explain to the jury the protocol of how the trial will
5
   proceed, and, you know, you can't even make your
6
   decision until at the very end when you have the
   instructions, and you've listened to all the evidence,
8
   and that's when you deliberate.
            And so in this case I can't rush to any
10
   conclusion; right? And here's my point. For example,
11
12
   we still have a pending fraud in the inducement claim;
   right? Still there. And so with that in mind, how can
13
14
   I decide the breach of the construction loan
   separately? And before but not at the same time that
15
   the fraud, the fraud in the inducement claims, are
16
17
  being decided?
18
            MR. GREER:
                        We agree, your Honor.
            THE COURT:
                        You see where I'm going on that?
19
20
            MR. GREER:
                        Absolutely. Absolutely. Because
  in both case --
21
22
            THE COURT: Yes.
            MR. GREER: -- after you bifurcate, there
23
   is -- if there is a surviving fraud in the inducement
24
25
   claim, it has to be heard first on both cases.
```

```
1
            THE COURT:
                        Right.
            MR. GREER: The difference here is one -- two
 2
            One with regard to the jury question, your
 3
   things.
   Honor, which applies to this, when we -- when we demand
   a jury, remember there are cases -- there are claims in
 5
   the complaint that have nothing to do with the
 6
   construction loan agreement.
            The Impact Advisors allegations, we have
 8
   people that aren't parties to the construction loan
 9
10
   agreement, so that jury demand is two things that can
11
   be tried as to a jury. Even though we've requested a
12
   jury, we can't try the equitable claims that are in
13
   there.
14
            THE COURT: We can all agree on that.
   Absolutely.
15
                        Right. And you know what, your
16
            MR. GREER:
17
   Honor, we can't do the contract either.
                                             That's -- if
   there are claims in the complaint which should not be
18
   heard by a jury, then the jury demand doesn't all of a
19
   sudden make them able to be heard by a jury demand --
20
   by a jury. So it's -- I would say that the contract
21
22
   claims and the equitable claims will be handled
   similarly. And we have to include it as a demand
23
   because there are all kinds of causes of action in
24
25
   there involving claims and parties that aren't related
```

25

to the construction loan agreement. So with regard to the fraud in the inducement, 2 I think on the bifurcation case, you would hear the 3 fraud in the inducement claims first. But I think why this makes this such a quick 5 trial and allows us to move quickly on the loan 6 agreement is once the evidence comes forward here, what are the allegations that you say were made that you relied upon in fraud and fraudulently induced you to enter into a construction loan agreement, well, because 10 of this email in May of 2016 where everybody agreed, 11 12 not going to go bring in 50 million, not going to bring in 75 million, not going to bring in 35 million. 13 14 have millions in the bank. That's it. Let's decide what we're going to do. 15 There is just no fraud in the inducement 16 17 evidence that goes into the bifurcated trial for the 18 construction loan agreement. And they can't in good faith say that, I 19 believe that they were going to make this 75 million 20 and that's why I entered into the construction loan 21 22 agreement, because right there in May of 2012 they all 23 agreed it wasn't going to happen. 24 So any of the fraud in the inducement claims

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR (702)671-4402 - CROERT48@GMAIL.COM
Pursuant to NRS 239.053, illegal to copy without payment.

would end at that point. And I think that issue should

```
be tried and the bifurcated case involving the
  construction loan agreement, it will just be a very
2
   quick, short part of the trial. And it will be heard
3
   by your Honor because that relates to the construction
   loan agreement, which all the parties have waived jury
5
   to.
6
7
            So I think that even though fraud in the
   inducement will be heard first, it will be dealt with
8
   in short shrift in the loan agreement case; whereas, it
   will be the primary focus and a very lengthy process in
10
11
   the engagement letter case.
12
            THE COURT:
                       Okay. What do you think about
   that, Mr. Aldrich? What do you think? Because --
13
14
            MR. ALDRICH: Well --
15
            THE COURT: -- it does appear to me -- and I
   understand I haven't been fully briefed on it.
16
17
   Typically we do briefing on this issue. But the fraud
18
   has to have some sort of an impact; right?
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          It has to what?
                                            I'm sorry.
19
20
            THE COURT: It has to be an impact on how the
   case proceeds procedurally.
21
22
            MR. ALDRICH: Yes.
23
            THE COURT: As long as it's a viable claim.
24
            MR. ALDRICH: Yes.
25
            THE COURT: We can all agree with that; right?
```

1 MR. ALDRICH: Yes. THE COURT: So I think what Mr. Greer was 2 saying -- and, of course, I know you don't agree with 3 this aspect of it because I was going to say. he's kind of agreeing that maybe the fraud would have 5 to be tried at the same time of the construction loan 6 agreement case. You don't agree with that. you probably disagree with the time it would take to 8 try that component, I understand that, but what's your take on that? 10 MR. ALDRICH: Well, my take on it is as I said 11 12 This is one scheme and it has gone on 13 through -- we can say it's through two agreements. 14 remember what Mr. Dziubla has said about -- during the 15 testimony. Now I am going off of memory, and I can pull it out and look at it if I -- if it turns out that 16 17 defendants disagree with what I say. But I've already 18 said one thing, which was he said that LVDF, Las Vegas Development Fund, took over the marketing for EB5 IA 19 20 once the agreement was signed. 21 Well, that's -- that's not consistent with the 22 money that he took and the way things were done. shut -- he also said that the engagement letter was 23 extended by gentleman's agreement until he decided to 24 25 do away with it. Well, those are -- how does that

1 work?

I mean, there are -- all of these things are so intertwined, I think it's difficult to separate them. But nonetheless, you absolutely have to do the fraud issues first regardless, and I've already kind of gone through today what those issues are, even related to the CLA, to the construction loan agreement, if the Court decides to bifurcate those issues. But this is a -- this is an ongoing fraud over a long period of years.

And I will remind the Court in making this decision right now, please remember, I have a motion -- we're -- still haven't talked about the subpoenas. I'm asking for bank records. Why? Because my client has given over \$500,000. When the Court ordered an accounting from EB5 IA, we got some documents. Okay.

I've got an accountant waiting for more documents, and he can give us a report. And he may just have to give me a report on what he needs. But they're here saying, Your Honor, bifurcate right now. Right? But we don't have the evidence that we need. We're going to talk about the bank records in a few minutes. But this is all very significant stuff because my client paid \$500,000 over the course of two agreements, by the way, to have this project go

```
1
   forward.
            And so that is significant because all of
 2
   those things are going to matter as we go forward to
 3
   try this case.
 5
            THE COURT: And here's my next question.
   the fraud in the inducement is tried at the same time
 6
   the breach to the construction loan agreement is tried,
   what's left?
 8
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          If -- I think it tries the whole
 9
           If we do fraud in the inducement -- because as
   thing.
10
   I'm standing here telling the Court, it starts in 2012,
11
12
   2013, and it goes really to current. And that is all
   the issues are going to be resolved, in that one trial.
13
   That will include the fraud in the inducement, it will
14
   include the contract claims, the counterclaims, all of
15
   it, which is why our initial position is the Court
16
17
   shouldn't bifurcate. We should just try the case.
18
            THE COURT:
                        I get that. But my question is
          If I throw in the fraud claim with the
   this:
19
   construction loan agreement, I know Mr. Greer feels
20
21
   that will be a very short part of the presentation of
22
   evidence.
              I'm quite -- and this is a one -- I just
23
   know this. It would be -- your position would be the
   exact opposite. It would be, Judge, we're going to --
24
25
   it's going to take days to try the fraud in the
```

```
1
   inducement.
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          Of course.
2
            THE COURT: Of course, right. I just know.
3
 4
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          Of course.
5
            THE COURT: And so -- and I was just looking
   at it from this perspective: If you have a fraud, you
6
   have a breach of contract, what's really left? I mean,
   you might have some affirmative defenses. You might
   have estoppel, waiver.
                           I mean, I don't know.
   trying to think off the top of my head. But ultimately
10
  rescission.
11
12
            But what's left? Because those would all -- I
   think, probably whatever affirmative defenses and the
13
14
   like would be available would stem directly from the
   facts as it relates to the allegations of fraud and the
15
   allegations of breach of the construction loan
16
17
   agreement.
            Am I missing something?
18
                               In fact, if there were
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          No.
19
   anything left, especially reputable things that were
20
21
   left or whatever, your Honor, whether it was a jury or
22
   bench trial would have sat through it, and would
   probably be in a position to either just make a
23
   decision on those issues or at least request briefing
24
25
  based on what was already done and then make a decision
```

```
1
   on those issues. So that would seem to me to be more
   efficient just to do it all together.
2
            THE COURT: All right. The only reason why I
3
  bring this up, I remember it was -- at one time I had a
   case, and it was specifically dealing with equitable
5
   indemnity issues; right? And so at first blush when
6
   you're dealing with equitable indemnity, there's no
   contract, no contractual indemnity. And I had a
8
   question for the lawyers. I said, Okay.
   equitable indemnity scenario, who do you try the case
10
  in front of? Right? And we had a real long discussion
11
12
   on that.
            MR. ALDRICH:
13
                          Um-hum.
14
            THE COURT: And it actually ended up with some
   briefing. I think I know the ultimate answer to that
15
   question, but it's -- it's a fascinating issue.
16
17
   that's why I brought it up. And we're clear, no one is
   disagreeing about equitable claims are tried to the
18
   Court, but I'm just looking at it from this
19
   perspective. Because if I bifurcate and we have to
20
   have the fraud heard at the same time or breach of the
21
22
   construction loan agreement, what is left to try?
   That's my point.
23
24
            MR. GREER: I have the answer.
25
            THE COURT:
                        All right.
```

25

```
1
            MR. GREER: So, your Honor, this shows exactly
   why the Court really must bifurcate. Because if you
 2
   bifurcate, then the question in the case first will be
 3
   was there fraud in the inducement. And your Honor will
   then look at that evidence and determine whether the
 5
   evidence applies to the construction loan agreement or
 6
   not.
 8
            And this is the important part. Because if
   the Court decides that neither that inducement goes to
 9
10
   the contract, your Honor hears that, your Honor hears
   that theory, your Honor makes that decision, your Honor
11
12
   makes the decision first as to whether it was evidence
   of fraud in the inducement. Anything your Honor says
13
   wasn't related to the construction loan agreement then
14
15
   goes to the jury.
            If your Honor doesn't bifurcate and hear this
16
17
   first, the jury winds up getting -- making decisions
18
   that the judge -- that your Honor later has to make
   because it relates to the construction loan agreement,
19
   we could have disparate rulings. And it's clear that
20
21
   if the judge is going to rule on something, the judge
22
   has to rule on it first. And so by bifurcating --
            THE COURT: But what would be left?
23
            MR. GREER: What would be left. Here's --
24
```

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR (702)671-4402 - CROERT48@GMAIL.COM
Pursuant to NRS 239.053, illegal to copy without payment.

Here's my question.

THE COURT:

```
1
            MR. GREER: Just --
            THE COURT: And -- and -- and these are just
 2
              This is not a decision I've made. These are
   thoughts.
 3
   just issues that I've thought about.
 5
            For example, would the fraud in the inducement
   issue be heard by me as a trial judge based upon the
 6
   waiver language contained in the construction loan
   agreement?
 8
            MR. GREER:
                        Yes.
 9
            THE COURT: These are just thoughts.
10
11
            MR. GREER: Yes, that is --
12
            THE COURT: And I don't want to cut you off,
   but put a big question mark after I say that. Right?
13
14
   I'm not saying --
15
                        I think the language is pretty
            MR. GREER:
           It says anything relating to a dispute over
16
17
   this agreement, which would inherently include fraud in
   the inducement, your Honor decides.
18
19
            THE COURT:
                        Okay.
20
                        It's big capital letters all the
            MR. GREER:
21
   way through.
                 And so --
22
            THE COURT: My point is I'm just making a
23
   statement. That's all I'm saying. Put a question
24
   mark.
25
            MR. GREER:
                        Okay.
```

```
1
            THE COURT:
                        I don't know the answer to that.
   That's a question that's so obvious to me.
 2
                        Then you said what's left.
 3
            MR. GREER:
                                                     Well,
   there's still -- with regard to the -- you have to go
   then over to the Impact Capital advisor group, and
 5
   there is allegations of how they spent their money.
 6
   How the money was spent is a big contention that Front
   Sight is trying to tie into this whole thing, but there
 8
   is actually two different types of money here.
   money given to Capital Advisors that Front Sight is
10
11
   saying wasn't spent efficiently in marketing, and they
12
   feel they had more say and control over that money
   than -- than they got.
13
14
            And then after May 2016, you have the -- the
   performance bonuses, which Front Sight had no control
15
   over, no ability, no right to even know where it went.
16
17
   So when Mr. Aldrich said we spent over $500,000 here,
18
   well, that's right. It's maybe $360,000 to EB5 Impact
   Advisors, 140 over here to Front Sight.
19
                                             I don't
   know -- to LVD Fund. I don't know how it balances out,
20
   but there is two different types of payments, two
21
22
   different amounts. And those are two different trials.
23
            So if the judge -- your Honor bifurcates the
   case, looks at the fraud in the inducement argument,
24
25
   determines, you know what, this fraud in the inducement
```

```
evidence does not apply to the construction loan
   agreement, therefore, jury, it's going to go to you and
 2
   you can deal with it on the capital advisor case.
 3
   Conversely, if your Honor says that it does apply, then
   your Honor makes a decision on that fraud in the
 5
   inducement evidence at that time so that the jury
 6
   doesn't make a decision, a duplicative decision later
   when we go back to them over to the other case
   involving Capital advisors and which there are still
   issues that will remain as to how the money was spent,
10
   did Front Sight have the right to control that money,
11
12
   was -- you know, did -- Impact Capital advisors somehow
   breach any duty they had to Front Sight, which is all
13
14
   jury. All jury.
15
            So really the only logical way to make it work
   and avoid duplicative decisions and to efficiently get
16
17
   the process done is to bifurcate. And I think it will
   have to be bifurcated eventually. I'm confident
18
   enough, almost 100 percent. The question is do we do
19
   it now versus later. We're pushing for us to do it now
20
   because doing it now has the added benefit of allowing
21
22
   the construction lender funded by EB5 investors to move
23
   quickly through this process to get final determination
   before the Court.
24
25
            Because it's -- your Honor -- I think your
```

```
1
   Honor is going to have to bifurcate it at some time.
            So anyway, that's what I have to say.
 2
            THE COURT: And here's just one other thought.
 3
   I was listening, and I think it only goes one way.
   someone disagrees, that's okay, and you can tell me
 5
 6
   why.
 7
            But if I make a determination -- for example,
   I haven't looked at the language, and this isn't that
 8
   specific motion as it relates to the waiver of the jury
10
   trial and its impact pursuant to the language contained
   in the construction loan agreement. But if I make a
11
12
   determination that there's a nexus between the
   construction loan agreement and the allegations of
13
14
   fraud in the inducement, it would appear to me as a
   matter of law that has to be decided by the terms and
15
   conditions as set forth in the construction loan
16
   agreement, versus if I make a determination that
17
   they're unrelated, then maybe they're tried separately.
18
   I don't know.
19
20
                        That's exactly what would happen.
            MR. GREER:
                        But those are just my thoughts
21
            THE COURT:
22
   from a legal analysis.
23
            MR. GREER: I think that's the logical way
   that it works out.
24
25
            THE COURT:
                         Okay.
                                Just -- Mr. Aldrich.
                                                       You
```

```
can -- we're just having a dialogue here. Then I'll
  make some decisions.
2
            MR. ALDRICH: Okay.
                                 So, I mean, I've kind of
3
   said my piece. I will clarify. Mr. Greer was
   explaining that EB5 Impact Capital Advisors is actually
5
   the regional center, and I don't believe that it was
6
   the one that was paying money out, due to the
   marketing. I believe that was EB5 Impact Advisors.
8
            And so that may help with, you know, some of
9
   the confusion, kind of -- sorry, kind of goes to my
10
   argument that it's all kind of one in the same.
11
12
   mean, I've kind of -- I'm kicking a horse that's down
   already at this point. I mean, our position is that
13
14
   the fraud covers the whole time and it should not be
   bifurcated. But if the Court is going to bifurcate
15
  it --
16
17
            THE COURT:
                        No, no.
18
            MR. ALDRICH: -- we got to do the --
19
            THE COURT: I'm not sure.
20
            MR. ALDRICH: -- I don't have anything else to
  add.
21
22
            THE COURT: Okay. But I think -- would you
23
   agree with this or disagree that if -- and my question
24
   is this: That if the fraud is somehow linked to the
25
   construction loan agreement, then the language in the
```

```
construction loan agreement would dictate how we
   proceed procedurally as it relates to a jury trial or
 2
   non-jury trial?
 3
 4
            MR. ALDRICH:
                           That's a good question.
 5
            THE COURT: That's what my --
            MR. ALDRICH: Probably needs some briefing;
 6
 7
   right?
           Because my position is that we were defrauded
   into entering in that agreement in the first place.
 8
            THE COURT:
 9
                        Right.
            MR. ALDRICH: So to me fraud claims -- there
10
   are common law fraud claims. They're legal questions
11
12
   and should be in front of a jury. I mean, I recognize
   that there's a construction loan agreement that has
13
   this waiver of a jury trial in it, and now I've already
14
   expressed my position that that's waived anyway.
15
   so, you know, I guess, I would disagree to some degree,
16
17
   because I think that they are common law claims that
18
   should be heard in front of a jury. And fraud.
            MR. GREER: If I can, I think the law says
19
   there is a lot of law on this in the arbitration clause
20
   that I think applies equally to the jury waiver clause.
21
22
            THE COURT: There is no doubt --
23
            MR. GREER:
                        Because you have to show fraud in
   the inducement of the particular clause in order to --
24
25
   to get around a clause that's in the agreement.
```

```
1
            Fraud in the inducement of the agreement
   itself does not get you around an arbitration clause.
 2
   It won't get you around a waiver of jury trial clause.
 3
 4
            THE COURT: But, I mean, like the seminal case
 5
   involving the arbitration, enforceability of
   arbitration clauses would be -- I think it's the AT&T v
 6
   Concepcion case that was decided by our United States
   Supreme Courts, probably about six, seven, eight, nine
 8
   years ago. And that specifically dealt with the
   enforceability of the arbitration clauses.
10
11
            What was unique about that, I mean, waiver of
12
   the right to a jury trial under the arbitration in a
13
   consumer contract setting, what's unique about that,
   that was actually a class action case. That is my
14
15
   recollection.
                  I haven't read it in a long time.
            But -- and -- and I think the United States
16
17
   Supreme Courts said the typical defenses of procedural
18
   and substantive unconscionability didn't apply, because
   I think that's a California case. And typically that
19
   was a defense, and they actually overruled the
20
   California Supreme Court in that case.
21
22
            And -- but interesting. Because here's my
   thoughts. And this is one of those -- I mean, normally
23
   I don't -- it's rare that we bifurcate cases. We have
24
25
   Nevada case law that stands for the proposition that if
```

```
the damages and liability are intertwined, it would be
   abuse of discretion for the trial court to grant
 2
   bifurcation under those conditions, you know.
 3
 4
            And, however, regardless of the -- whether you
   get a jury trial on one issue or not, or whether
 5
   there's been a waiver or not, I do think that at the
   end of the day, the fraud can't be bifurcated from the
   breach of the construction loan agreement.
            Now, I've had other thoughts, and I'll just
 9
   throw this out. And this is one of the reasons why,
10
   when it comes to cases that might be somewhat more
11
12
   complex procedurally, and we've done this many times in
   this department. That's why we have trial protocols.
13
   And I think everybody understands what that means.
14
15
            And so this is what I'm going to do for now:
   I'm going to deny the motion to bifurcate without
16
17
   prejudice.
18
            And this is why: I feel that before I make a
   final decision, we have to vet, unless we have some
19
   sort of an agreement, as to specifically whether that
20
   fraud claim comes up under the terms and conditions as
21
22
   set forth in the consumer loan agreement. Although, if
   you want to do briefing on that, then we can.
23
24
            And just as important, if I rule that they do,
25
   then I probably would bifurcate those out and have
```

```
those tried together, if you understand what I'm
 2
   saying.
            MR. GREER: I don't think we can bifurcate
 3
 4
   just the fraud claims, though.
 5
            THE COURT: No, no, no. I'm saying I will try
   the construction loan agreement along with the -- with
 6
   the fraud claims in the inducement together.
            MR. GREER: And then to the extent they apply,
 8
   they're determined. To the extent they don't apply and
 9
   they relate to the other acts, then they're tried with
10
11
   the jury in the other action.
12
            THE COURT: Potentially, yes.
13
            MR. GREER:
                        Okay.
14
            THE COURT: You see what I'm saying,
   Mr. Aldrich?
15
            I think -- I'm not going to sit here and say,
16
17
   Look, sir -- and that's why I denied the motion -- that
18
   I'm not going to make a determination that the fraud
   claims as a matter of law without having briefing on
19
   the language as contained in the construction loan
20
   agreement stands for a waiver of your client's right to
21
22
   a jury trial as it relates to the fraud claims, without
   having full briefing on that issue.
23
            I do think they're related.
24
                                          Right?
25
            Just as important, too, looking at this, and
```

```
this is where I think we need to dig a little deeper,
   would fraud be -- if there's a determination of fraud,
 2
   what impact does that have on the construction loan
 3
   agreement?
               Right?
 5
            It's your position that it would be -- that it
   would -- that the construction loan agreement would be
 6
   void and/or voidable, I think; right?
 7
            MR. ALDRICH: Yes.
 8
            THE COURT: I understand that.
 9
            And I know Mr. Greer doesn't agree with that;
10
11
  |right?
12
            But those are issues -- those are somewhat
   complex issues that we don't see every day; right? I
13
14
   mean, everyone here might see them, but I don't.
15
            But -- and so -- pardon?
            MR. GREER: So if -- if --
16
17
            THE COURT: Go ahead.
18
            MR. GREER: So, your Honor, if I go up to a
   friend and, you know, and he wants to borrow some
19
   money, and I -- I pull out my pocket, I have 20 bucks.
20
   I can only lend you 20. Well, I need 40.
21
                                               I can only
22
   lend you 20.
                 Right?
23
            Then I go back around the corner and reach in
   my other pocket, I got another 20. My friend sees it
24
25
   and he says, You lied to me. You had 40.
                                               You said you
```

```
only had 20. I'm not going to pay you your 20 back,
  because you only gave me 20 when you had 40.
2
            I'm not seeing how that has any impact on his
3
   ability, his obligation to pay the money back.
            THE COURT: Well, here's -- well, here's the
5
          And I'm not necessarily saying that, and I
6
   don't think -- I don't think plaintiff is taking a
   position that they don't have to repay the funds, the
8
   $6 million.
9
            Is that a position you're taking?
10
            MR. ALDRICH: Your Honor, I think that that
11
12
   all kind of remains to be seen at the end, whether
   they -- I certainly see the scenario where they didn't
13
   pay back the $6.3 million. There is also an argument
14
   to be had about damages. And all this is kind of
15
   addressed in the other motion that's out there.
16
            THE COURT: I understand.
17
            MR. ALDRICH: But --
18
            THE COURT: I do. But I think we're -- I
19
   think we can't simplify it in this regard. Say, if we
20
   change our scenario slightly, where your friend came to
21
22
   you and said, Look, you know, I can raise $100,000 for
23
        And I got all this money set aside. And we can
   you.
   go ahead and start some improvements, and those types
24
25
   of things. And, yeah, I'm sure you can get the
```

```
$100,000, and lo and behold, it comes to light that
  maybe you can't get that 100,000. And whether you knew
2
   or should have known, that is a different issue.
3
   you can only get 20.
5
            MR. GREER: Yes.
            THE COURT: And what impact does that have on
 6
   the friend?
7
            MR. GREER: Is it different, though, if he
8
   says, you know what, I can only get 20.
                                            That's all we
       You want me to give the 20 back to the people I
10
   raised it from? Or let me give it to you to for the
11
12
   loan -- you make the call. Clearly, I couldn't come up
   with what I said earlier I was going to come up with.
13
14
            So -- and then if you take the 20, I think you
   have to pay it back with interest and terms, and I
15
   don't think that you can benefit from knowing that
16
17
   you're -- that the guy couldn't raise the whole
18
   hundred, and then take his 20 and take advantage of it.
            THE COURT: And -- and this is important to
19
   point out. And understand, I try to think and make
20
   statements that are qualified. And there's a reason
21
22
   for that.
            Understand, I think when we had this
23
   discussion, I said it was based upon the current
24
25
  procedural posture of the case; right? And so I
```

```
haven't thrown out the fraud claims as a matter of law,
   have I?
 2
            MR. GREER:
 3
                        No, sir.
 4
            THE COURT:
                        You see where I'm going?
 5
            MR. GREER:
                        Okay.
            THE COURT: I can't -- it goes back to my
 6
 7
   statement, remember, I made regarding I can't rush to
   judgment.
 8
            MR. GREER:
 9
                        Yes.
            THE COURT:
10
                        Right?
11
            MR. ALDRICH: Correct.
12
            THE COURT:
                        Yeah. And that's why I said all
   that, you know. I understand everybody's respective
13
14
   position.
              I do get it.
15
            But until certain claims are peeled off or
   whatever, or are still part of the case, I look at it
16
17
   this way: Everything is still there.
18
            Right, Mr. Aldrich?
                                  It's still there.
            MR. ALDRICH:
                           Yes.
19
20
            THE COURT: And so I think -- and I think
21
   that's when judges get in trouble from an appellate
22
   perspective, when they rush to judgment. Because you
23
   can, ultimately, maybe be right, but -- after it's all
   said and done, but if you don't go through the process,
24
25
   we're going to say you're wrong.
```

```
1
            Right, Mr. Aldrich?
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          That's correct.
 2
            THE COURT: Yes.
 3
 4
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          Okay.
 5
            THE COURT: So where do we go from here?
            And that's without prejudice. I just want to
 6
 7
   make sure you understand that.
            MR. GREER: Sure.
 8
            THE COURT: Because I do think -- and I don't
 9
   mind saying this. On some level we're going to have to
10
   revisit, and maybe this might even go to an issue more
11
12
   of trial protocol. But we're going to have to revisit
   how these cases ultimately are going to be tried.
13
14
            All right. And I don't know the answer to
   that yet. And I rely on counsel to help me out on
15
   that.
16
17
            MR. ALDRICH: Understood.
18
            THE COURT: Okay. So.
                          The -- I think the -- you know,
            MR. ALDRICH:
19
   the supplemental Rule 16, or 16.1, whichever qualifies
20
   as conference related to the counterdefendants and then
21
22
   the discussion of the NRCP 65(a)(2) notice.
23
            THE COURT: Okay. Let's go to the Rule 16
   issue.
24
25
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          Okay.
                                 So in this respect, I
```

```
mean, I think the issue there is the deadlines that are
   in the current joint case conference report, I should
 2
   have looked at it before I came.
 3
 4
            I don't know if, Kathryn, if you know what
   they are.
 5
            MS. HOLBERT:
                          Yes.
 6
 7
            MR. ALDRICH: I want to say trial is like a
   year from now, and experts are due in, like, June.
 8
            THE COURT:
 9
                        Right.
                           I'm -- I mean, for purposes of
10
            MR. ALDRICH:
   the conference today, obviously the defendants want to
11
12
   start some discovery on the counterclaims because they
   want to have that conference, and then if the Court is
13
   inclined, we need to talk about when we're going to
14
   really try the case.
                         If the Court wants it to be
15
   different than what's in there in -- in the judgment of
16
17
   conviction right now.
18
            MS. HOLBERT: Right. And typically for the
   purposes of the supplemental case conference report is
19
   do you agree with the current dates or not.
20
21
            THE COURT: Right.
22
            And, Ms. Holbert, where should we go on that?
   What's your -- do we hold -- because this is kind of --
23
   this is kind of interrelated to the notice I gave
24
25
   regarding -- what was that? Let me see here.
```

```
1
            Yeah, the status check regarding 65(a)(2)
   notice; right?
 2
            MS. HOLBERT: Correct. Yes, I think we're --
 3
 4
   we're doing those together.
 5
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          They seem to go together.
            THE COURT:
                        They do.
 6
 7
            MS. HOLBERT:
                          Yeah.
            THE COURT: That's my point.
 8
 9
            MS. HOLBERT:
                          Right. Really the main thing
   that we wanted is that the supplemental case
10
   conference, that provision of the rule is then
11
12
   satisfied. That's what we wanted today so that we can
   begin discovery on those. I think the broader question
13
14
   of can we move the trial up, do the dates stand as is
   goes more into the notice issue.
15
            THE COURT:
                        Right. So any objection to this
16
17
   meeting the requirements of 16.1 as it relates to the
   additional claims?
18
            MR. ALDRICH: The counter-defendants.
19
20
            THE COURT: Counter-defendants, yes.
            MR. ALDRICH: No.
21
22
            THE COURT: Okay. So that's been handled.
23
            MS. HOLBERT:
                          Thank you.
24
            THE COURT: All right. And, I guess, we -- we
25
   will have to, I guess, lodge or just file the
```

```
1
   supplemental report on that.
                          The supplemental --
 2
            MR. ALDRICH:
            THE COURT: 16.1.
 3
 4
            MR. ALDRICH: -- joint case conference report.
 5
            THE COURT: Yes.
            MR. ALDRICH: Correct.
 6
 7
            THE COURT: Yeah. All right.
            Next up would be Rule 65; right?
 8
            MR. ALDRICH: Correct.
 9
                                   So --
            MS. HOLBERT: Correct.
10
11
            MR. ALDRICH: -- the Rule 65 notice plus, you
12
   know, if we're going to change any dates in the
   supplemental joint case conference report.
13
14
            MS. HOLBERT: Right.
15
            MR. ALDRICH: Those seem to go together. And
  now seems to be the time to do it.
16
17
            THE COURT: Right. But I don't know what you
18
   want to do, I really don't, as far as dates are
   concerned. Do we have some recommended dates?
19
20
            MR. ALDRICH: I mean, we have dates in the
21
   joint case conference report already.
22
            THE COURT: All right.
            MR. ALDRICH: Those are fine for me.
23
                                                   I know
   the Court has expressed a desire to go faster.
24
25
            THE COURT: And there's -- there's a reason
```

```
1
         And number one -- let me look here.
   why.
            This is a business court case.
 2
            MR. ALDRICH: It is.
 3
 4
            THE COURT: Everybody understands that.
 5
            I don't mind saying this. I spent more time
   on this business court case than any business court
 6
   case I have, including some pretty complex shareholder
   derivative actions involving strip resorts and -- and
   other matters involving actions of political
   subdivisions within the state of Nevada.
10
                                              I mean, I
  have. And -- and notwithstanding they're all very
11
12
   important. I don't mind saying that.
13
            And so my point is this. I remember taking a
14
   look at the rule, and this is an often overlooked
   provision under Rule 65, I've done it in one other
15
   case, and it just seems to me that from an efficiency
16
   perspective, and that's more so than anything else, if
17
   you have a potential contract in place that impacts
18
   certain claims of whether there's a right to a jury
19
   trial or not, that I've heard a lot of testimony. We
20
21
   can all agree.
22
            Just as important, too, some of the testimony
   it reminded me of -- it was -- some of it was
23
   deposition.
24
25
            MS. HOLBERT:
                           Yes.
```

```
1
            THE COURT: Great.
                                Right.
                                        It was.
            So I just thought about it, and I said -- I
 2
   looked at the provision. And I said to myself, I'm
 3
   always told by our Supreme Court, and more specifically
   I think this whole business court was the child of
 5
   Justice Hardesty, I think he started this. This is one
 6
   of his pet projects. And there's nothing wrong with
   it. He wanted Nevada to become like the Delaware of
 8
   the west --
 9
10
            MS. HOLBERT:
                          Right.
11
            THE COURT: -- and have the specific business
12
   court and the like. And so when I looked at
   Rule 65(a)(2), and reflected a little bit, and it
13
14
   provides as follows:
15
            "Before or after the commencement of a
        hearing of an application for preliminary
16
17
        injunction, the Court may order the trial of
        the action on the merits to be advanced and
18
        consolidated with the hearing of the
19
20
        application."
            And I think I understand why. Goes to the
21
22
   issue of efficiency; right?
            MR. ALDRICH: Sure.
23
24
            THE COURT: So where do we go from here?
25
   Because those are my thoughts. And for the record, I
```

```
haven't made any decision. That was a lot.
            MS. HOLBERT: I don't think we're opposed
 2
   with, you know, with consolidating the evidentiary
 3
   hearing with that.
 5
            Another issue that is on calendar today is a
   status check regarding that evidentiary hearing.
 6
 7
            Because, of course, we need to finish that.
   So it's hard to talk about when we're going to set a
 8
   trial when we don't even know when the evidentiary
   hearing is going to be done.
10
11
            THE COURT: I agree, ma'am.
                                          I do.
12
            MS. HOLBERT: Right. So I don't know really
   what we take first, but if we're still doing the
13
   evidentiary hearing in January, and haven't done some
14
   of the other stuff, I don't know how we can do trial in
15
16
   February.
17
            THE COURT: I understand, ma'am.
                                               I do.
                                                      I get
   it.
18
            MR. ALDRICH: Yeah.
                                 So my concern comes with
19
   a couple of things. Number one, right now, experts are
20
21
         Initial expert disclosure is March 5 of 2020,
   set.
22
   which is just a little under five months away.
23
            You know, we can move that up a little bit,
   but I remind the Court we've still got discovery
24
25
   battles to fight. If I lose those discovery battles in
```

```
a couple of weeks, then that may change a little bit.
   But if I win and the Court gives them a reasonable
 2
   amount of time to provide the information I'm asking
 3
   for, that's going to push us, I'm assuming, you know,
   close to the end of the month of November, or something
 5
   to that effect. I've got to have time to get that
 6
   stuff together, get experts and all that kind of stuff.
   So that's where my concern comes.
 8
            You know, I'm fine with the current dates.
 9
                                                         Ι
   understand why defendants wouldn't be. At the same
10
   time, as the evidentiary hearing goes forward, I got to
11
12
   be able to have discovery.
13
            THE COURT: I'm not going to side step the
14
   process.
15
            MR. ALDRICH: I will -- correct. And I will
   tell the Court my reading of Rule 65(a)(2), and I did
16
17
   some research. I -- maybe 20 minutes, 30 minutes, just
18
   to see what I can see about it. And really all I found
   is it's the Court's discretion to do that.
19
20
            And then it -- but it appears to me to be a
21
   combining of trial and the evidentiary hearing.
22
            THE COURT: That's -- I agree with all that.
23
   I do.
24
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          Right.
25
            So that's how I read it, which then leads to
```

```
this discussion where I'm saying I'm fine with the
   dates as they are. But if we're going to move it, it's
 2
   got to be a practical amount of time to give us, you
 3
   know, a way to get it all done. And then -- and I just
   have -- I just have a block of time. At the end of
 5
   April and early May, I can't have a trial, so ...
 6
 7
            THE COURT:
                        I understand.
                        I can -- just two cents here.
 8
            MR. GREER:
            And I also did a little bit of research on
 9
          It looks like the Court has discretion at the
10
   end of this, of the evidentiary hearing, if the Court
11
12
   looks like at that point in time it's got enough
   evidence to make the decision that we made at trial, it
13
14
   can be done.
15
            And I think as we move forward here, I think
   it's highly likely that by the time we get through this
16
17
   preliminary injunction evidentiary process, your Honor
18
   is going to have everything before the Court that it's
   going to need to make that decision.
19
20
            I don't see that -- I know we're talking about
   discovery. This is all, in my opinion, extraneous
21
22
   stuff because the real evidence is going on the stand,
   and your Honor is going to have it. And that rule is
23
24
   there so we don't have to put it on twice. And so
25
   it's -- I think it's -- it would be more powerful then,
```

```
you know, summary judgment motion. But I do think if
   the evidence plays out the way I believe it's going to
 2
   be, I think your Honor is going to be in a position
 3
   where you can do that, and not only make a ruling on
   the preliminary injunction, but concurrently make a
 5
   ruling on the case. And that's I -- we would prefer
 6
          The sooner the better.
            So -- and, I guess, that, again, would be
 8
   answered as we go forward, because I think Mr. Aldrich
 9
   is going to do a good job here and put on all the
10
   evidence that support his, you know, fraud in the
11
   inducement claim and all of his other causes of action
12
   in order to get that preliminary injunction ruled on in
13
14
   his favor, and in doing so I think he's going to show
   all his cards. And at that point in time I think the
15
   Court is going to be able to rule on behalf of the
16
17
   defense, particularly LVD Fund on the issues involving
   the loan. And we would encourage that.
18
            THE COURT:
                        Interesting.
19
20
                        The Court has given notice to
            MR. GREER:
   everybody, so everybody has adequate notice if the
21
22
   Court does that, makes that kind of decision.
            THE COURT: What about -- and there's another
23
   reason why I didn't think it would be -- represent a
24
25
   significant problem in this specific case. Because
```

OCTOBER 9, 2019

```
it's my understanding, Mr. Aldrich, you've already
   retained some experts; right?
 2
            MR. ALDRICH: I have.
 3
 4
            THE COURT: Yeah, one specifically related to,
 5
   I guess, the interpretation of the contract and/or
   construction loan agreement and whether there's been
 6
 7
   compliance or not. That's my understanding.
   that --
 8
                          Well, I have -- I have --
 9
            MR. ALDRICH:
            THE COURT: Whether --
10
11
            MR. ALDRICH: I've submitted a declaration
12
   from an EB5 expert.
13
            THE COURT:
                        Right.
14
            MR. ALDRICH: And I've submitted reports, the
                 I'm -- I -- I've got a financial expert.
15
   jobs report.
   I haven't produced a report from him yet because I
16
   don't have all the information that I need.
17
            Am I missing anything?
18
            So that's it so far.
19
20
            THE COURT: So, I guess your most significant
21
   concern would be regarding the financial expert,
22
   without enough information?
23
            MR. ALDRICH: Yeah.
                                  I mean, right now that's
   my biggest concern. And because experts aren't due for
24
25
   a long time, I haven't done a formal --
```

```
1
            THE COURT: I understand.
            MR. ALDRICH: -- you know, sit down with them,
2
   make sure they have every single thing they need and
3
   all that kind of stuff. I mean, we're still in the
   process of that, but it's -- I mean, it's happening.
5
            MR. GREER:
                        It's really just administratively
 6
7
   tabulating things because Front Sight knows every penny
   that it gave to the defendants. It knows what its
8
   alleged damages are. It's in control of that
   information.
10
11
            So even that is an easy issue to deal with.
12
   And you want to make -- for the record, your Honor,
13
   those -- the declarations are hearsay and should not be
14
   admitted thus far. I think if counsel got his expert
   on the stand and -- as he should, then it would be
15
   admissible.
16
17
            THE COURT: Don't worry about that. I mean, I
18
   get that.
            MR. GREER: Yeah.
                               I mean that's dangerous.
19
20
            THE COURT: Don't worry about that.
21
   are -- I guess, you know, number one, the reports don't
22
   get admitted into evidence. Many times lawyers don't
23
   take depositions of experts because they want to limit
   them to what's contained in their report. And I get
24
25
        But you got to have live testimony.
                                              I understand.
```

```
So I'm not worried about that.
            And you shouldn't have that concern.
2
                                                   I mean,
  ultimately, at some point if there are experts to
3
   testify during our journey, they will, of course, have
   to meet all the requirements under Hallmark.
                                                  They do.
5
  And -- and if they give you standard of care,
   compliance, causation-type opinions or whatever it
  might be, I understand that. So we're not going --
   once again, I'm not going to rush to judgment. I've
   never been reversed on rushing to judgment.
10
                                                 I believe
11
   in due process. I don't mind saying that.
12
            So is this something we should visit a little
   later? But I think there is -- even if we do that, we
13
14
   still have to decide because this -- this is flowing in
   now to the motions for protective order and/or motions
15
   to compel; right? Because at the end of the day we
16
   have to make a -- I have to make a determination on
17
18
   discovery. And, I guess, the quicker specific
   documents get in the hands of the plaintiff's expert,
19
   it will, of course, accelerate the ability to prepare
20
   for the ultimate determination; right?
21
22
            Do you agree with that, Mr. Aldrich?
            MR. ALDRICH:
23
                          Yes.
            THE COURT: Okay. So what do we --
24
25
            MS. HOLBERT:
                          I think, your Honor, if we can
```

```
just leave the dates as they are right now, you file a
   joinder on behalf of the counter-defendants to the
 2
   current cases in a joint case conference report, and
 3
   then we revisit the issue.
            But then we also need to set a continued date
 5
   to get a plan to finish the evidentiary hearing.
 6
 7
            THE COURT:
                        Right.
            MS. HOLBERT: Will that work?
 8
            MR. ALDRICH: That's fine with me.
 9
                                                 We're here
   in two weeks, or we can set a different one after that.
10
   Two weeks may not be soon enough to make that --
11
12
            MS. HOLBERT: To do what?
13
            MR. ALDRICH: To discuss what we're doing on
14
   the rest of the individual --
15
            MS. HOLBERT: We just need a date; right?
                    The Court's availability; right?
16
   From the Court.
                        Right.
17
            THE COURT:
                                Right.
18
            MS. HOLBERT: Because you're not done; right?
                          I'm not done, that's correct.
            MR. ALDRICH:
19
20
            THE COURT: They're not done.
            How many days has it been now?
21
22
            MR. ALDRICH: We've had four days of
23
   testimony. One of them was real short, but four days.
24
            MS. HOLBERT: And that's not on the 23rd;
25
   right?
           That's just a law and motion calendar on the
```

```
23rd.
 1
            MR. ALDRICH: Correct.
 2
            THE COURT: Right.
 3
 4
            How much more time do we anticipate,
   Mr. Aldrich, as far as how many more days do you need?
 5
            MR. ALDRICH: Well, Judge, I got some experts
 6
 7
   I got to call. And I don't have the discovery.
   mean, I realize it's a preliminary injunction hearing,
   but the case has been pending over a year now.
   I -- I mean, we'll get to this in a couple weeks when
10
   we come, but I've been waiting for supplemental
11
12
   disclosures or a supplemental response or something for
   months, with promises that they were coming, and then
13
14
   they haven't come.
15
            And so, you know, I mean, certainly another
   day, maybe longer. But again, I mean, this --
16
17
            THE COURT: Should we decide this on the 23rd?
18
            MR. ALDRICH: Probably.
            THE COURT: And I think for the 23rd, should
19
   we set a status check for setting additional days for
20
   the evidentiary hearing and testimony?
21
22
            MR. GREER: What was that?
23
            THE COURT: You're going to be here on the
24
   23rd, at least for now. Assuming you're not in trial.
25
   |If you're in trial, Mr. Greer, I get it. We'll just
```

```
move it to a time convenient for everyone. And I hate
   kicking the can down the road, but there still are a
 2
   lot of balls in the air, I think, right now.
 3
 4
            MR. ALDRICH: Yes, please.
 5
            THE COURT: And then they're going to have to
   fall ultimately.
 6
 7
            But on the 23rd, we should plan on setting
   more days for testimony; right? Within the next --
 8
   within that next month or so.
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          That's fine.
10
11
            THE COURT: And maybe get everything
12
   potentially done, except for experts. And maybe if we
   can -- I'm not sure. But we'll talk about that on the
13
   23rd, but we should definitely set a plan for -- for
14
   who's anticipated the next witnesses will be and have a
15
   time set for those witnesses.
16
17
            MR. ALDRICH: Okay.
18
            THE COURT: So, Ms. Holbert, do you agree?
            MS. HOLBERT: Yes.
                                Thank you, your Honor.
19
20
            THE COURT:
                        Okay.
                               All right.
            You got that? Status check regarding dates
21
22
   for the evidentiary hearing schedule.
23
            To my understanding, we might want it -- it
   might be premature, but I'd love to get that set.
24
25
            So what do we have left now? Pending motions;
```

```
1
   right?
            MR. ALDRICH: We have two. Well, it's two
 2
   issues, but it's the -- they filed eight motions to
 3
           I filed an omnibus opposition, so there's that
   set. And then there's a set. I filed a motion to
 5
   quash related to some subpoenas that they sent out.
 6
   we can start with theirs because they came first.
            THE COURT: Okay.
 8
            THE COURT REPORTER:
                                  Should we take a break
 9
10
   now, Judge.
11
            THE COURT: If you need a break, we can take a
12
   break.
13
            What we'll do, we'll come back about 3:05 or
14
        No later than 3:10.
   so.
15
            We'll take a break, ma'am.
                             -000-
16
                            (Recess)
17
                             -000-
18
            THE COURT: Okay. I guess next we go to the
   motions to quash; right?
19
20
            MR. ALDRICH: That's correct.
21
            MR. GREER: Yes, your Honor.
22
            THE COURT:
                        Motion to quash.
23
            MR. GREER:
                        Your Honor, to help us get through
   these in an efficient fashion, I've broken them down
24
25
   into three categories.
```

```
1
            You have subpoenas that Front Sight has issued
   to Empyrean West, J. Carter and David Keller.
 2
            THE COURT: I'm ready when you are, sir.
 3
 4
            MR. GREER:
                        Okay.
 5
            Your Honor, this is -- Empyrean West is a
   company that Mr. Dziubla was associated with prior to
 6
   his involvement with Front Sight. It involves the use
   of EB5 capital regarding the San Diego Hyatt project.
 8
   There's been testimony from Mr. Dziubla on the stand
   and the various declarations that this was his prior
10
   EB5 experience directly with the raising and developing
11
12
   of that property.
13
            So arguably there would be some relevance to
14
   information confirming that he was associated with this
15
   and that he had this EB5 experience. However, the
   problem we have with the subpoenas is they are just way
16
17
   too broad.
            If we go to -- the Exhibit A's are the same on
18
   each of the three subpoenas: The Keller, Carter and
19
   Empyrean. So they just ask for the exact same
20
   information just from different parties.
21
22
            The Ouestion Number 1 is: Provide all
23
   documents you possess or control showing communications
   between any employee, officer, member, manager, agent,
24
25
   or principal of Empyrean West and Robert Dziubla, John
```

```
Fleming, Kenworth Capital, Legacy Realty Company, Las
   Vegas Development Fund pertaining to the San Diego
 2
   Hyatt project" for which Empyrean West raised EB5
 3
   (indiscernible) investors through Liberty West Regional
 5
   Center.
            Way overbroad.
                            The burden it would put on
 6
   Empyrean would be overwhelming and not relevant for the
               If it was specifically tailored to identify
   most part.
 8
   what Mr. Dziubla's position was or relationship was,
   what functions he was responsible for, what he was
10
   involved with, they would arguably have some relevance.
11
12
   It's just this takes in everything under the sun and
   needs to be quashed. For that reason, it's just --
13
14
   it's just uncontrollably broad.
15
            The second one suffers from the same problem.
   The second one is even more broad, in fact, because it
16
   asks for:
17
            "All communications, all documents you
18
        possess controlling, showing communications of
19
20
        any type between any employee, officer, member,
        manager, agent, or principal of Empyrean West
21
22
        and Robert Dziubla, John Fleming, Kenworth
        Capital, Legacy Realty Capital, Linda Stanwood,
23
24
        EB5 Impact Advisors, EB5 Impact Capital
25
        Regional Center, Las Vegas Development Fund,
```

1 LLC, from March 2012 forward." Again, incredibly overbroad, covering 2 potentially privileged things affecting the privileges 3 of third parties, potential attorney-client privilege material. It's just way, way too broad and 5 unmanageable. 6 The third one is all documents showing communications between you and all those same players 8 9 So that's for the same thing, again with no 10 subject matter at all. And then the last one: 11 12 "Provide any documents you possess or 13 control regarding the Front Sight project and 14 the EB5 fundraising that sought investors from 15 the Front Sight project by and through EB5 Impact Capital." 16 17 Now, there may very well not be any documents 18 in that category because they weren't involved in it at all, but as phrased it -- it has the same concern as 19 we've seen in the past, where Front Sight is trying to 20 get its hands on very important, guarded -- jealously 21 22 guarded proprietary information about the names and contact information of LVD Fund's investors, its 23

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR (702)671-4402 - CROERT48@GMAIL.COM
Pursuant to NRS 239.053, illegal to copy without payment.

before, the problems that LVD Fund had with Mr. Piazza

brokers, its agents. When we said in this court

24

25

and Front Sight getting that information on some of the brokers and going directly to them, trying to end run around them in order to go directly to the investor, the brokers rather than deal with LVD Fund.

This is what gives LVD Fund value is its contacts with these agents, its knowledge of who they are, what their contacts there are, what money they have available, et cetera. And giving that up would be very, very detrimental to LVD Fund in general, but in particular to Ignatius Piazza because -- and I haven't conferred with Mr. Aldrich and discussed the possibility of a protective order because oftentimes that helps out.

But it doesn't work here because Ignatius

Piazza is involved, and I think it's clear from his

actions that he doesn't care what the Court says. He's

not going to care about a protective order. He's going

to take these things, and he's going to use them to his

advantage. He's already sent damaging correspondence

directly to the handful of brokers that he has the

contact information for.

So, again, as to this particular group of individuals that are being subpoenaed, that may not be anything that falls under that for Request No. 4, but to the extent they are, we object because they would

```
not have a right to that information.
            So that is the first group. It might be
 2
   easier just to do these as a group at the time.
 3
   suggest, your Honor, that Mr. Aldrich -- unless your
   Honor has some questions for me, that Mr. Aldrich maybe
 5
   address these three, and we get them handled.
 6
 7
            THE COURT:
                        Okay.
                          Thank you, your Honor.
 8
            MR. ALDRICH:
            I quess I have to start with Mr. Greer and I
 9
   did talk about protective orders and an order from the
10
   Court that we not share this information except
11
12
   outside -- or I'm sorry, except within the litigation.
   He made that same statement to me about Dr. Piazza.
                                                         Ι
13
14
   just have to address that initially.
15
            There's -- Dr. Piazza has complied with all
   court orders in this case. He hasn't been ordered not
16
17
   to do anything. He hasn't done anything he was ordered
   not to do. So -- and interesting that defendants come
18
   in and say that because we've got a court order for an
19
   accounting. We didn't get a full accounting.
20
                                                   And then
   they filed his tax returns in the open forums, some
21
22
   different things like that.
            So if that's the basis for the objection, then
23
   we should get the information. The Court can order
24
25
   that we can't use it except in the litigation, and off
```

```
1
   we qo.
            But let me address these points here.
 2
                                                    The
   first point that I mentioned was the -- that the
 3
   motion's late. And so procedurally the Court, you
   know, can deny and allow the discovery right off the
 5
   bat.
 6
 7
            But with J. Carter, Dave Keller, and Empyrean
   West, the Court may recall that Mr. Dziubla represented
 8
   a couple of things significant. One was that they
   weren't together on the San Diego Hyatt project, which
10
11
   ultimately Mr. Dziubla certainly admitted, never went
12
   anywhere, but he represented them as partners early on
13
   for starters. He also represented them as the only
14
   ones allowed to do EB5 fundraising in Viet Nam.
                                                     Those
   are all significant related to the fraud claims.
15
            The other thing is that there -- these are
16
   actually narrowly tailored. We're asking for
17
18
   communications that they possess or control -- I'm
   looking at No. 1. -- between any employee, Mr. Greer
19
   went through it, of Empyrean West and Robert Dziubla, a
20
   party to this litigation.
21
22
            John Fleming, a party to this litigation, and
23
   the other person who was supposedly out raising money
   with my client's money.
24
25
            Kenworth Capital, Inc. Well, that is
```

```
|Mr. Dziubla's company. He testified as much that one
   of the first engagement letters is on Kenworth Capital
 2
   letterhead.
 3
            Legacy Realty Capital. My understanding is
 5
   that that this Mr. Fleming's company.
            So again, I haven't even gotten outside of any
 6
 7
   parties yet.
 8
            No. 5, Las Vegas Development Fund. Also a
 9
   party.
10
            Rule pertaining to the San Diego Hyatt
            That's -- that's it. That is narrowly
11
  project.
   tailored.
12
13
            There hasn't been an argument that that's so
   many documents it's overly burdensome. And we're at an
14
   interesting position because I put in my pleadings that
15
   they don't have standing to object to these.
16
   Interestingly enough, when we argue the next motion, we
17
   have to deal with that issue for myself.
18
            But nonetheless, since that's the main
19
   objection is that it's overly burdensome, then that's
20
21
   why I addressed them individually.
22
            But that No. 1 is a narrowly tailored request.
            Now, No. 2 admittedly is a little bit broader
23
   because it doesn't limit it to the San Diego Hyatt
24
25
   project, but it is limited in time from March 2012 to
```

```
present day, which is the relevant time frame.
   suspect -- again, we haven't had an argument that this
 2
   is a huge amount of the documents. I suspect there
 3
   probably aren't that many documents, certainly from the
   2014 or 2015 time forward, but we're certainly entitled
 5
   to discover these things. Remember, I know the Court
 6
   knows this already, but whether these become admissible
   or not is one thing; discoverability is broader than
 8
   admissibility anyway.
 9
            The next thing, the request was communications
10
  between at least these three: Dave Keller, J. Carter,
11
12
   or Empyrean West between you and Robert Dziubla, a
   party; John Fleming, a party; Kenworth Capital,
13
   Mr. Dziubla's company; Legacy Realty Capital,
14
   Mr. Fleming's company; Linda Stanwood, also a party;
15
   EB5 Impact Advisors, LLC, also a party; EB5 Impact
16
17
   Capital Regional Center, also a party; and Las Vegas
   Development Fund, from March 2012 to the present.
18
   Relevant time frame.
19
20
            The last one:
            "All documents you possess or control
21
22
        regarding the Front Sight project and the EB5
        fundraising that sought investors for the Front
23
        Sight project by and through EB5 Impact Capital
24
25
        Regional Center, LLC.
```

```
1
            Now, this one is important because there were
   representations, number one, that this was the only
 2
   project that they were working on, even though
 3
   apparently there was also a San Diego Hyatt project
   going on at the same time.
 5
            We continued to hear about the proprietary
 6
 7
   nature of the jealously guarded information about
   investors. And I guess a couple of points on that real
 8
          Number one, we're a year in the litigation.
   continue to hear this is proprietary. It's privileged.
10
11
   We have no citation to authority why it's privileged.
12
   I've addressed in my brief this trade secret argument
   that they've made. It's not a trade secret.
                                                  This is
13
14
   information that has to be provided to the USCIS.
15
            MR. GREER: Lacks foundation.
            I'm sorry, it does have to be provided.
16
17
   withdraw that objection.
18
            THE COURT: Okay.
            MR. ALDRICH: It has to be provided to the
19
           Now, I cannot stand here and tell the Court
20
   that I'm going to get it from the USCIS.
21
                                              I did a FOIA
22
   request a long time ago, and I don't have it back.
23
   it's hard for me to get a status on it. So I don't
   know what the USCIS would give me, but that information
24
25
   certainly goes to the USCIS.
```

Again, if the Court wants to order me and my client that we're not able to utilize that information outside of this litigation, I can accept that. And we'll properly advise my client, and I know he will abide by the Court's order.

And the other thing that's -- it hasn't happened yet, and I think is going to have to happen, is we continue to hear about the immigrant investors that we have to protect. We haven't actually seen any evidence there are immigrant investors. We're all assuming that there are. But at some point that has to happen, too, because this is supposed to be under the EB5 program. There are supposed to be investors there.

And, by the way, as the motion that I just filed the other day talks about, there's a dispute on whether they -- whether Front Sight can pay off this loan or not. There is a prepayment provision in the contract that allows for it. But it can't, under certain circumstances, relate it to the investors.

So we have to somehow find a way to make this work that continues to be objected to and we're not getting information. We've got to be able to have that information. The Court needs that information because we've got money that we're trying to get ahold of to resolve all this stuff and we need to figure out where

```
all that goes.
            So with regard to these three that we've
2
   talked about -- Dave Keller, J. Carter, and Empyrean
3
   West -- those are proper subpoenas.
                                        They're narrowly
   tailored. And we're entitled to that information.
5
            One other thing I want to address. Mr. Greer
 6
   didn't address it, and I'm not entirely sure if -- if
   there's an objection or not, but I did a note -- all of
8
   them are served with notice -- well, I'm sorry.
10
  back up.
11
            They weren't served. We also intend to
12
   subpoena them for deposition testimony, and we included
13
   some topics for a PMK. Those haven't been addressed by
   Mr. Greer, but it's -- they're very similar. And I
14
   think the same arguments apply. We think we are
15
   entitled to issue these subpoenas and take this
16
17
   discovery.
18
            Does the Court have any questions for me?
            THE COURT:
                        No, sir.
19
20
            MR. ALDRICH: All right. Thank you.
            MR. GREER: I want to gather that Mr. Aldrich
21
22
   is saying these are narrowly tailored because they're
23
   limited to correspondence involving parties to the
   litigation.
24
25
            That is not narrowly tailored.
                                             Just because
```

```
they are a party to this litigation doesn't mean that
   any correspondence they ever did in the past is all of
2
   a sudden discoverable from third parties. You know, we
3
  need to keep in context here this is third party
   discovery. One, they have to make a showing that they
5
   can't get it any other way. They haven't made any
6
   efforts to do that.
            Two, this privacy issue, there's no argument
8
  here as to why they need the names of the investors,
   why they need the names of the brokers. And there's no
10
   evidence that the brokers are ever disclosed in any of
11
   the USCIS documentation. So this -- this isn't
12
   information that they would have a way to get through
13
14
   any source. It's very, very protected by LVD Fund, and
   actually anybody in the EB5 business who has
15
   relationships with brokers.
16
17
            With regard to the EB5 investors having to
   come forward, they don't. The money here is lent by
18
   LVD Fund.
              The money gets paid back to LVD Fund.
19
   then goes to the EB5 investors. This is all regulated
20
   through the USCIS. I don't think Mr. Aldrich is
21
22
   seriously saying that there aren't EB5 investors
   involved here.
23
24
            Also there is another reason for privacy with
25
   the investors is there's a potential for repercussions
```

```
in their own country. Remember, they're trying to
   escape countries. And thus have an interest in keeping
 2
   their interest, their identity from being publicly
 3
   discussed in their home countries where it could
   cause -- they can have repercussions from that.
 5
            And what's missing from this whole picture is
 6
 7
   why do they need the names? Why do they need the names
   of brokers? Why do they need the names of investors?
 8
   That really isn't even an issue here.
            If these documents -- any documents that were
10
  produced would necessarily have to be redacted, and
11
12
   that would not take away any of the value. Because the
   only thing of relevance here is was Mr. Dziubla
13
14
   involved in this and what was his experience. So I
   think these are all way overbroad, your Honor.
15
   bring in privileged proprietary information and
16
17
   potential attorney-client privileged information as
18
   phrased. And the motion to quash should be granted.
            With regard to timing under Rule 26, these are
19
   timely and the Court has the discretion to consider
20
21
   them anyway.
22
            So at this point in time I would ask that just
23
   the whole thing be quashed, counsel be directed to
   draft more narrowly tailored requests.
24
25
            THE COURT: What would be more narrowly
```

OCTOBER 9, 2019

```
tailored?
 1
            MR. GREER: Well, what -- they're not just --
 2
   you can't just narrow it to the party, to the subject
 3
 4
   here.
 5
            Documents identifying Mr. Dziubla's position
   with the company. Documents, you know, identifying
 6
 7
   projects he worked on.
            Really this -- all that they need to confirm
 8
   or deny is whether or not he was involved with that
 9
10
   project. And without crawling into another company's
11
   business who is not a party to this lawsuit, they could
12
   do it with a very narrowly tailored request that says
   documents identifying Mr. Dziubla's association and
13
14
   involvement with the company excluding information
   relating to names of investors and brokers.
15
   think, would come very, very close to that.
16
17
            Right now it asks for, you know, if you sent
   birthday cards, it would be covered, or well wishes, or
18
   vacation discussions. I mean, they're just incredibly
19
           They should be narrowed by issue not just by
20
   broad.
21
   the party.
22
            THE COURT: And I look at Exhibit A to
23
   defendant's motion to quash subpoena for deposition and
   documents to Empyrean, I'm looking at No. 1. He does
24
25
   list out -- he's looking for communications between
```

```
employee, officers, members, managers, agents, and
 1
   principals of Empyrean West, LLC.
 2
            And he sets forth the names of specific
 3
   individuals, and then limits it to the San Diego Hyatt
   EB5 project of which Empyrean West raised investment
 5
   funds.
 6
 7
            What's specifically wrong with that?
            MR. GREER: Number one?
 8
            THE COURT:
 9
                        Yeah.
            MR. GREER: So all documents, communications
10
   between anybody at Empyrean West and all these list
11
12
   of -- list of the entities pertaining to the project
   for which Empyrean West raised funds from EB5 during
13
   investors, literally, your Honor, that would mean that
14
   any type of internal communication, marketings that --
15
   marketing solicitations and attorney-client privilege
16
17
   communications.
            Irrelevant social communications. It doesn't
18
   ask by topic. It just -- it asks for any communication
19
   with anybody at that company with any of these people.
20
   What -- what kind of burden are you going to be placing
21
22
   on this -- this company. And what's -- there's no
23
   showing of any relevance to any of it, other than what
   was Mr. Dziubla's job there.
24
25
            THE COURT:
                        Well, I think what it is -- and
```

```
correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Aldrich is looking for his
   pre-history and experience in EB5 funding; right?
2
            MR. ALDRICH: Correct.
3
4
            MR. GREER: And, again, your Honor, that's
  part of the issue really here is, your Honor, is to
5
   just repeat this, it's very, very important.
   be -- it would discuss brokers and investors,
   Mr. Dziubla's efforts to reach out to brokers, do
  business with brokers. It would identify his business
10
   model.
           It would disclose to Front Sight, very, very
11
   strictly guarded proprietary information.
12
            Now, again, if it was excluding their names,
   if they just want to know was -- I don't even know how
13
14
   it's relevant. But if Mr. Dziubla has communications
   with investors in an EB5 project, before he came across
15
   Front Sight folks, how would it even be relevant here,
16
17
   other than the existence of Mr. Dziubla having
   experience. You don't need the names. You don't need
18
   the contact information from brokers for people that he
19
   was developing as his base for soliciting EB5
20
   investment proceeds.
21
22
            If I can imagine how they're going to do this,
23
  your Honor, this company, are they going to go between
   every employee, officer, member, manager, agent or
24
25
  principal, and then identify all communications with
```

```
each one of these separate individuals.
            THE COURT: I would think, I would think they
 2
  have a file.
 3
 4
            MR. GREER: I'm on communications of Front
   Sight defendants?
 5
            THE COURT:
                        Well --
 6
 7
            MR. GREER: You know, it's not -- it's going
   to be -- and it's open ended. For how long?
                                                  There's
 8
   no time frame on it.
            MR. ALDRICH: Your Honor.
10
11
            THE COURT: Yes.
12
            MR. ALDRICH: Number one, on here, it is --
   this one -- Mr. Greer, actually addressed No. 2.
13
14
            No. 1 is related to the EB5 San Diego Hyatt
15
   project.
            THE COURT:
16
                        Right.
17
            MR. ALDRICH: I don't know how long that
18
   lasted. I mean, Mr. Dziubla admitted that it didn't go
   anywhere. So, you know, I don't know how much it is,
19
   but they haven't made an offer of proof that it's any
20
   significant amount either. Honestly, that is what
21
22
   Empyrean West would do when they were served with it.
   If they come back and say, It's 7,000 pages of
23
   documents, then we have a different issue.
24
25
            But that isn't what we're here talking about.
```

```
We're here talking about is this sufficiently tailored,
   narrowly tailored to seek discoverable evidence?
 2
   the answer to that is yes.
 3
 4
            MR. GREER:
                       If I may. My question is why, why
   is it relevant?
 5
            THE COURT:
                       I think it goes -- I mean, I
 6
   don't -- based upon what I know about the case, I
   assume he's making -- this might go to the fraud in the
 8
   inducement issue.
 9
10
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          Absolutely.
11
            MR. GREER: To the extent that he was involved
12
   with the project, yes.
                           I mean, did he have experience?
13
   Did he work with them? What was the EB5? But they
14
   don't need the names of the brokers that he dealt with
   and the investors he dealt with, your Honor.
15
   doesn't -- that doesn't add anything to the case.
16
17
   there -- if there are communications between
18
   Mr. Dziubla and brokers, or between other Empyrean
   people and Mr. Dziubla and brokers, the identity of the
19
   broker doesn't matter. The fact that the communication
20
21
   was made would show that he was involved in the
22
   process. But there's no evidentiary value in
23
   identifying the name of the broker that was involved,
   and there is a very strong proprietary interest in
24
25
   keeping that secret, confidential.
```

```
1
            So if this was tailored, one, as to time, it
   would be a significant limitation; two, to exclude the
2
  names of investors and brokers, which are proprietary,
3
   that would at least limit the damage that would be
   caused by this incredibly overbroad request.
5
            If, with those limitations, the company then
 6
7
   could put the objection on to the extent to which it
   was overly burdensome, but we're here today to protect
   Las Vegas Development Fund, Mr. Dziubla, Mr. Fleming,
   Kenworth Capital, and EB5, EB5 Impact Capital, the
10
   Regional Center of Front Sight getting access to
11
12
   proprietary information. It's not necessary for its
   case, but is damaging to the defendants.
13
14
            MR. ALDRICH: Your Honor, here's an
   interesting thing. Listen, I hope that your Honor can
15
   see that inside I'm like jumping up and down, okay,
16
17
   because this -- think about these arguments.
18
   argument is, We don't want Front Sight to know if we
   had any brokers in place in 2012 or 2013 or 2014.
19
   Because I don't think there are any. Why does that
20
21
  matter? Because the representations are that they were
22
   raising tens of millions of dollars for an EB5 funding
   for the San Diego Hyatt project, that they have a vast
23
   network of agents and people. They're going to just
24
25
  bring them in, at the beginning, four or five months,
```

```
and promises by Thanksgiving day and all these
   different things. It makes no sense.
2
            They would -- should have wanted to go, here
3
  yet, your Honor, make an order that we can't use it
   anywhere outside of this litigation, but we're going to
5
   show you this, Mr. Dziubla is telling the truth.
 6
   that's not what is happening. It's hide and obfuscate,
   and don't show our hand, and don't give anything, and
   it's continued objections to every single thing.
10
   that is not going to fly.
11
            And with respect to Mr. Dziubla, he's sitting
12
   here, and I say these things about him and it bothers
   me that he's here listening to me say it, but I'm not
13
   going to trust if your Honor let's him or has someone
14
   else redact documents. He threw away the EB5
15
               Threw them away. Hasn't provided a proper
16
   documents.
17
   accounting. We're not taking their word for anything.
18
   This is absolutely 100 percent talking about, number
   one, it is easy, no brainer, relevant.
19
20
            MR. GREER: Your Honor --
            MR. ALDRICH: And discoverable.
21
22
            MR. GREER: He's -- we'd love to let -- if
   there was a broker involved, the fact that there was a
23
   broker involved, is relevant. He should have a right
24
25
   to it.
           The identity of that broker is what is the
```

```
problem here. Because it is proprietary information.
1
            Now, if they were properly redacted with
2
   initials where you can get the substance of the -- in
3
   fact, the way to go would probably be to allow it to be
   redacted, and then if -- if there's a need to have it
5
   disclosed, come before this Court and say, Okay. Your
6
   Honor, I -- I now have a reason that I need to know the
   identity of this broker, and here it is. But right now
8
   all they need to know is did Mr. Dziubla have
10
   interaction with brokers. They can get that with the
11
  broker's name redacted with only the initials and some
12
   non-identifying information so that Mr. Piazza, who, as
   the Court knows -- I've had a prior class action with
13
   him, I work with him well, and dealt with him in the
14
   past and know what he does.
15
            I think this Court has also seen his -- his
16
17
   alerts that he sends out to all his members, talking
18
   about things that happens in this courtroom. He's not
   able to be controlled. And so we want to give it to
19
   plaintiffs --
20
            THE COURT: I actually haven't looked at any
21
22
   of that. I don't look -- I just focus on what's in
   front of me.
23
24
            And here's my point. I mean, it appears to me
25
  what Mr. Aldrich is attempting to do, and I think what
```

```
any lawyer would try to do when it comes to certain
  aspects of the case, he wants to know, I mean, really
2
   and truly, Okay. You worked on the San Diego Hyatt EB5
3
   project. Show me what you wrote. Show me what you
   did.
5
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          Sure.
 6
7
            THE COURT: Isn't it really that simple?
            MR. ALDRICH: Sure.
                                 It is.
8
9
            MR. GREER: They should have a right to that.
            MR. ALDRICH: And Mr. Keller and Mr. Carter, I
10
  believe attended a meeting early on as well that had to
11
12
   do with this. And then that's the information that I'm
  looked for.
13
14
            And just to address this proprietary issue
   again, okay. Mr. Dziubla testified, he sat right there
15
   in that chair, and he said he's not marketed this
16
17
   project since the end of 2017. That is almost two
18
   years ago. So I don't know what we're protecting in
   proprietary fashion. This is the only project they're
19
20
   working on.
21
            MR. GREER: That's not true.
22
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          That's exactly 100 percent true.
23
  I can pull it up.
24
            THE COURT REPORTER: I need one at a time.
25
            THE COURT: One at a time.
```

```
1
            MR. ALDRICH: But this whole, It's all
   proprietary -- but, again, there's an easy fix to that.
 2
               The Court says, Mr. Aldrich, I'm going to
   It's easy.
 3
   let you try to get this information. And it's going to
   be restricted. You can only use it in this case.
 5
   client can only use it in this case. You're not to go
 6
 7
   publish it out in the world.
            That's very easy, and I'm willing to do that.
 8
                        See, but, your Honor, this case
 9
            MR. GREER:
10
   is, Let's call these people and talk to them about this
   litigation.
11
12
            And then -- and undermine -- we already know
   that he's attempting to squeeze off the income from LVD
13
   Fund by not paying for all these months, and still not
14
   paying default interest.
15
            He's a very aggressive and creative gentleman.
16
17
   And he will take that, and he will use it to his
18
   advantage, and they don't need it. They don't need the
   names. You only need the names you're going to contact
19
   those people, and they shouldn't be contacting them.
20
   So we need --
21
22
            MR. ALDRICH: I'm not --
23
            MR. GREER: So we should get them everything,
   but not the names of the brokers and the investors
24
25
   because that is proprietary and it will be misused.
```

```
1
            MR. ALDRICH: I won't belabor the fact.
                                                      The
   Court knows --
 2
            THE COURT: How can I -- how can I do that?
 3
   What is the appropriate vehicle in place to even do
 5
   that?
            MR. GREER: Just with -- have they produced
 6
 7
   these documents, whatever you decide the scope is, with
   redacting the names of any brokers or investors that
 8
                  I mean, they have -- they have
   are involved.
   third-party privacy rights themselves also.
10
            But here it's the most -- we're concerned
11
12
   about, in addition to that, is not letting Front Sight,
   Ignatius Piazza, get his hands on these because he will
13
   do something with them. And he doesn't need them.
                                                        So
14
   we could just say, Produce it, redacting the names.
15
            And then if Mr. Aldrich sees this and says,
16
17
   Hey, I need these names, we get a chance to meet and
18
   confer. We can get around that and just give them to
        If not come into court say, your Honor, Mr. Greer
19
   said we wouldn't need the names. I disagree.
20
                                                   I need
21
   the names for this reason, and then the Court can make
22
   the ruling. Are we giving them carte blanche?
23
            MR. ALDRICH: Am I going to get a chart that
   is blank?
24
25
            MR. GREER:
                        No.
                             You would have -- with his
```

```
correspondence with just -- we could do it -- just give
   you the initials, and just do the initials of the first
 2
   and last name, and -- so you can see --
 3
 4
            THE COURT: How do we know that they will do
 5
   that?
            MR. GREER: Because it's proprietary to them
 6
 7
   too.
         They're going to be -- if we do this well here,
   maybe we'll avoid another, you know, motion to squash.
   But now it's going to go off to the producing party,
10
   and they're going to have to have a right to come in
   and do this.
11
12
            MR. ALDRICH: One of the struggles here is
   that we don't know what there is. There could be
13
   nothing at all. Or there could be 7,000 pages. But
14
   that's why we get to ask, so that we can find out what
15
   is there.
16
17
            MR. GREER:
                        And if the names are redacted,
   doesn't matter whether it's zero or 7,000.
18
                  (Brief pause in proceedings.)
19
20
            THE COURT:
                       See, my concern, I was thinking
   about how to do this in such a manner where -- I don't
21
22
   know if, in the production of documents, we can rely on
23
   redactions from the source. I'm wondering if whatever
24
   is produced should be sealed. We bring them to open
25
   court and you can take a look at them without anyone
```

```
having access, except for the parties here. And if
   there is an issue and something should be redacted, we
 2
   can redact the names at that time.
 3
 4
            MR. GREER:
                        Attorney's eyes only for that part
 5
   of the process?
            THE COURT: Any problem with that?
 6
 7
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          That would certainly give me an
   opportunity to look at it and make noise if I want to.
 8
            THE COURT:
                        Right.
 9
                                And --
            MR. ALDRICH:
10
                          Yeah.
11
            THE COURT: -- my point is this: You keep
12
   them sealed. When you get them back you come back here
   and -- or you could do it in your offices together, you
13
   know, or something like that. But I think potentially
14
   the documents could be, no question, relevant.
15
   the relevance issue.
16
17
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          Right.
18
            THE COURT: But I was looking at it from this
   perspective: How do you even instruct them what to do?
19
20
            Ms. Holbert, ma'am?
            MS. HOLBERT: No, I agree.
21
                                        The problem,
22
   though, is depositions then. When are you going to
23
   take the deposition?
24
            MR. ALDRICH: Yeah, we'll have to set the
25
   deposition for a later time, I guess.
```

```
1
            THE COURT: Well, you want to read the
   documents.
 2
            MR. ALDRICH:
                         Yeah.
 3
 4
            THE COURT: And then maybe -- I mean, we don't
          What if there's no documents?
 5
   know.
            MS. HOLBERT:
                          Right.
 6
 7
            THE COURT: You going to take the deposition?
            MR. ALDRICH: Well, I might.
 8
            THE COURT: Yeah.
 9
10
            MR. ALDRICH: Because there are going to be
  some facts.
11
12
            So if I'm understanding, the suggestion then
   is so if I send the subpoena out and something comes
13
14
   back to my office, we will put it in the envelope.
15
   will not look at it.
            THE COURT: Or whatever you get from them it
16
17
   stays sealed.
18
            MR. GREER: Stays in the envelope.
            MR. ALDRICH: Okay. Fair enough.
19
20
            MR. GREER: The instruction as to the
21
   producing party is to put it in a sealed envelope.
22
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          Okay.
23
            MR. GREER: And put it in another in the mail
   and it remains sealed.
24
25
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          That's fine. And we'll hold
```

```
that until we can get together or come here to look at
   it.
 2
                        We can meet at his office.
            MR. GREER:
 3
 4
            THE COURT: I think that's the best way to do
 5
   it, Mr. Aldrich.
            MR. ALDRICH:
                           Okay.
 6
 7
            MR. GREER: So with that, though, even -- I
   guess, they're going to object to it. We can let them
 8
   object over the breadth, I think, because they are
   still incredibly --
10
11
            THE COURT: I mean, if you want to set a
12
   status check, we can bring them here, you can go out in
   the ante room and look at them. And if I have to issue
13
   an order immediately, I can do that.
14
15
            MR. ALDRICH: We can coordinate that because
   there's a couple ways we can do it really. We can even
16
17
   call the law clerk or the JEA and ask about your
   availability.
18
                        Exactly.
19
            THE COURT:
20
            MR. ALDRICH: And then just we can meet at my
   office or come here, either way, so that your Honor
21
22
   could do that with us. We can make that work.
            MR. GREER: Okay.
23
            THE COURT:
24
                         Okay.
25
            So that's regarding the Empyrean West; right?
```

```
1
            MR. GREER:
                        That also would apply to --
            MR. ALDRICH: Keller and Carter.
 2
            MR. GREER: -- Keller and Carter.
 3
 4
            THE COURT: Okay. So can you change the
 5
   subpoena on that, sir? Can you adjust that --
            MR. ALDRICH: Yes.
 6
 7
            THE COURT: -- and make sure Ms. Holbert or
   Mr. Greer sees it before it goes out?
 8
 9
            MR. GREER: I would ask that an instructional
   letter be included with that.
10
            THE COURT: Yes.
11
12
            MR. ALDRICH: Yes.
13
            Does the Court wish for us to prepare an order
14
   or --
15
            THE COURT:
                       Yes.
            MR. ALDRICH: -- is the transcript okay? You
16
17
   want an order?
            THE COURT: Probably a simple order would be
18
   fine.
19
20
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          Okay.
21
            THE COURT: It saves --
22
            MR. ALDRICH: So --
            THE COURT: Order signed off, filed.
23
                                                   There's
   never any confusion after that; right?
24
25
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          Agreed.
                                    So what I'll do is I'll
```

```
prepare an order. So far we're only the first three,
  as to Keller, Carter, and Empyrean West. I'll run it
2
  by counsel. And then I will do a cover letter that it
3
   will include the order and the cover letter with the
  subpoena. Does that sound good?
5
            THE COURT: And, I guess, the way to address
 6
7
   the -- the motion would be granted in part, denied in
          Is that correct? Because we're not quashing the
   part.
8
9
   subpoena.
            MR. ALDRICH:
10
                          Correct.
11
            THE COURT: We're modifying the subpoena.
12
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          Okay.
13
            MS. HOLBERT: Yeah, the motion was to quash or
14
   for protective order. So the Court is entering a
   protective order.
15
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          Right.
16
17
            THE COURT: Yeah.
18
            MR. ALDRICH: So granted in part, denied in
   part, protective order as to what we've talked about.
19
20
            THE COURT:
                        Yes.
            MR. ALDRICH: I'll get that in the order, and
21
22
  we'll follow that process. Is that okay?
            MR. GREER: Yes. Yes. Okay.
23
            THE COURT: All right.
24
25
            MR. GREER: Affirmative.
```

```
1
            THE COURT: So that one is done.
            Let's move on to the next one.
 2
            MR. GREER: Yeah, three of them.
 3
 4
            THE COURT: So next we're dealing with Bank --
 5
   Open Bank, Bank of Hope, Signature Bank. Is that it?
            MR. ALDRICH: Just give us just one second,
 6
   your Honor.
 7
            MR. GREER: We do banks. We can do banks.
 8
 9
            MR. ALDRICH: We can do banks.
10
            MR. GREER:
                        Your Honor, there were four
   subpoenas to banks. I think we have a lot of similar
11
12
   issues, with Wells Fargo being the first one I'd like
   to deal with.
13
14
            Your Honor, as we've -- we've filed motions
   in -- as to each of these subpoenas discussing the
15
   protections afforded to financial information.
16
17
   are -- this is financial information of a party before
18
   a judgment has been entered against the party.
            And those are -- those are clearly protected
19
   unless directly relevant to the proceedings.
20
21
            Now, Wells Fargo is the bank that's impact --
22
   EB5 Impact Advisors banked at. The Court ordered an
   accounting of that. All the bank statements have
23
   already been produced to Front Sight on that, along
24
25
   with additional documentation to promote or to support
```

1 the accounting.

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

OCTOBER 9, 2019

So anything that would have to do with Wells |Fargo at EB5 Impact Advisors has already been produced, and thus it would be -- there would be no reason to go to the bank for anything further regarding that particular entity.

None of the other entities would be relevant, your Honor. I mean, these are -- this is -- it's asking for financial information regarding individuals, regarding Linda Stanwood, John Fleming, Mr. Dziubla, the regional center, all of the -- all of the other entities other than EB5 Impact Advisors to which there is an allegation that the monies were misappropriated. All the monies that were given to Las Vegas Development Fund were by way of payments that were made after the completion of it obtaining investor funds and releasing those funds to Front Sight.

What came back are very similar to points. They -- Front Sight paid a premium to LVD Fund for them procuring the loan. Front Sight had no right to know where that money went, what was done with it. the business of LVD Fund as the lender. The interest that was paid by Front Sight, clearly it has no right to know where that money went, what it was used for.

So as to everybody else, other than Impact

```
Advisors, this would be completely inappropriate
   financial information, private information that is not
 2
   appropriate to compel the production of prior to there
 3
   being a judgment being entered and their finances and
   their banking information being relevant.
 5
   actually holds true for every other bank, including
 6
   Wells Fargo, as to all of the named defendants other
   than Impact Advisors.
 8
            That's really -- your Honor, we cite the
 9
10
   authority, just because somebody is a party doesn't
   mean you have the obligation to open up their bank
11
   account statements and their financial information.
12
   And law is very clear on that. So I don't really have
13
14
   much to add other than that. I mean, it's pretty clear
15
   law.
            THE COURT:
                        Thank you, sir.
16
17
            MR. ALDRICH:
                         All right. The bank, the
18
   request for documents to the banks are a little bit
   different, depending on what the account was being used
19
        So I notice, you know, Signature Bank.
20
   one on the request, the Signature Bank it asks:
21
22
            "Please provide any and all bank statements
        and other documents for NES Financial's escrow
23
        account for Las Vegas Development Fund, LLC,
24
25
        account number, " and it gives a number, "for
```

```
1
        the time period beginning March 2012 to the
        present date."
 2
            So this is -- this will go some to -- I would
 3
   expect that they would complain that this is going to
   have some proprietary information or something like
 5
   that in it, which goes to the resolution we already
 6
   talked about, but --
 8
            MR. GREER: I'm sorry.
            MR. ALDRICH: -- the significant thing here is
 9
10
   that over a period of time, Mr. Dziubla was making
   representations to my client about how many investors
11
12
   he has; money in the bank.
13
            And that is particularly relevant to the fraud
   claims.
            It's also particularly relevant to the May 12,
14
   2016, email and then the representations Mr. Dziubla
15
   made to Dr. Piazza thereafter, as Dr. Piazza testified
16
   last time, when he was here -- when we were here.
17
   And --
18
            THE COURT: Now, Mr. Aldrich, I understand
19
          But isn't there -- aren't there other ways you
20
   that.
   can find out that information without subpoenaing the
21
   bank records?
22
            MR. ALDRICH:
23
                          No.
            THE COURT: Why is that?
24
25
            MR. ALDRICH:
                           They're not providing them to
```

```
We've asked for them. That's the subject I
  mentioned in the motion to compel, whether the
 2
   defendant entities or people would have to provide
 3
          But, no, there's not another way to get this
   information.
 5
            And like I said, the defendants are not
 6
 7
   providing it. They're not providing anything like
          They've objected to every request related to
   this.
 8
   this, just as they did to the subpoena.
            THE COURT: Well, it would be -- it's a
10
   different animal. The reason why I am focusing on the
11
12
   financials, I understand what your position is.
            MR. ALDRICH:
13
                          Yeah.
14
            THE COURT: I understand I ordered an
   accounting, and I -- I -- it's my impression you feel
15
   whatever was produced was very much deficient.
16
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          That is correct.
17
18
            THE COURT: Okay. I get that. All right.
            Well, in certain respects, you have factual
19
   allegations that they were underfunded or whatever and
20
   had no experience --
21
22
            MR. ALDRICH: Correct.
23
            THE COURT: -- and you make that allegation.
   Aren't they going to have to come forward with some
24
25
   evidence to show that they had that experience if they
```

```
don't come forward with it?
 1
            MR. ALDRICH: Well --
 2
            THE COURT: Maybe you win on that issue?
 3
 4
   don't know.
            MR. ALDRICH: Well, I will win on that issue
 5
   because Mr. Dziubla already admitted he didn't have any
 6
   experience. But the issue --
            THE COURT: Or the finances.
 8
            MR. ALDRICH: -- the issue here --
 9
            THE COURT: The finances.
10
            MR. ALDRICH: -- on the finances is -- there's
11
12
   several issues here.
                         Okay?
13
            Remember, we got defendants, Las Vegas
   Development Fund, whose CEO and founder is Mr. Dziubla.
14
   EB5 IC, which is the regional center, which Mr. Dziubla
15
   is an owner of that. We've got EB5 IA, which is the
16
17
   marketing entity, Mr. Dziubla is the person in charge
18
   of that. That's the entity that he destroyed the
   records for, and I'm not happy about the accounting.
19
20
            We've got Fleming. Mr. Fleming, who is --
21
            THE COURT: But think about what you're
22
            You're saying he destroyed the records for and
23
   you're not happy with the accounting. Ultimately,
   doesn't that have some sort of impact on an evidentiary
24
25
  perspective?
```

```
1
            MR. ALDRICH: Yes. And I filed that motion.
   But this is -- so this -- this -- right now talking
 2
   about Signature Bank.
 3
 4
            THE COURT:
                       Right.
 5
                           Okay.
                                  This relates specifically
            MR. ALDRICH:
   to the representations that Mr. Dziubla made as to how
 6
 7
   many investors he had at any given time.
            THE COURT:
 8
                        Right.
            MR. ALDRICH: And the Court hopefully will
 9
   recall when Dr. Piazza testified last time, we talked
10
   about that meeting that occurred shortly after the
11
12
   May 12, 2016, email and he testified that Mr. Dziubla
   came in and said, We have to change the capital stack.
13
   We have to take out the minimum raise. But I've got
14
   these guys lined up and I have X number of people, and
15
   I don't remember the number right now, lined up ready
16
17
   to go as soon as we do this. And then he did.
18
            As to Signature Bank, and this first request
   that I have, it's absolutely relevant to that.
19
20
            The rest of the requests really relate mostly
21
   to the other entities and whether they also had
22
   accounts in those banks. We're trying to track down
   where the 500,000 and change from my client went.
23
24
            I don't know that there's going to be any
25
   other information related to these other requests, but
```

```
every one of them relates to a party to this
   litigation -- right -- or NES is the escrow agent.
 2
            And I recognize that there are concerns about
 3
   whether that might reveal the identity of the investors
   or something like that. I will abide by the protocol
 5
   that the Court has already addressed. And we can do
 6
   that with those documents as well. But this is
   relevant and discoverable stuff.
 8
            With regard to Open Bank, and the request
 9
   there, we're asking for similar things. We have an
10
   exact account number. And -- but Open Bank is --
11
12
   EB5 IA used that account. And then we want to know if
   there were transfers to any other parties in the case.
13
14
            Now, Wells Fargo probably, admittedly, is my
   most difficult one because Mr. Dziubla is telling us
15
   that he's provided all those records, but there's not
16
17
   harm in me subpoenaing them from Wells Fargo.
18
   doesn't hurt anybody. And then I get to verify that
   I've got everything. But I will admit that's the
19
   toughest one for me because I already have some
20
   documents from them.
21
22
            But Bank of Hope is one that was used by Las
23
   Vegas Development Fund. And I've asked for specific to
   an account that we have information, and then same
24
25
   thing, I go through and ask for any accounts or
```

1 transferring or whatever that happened with, related to a party to this litigation. 2 Now, there -- there really hasn't been -- with 3 one exception that I can recall as I'm standing here, there hasn't really been an objection that -- that I'm 5 going to even get information related to the parties in 6 the case. There was an objection raised or a concern by Mr. Dziubla that perhaps one of these subpoenas 8 would result in us receiving information related to an account his son is also on. 10 11 Again, on the one hand I certainly see why he 12 wouldn't want that to happen. On the other hand we 13 want to know where the money came from or if there was any money from my clients. So if we need to do --14 follow that same protocol, we're willing to do that. 15 But even the Wells Fargo documents that we 16 17 received, there's a whole bunch, tens of thousands of dollars that to unknown vendors we can't even tell 18 where it went, on the stuff we've already gotten. 19 20 And so I'm certainly hopeful that I might get 21 a little more information asking from Wells Fargo, but 22 they're all relevant and discoverable, and we'll abide 23 by whatever protective order the Court imposes related to that information. 24 25 THE COURT: This is -- these are my thoughts.

```
And I think it's important to distinguish this case
   from a typical business court case in this regard.
 2
            Normally, what we would see, we would have a
 3
   scenario where you have, maybe, a receivership or
   there's allegations of misuse of corporate assets or
 5
   assets of LLC or partnership and the like. And you
   have business bank accounts for the corporation or the
   LLC, and you start subpoenaing documents of that
   business organization to find out where monies have
   gone and the like.
10
11
            To me that appears to be a different animal
12
   here because you have a breach of contract, allegations
   of fraud in the inducement and so on. And so -- and
13
14
   it's different in this regard, because clearly,
   Mr. Aldrich, you have your burden of proof on certain
15
            Just as important, you have to remember when
16
17
   it comes to certain forms of defenses, you just can't
   say you got a burden of proof there too.
18
            And so I think it's slightly -- it's a
19
   slightly different animal because these are the
20
   separate accounts of the defendant in this case; right?
21
22
   And so it's kind of like a different analysis. And I'm
   just wondering from a traditional perspective because,
23
   for example, I think one of the cases that was cited by
24
25
   the defendants in this case was Schlatter v. Eighth
```

```
Judicial District Court.
1
            And it's a '70s case, but it really focuses --
2
   and it's a slightly different case, and I realize it
3
   dealt with -- it was a tort case. But the key
   language, based upon my recollection is this: They
5
   wanted to force the plaintiff to sign medical
6
   authorizations, income tax authorizations and the like.
   And the Nevada Supreme Court said, Wait a second here.
8
            And it's kind of analogous to what we have
9
   going on here. You just can't go on a fishing
10
   expedition; right? That was the language that was
11
12
   used.
13
            But my point is this: Can't you just straight
   up ask for stuff; right? And then ask for documents,
14
   and really specifically what you want, limited in time
15
   and location, and request them to produce it.
16
                                                   If they
   don't produce it, that's a problem. Right?
17
18
            MR. ALDRICH: Yes, I can. Yes, I did.
            THE COURT: That's --
19
20
            MR. ALDRICH: That's the motion to compel
   that's out there.
21
22
            THE COURT:
                        Okay.
            MR. ALDRICH: But the Court will recall, the
23
24
   reason -- part of why this went out is because -- I
25
  mean, it's the same objection. The same objection to
```

```
my request for production to them as they're making
  here today. Okay. And the Court will recall that we
2
  had a hearing in July that they came in, asked for
3
   special master, and the Court, instead of appointing a
   special master, said, I'm going to impose a 14-day
5
   deadline on a request for production for documents.
6
7
            THE COURT: Right.
            MR. ALDRICH: So I had it ready to go.
8
   dropped, I don't remember, between 550 and 600 over the
9
                 I was serious.
10
   six parties.
            THE COURT: I understand.
11
12
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          Okay. And -- and in those
   answers, I got a whole bunch of repetitive objections.
13
14
   I talked about the repetitive objections in my
15
   motion --
            THE COURT:
16
                        Right.
17
            MR. ALDRICH: -- or opposition. But I got a
18
   whole bunch of those. Not one document got identified,
   not one got identified to even one response.
19
20
            Okay. No justification of a privilege
   objection, proprietary objection. No citation, no
21
22
   case, nothing. Okay.
            So what did I do? I subpoenaed it from a
23
   third party. Why? Because it's relevant for us.
24
25
  relevant to the fraud claims. It's relevant to the
```

```
fact that my client paid 520-ish thousand dollars to --
   to try to move forward on this based on the
 2
   representations that were provided.
 3
 4
            So can I ask for it in a request for
   production? Absolutely. And I did.
 5
            And it's the same objection. They're going to
 6
 7
   say the same thing when we come here in two weeks as
   they're saying today.
 8
            MR. GREER: If we had a request for something
 9
10
   specifically, we could do it. When you get 600 of all
   documents to support anything that you disagree with in
11
12
   paragraph 12 of the complaint, all documents that
   support anything you disagree with in paragraph 13, I
13
   mean, times 600 or whatever, we -- we get, like, 40
14
   requests, and we thought about it. We focused on it.
15
   We asked for it. And that's how you get a response,
16
17
   your Honor, I think.
            I think he's being unfair here by, saying I
18
   asked for a million things and I didn't get anything.
19
20
   That's because it's lost in the message.
            The Court said 14 days, and that was to speed
21
22
   things up and make it easier. And I think that put a
23
   burden on counsel to use that judiciously and really
   focus, rather than say, Hey, here's 600 things, respond
24
25
   in 14 days. What are you going to do?
```

```
1
            MR. ALDRICH: Ninety days ago.
                                             That was 90
 2
   days ago.
            MR. GREER: But we did -- but in response we
 3
   are producing everything we have. He's getting
 5
   documents.
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          They did provide --
 6
 7
            THE COURT REPORTER: I need one at a time.
            THE COURT: One at a time.
 8
                          They provided a supplement to
 9
            MR. ALDRICH:
   initial disclosures, six-ish thousand pages.
10
11
            MR. GREER: 6,000 pages.
12
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          Okay. I -- they sent a request
   asking for the attachments to the emails because they
13
14
   were not attached, and they're confusing, but that's --
15
            MR. GREER: We fixed that --
            THE COURT REPORTER: I need one at a time.
16
17
            THE COURT: One at a time.
            MR. ALDRICH: They did provide a supplement to
18
   16.1 disclosures.
19
20
            MR. GREER: And we took that last request and
21
   we paired up the attachments with the emails and have
22
   that for you.
            MR. ALDRICH: It's coming?
23
24
            MR. GREER: I think I was probably supposed to
25
  bring them today.
```

```
1
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          Okay.
            MR. GREER: But it's -- because it's too big
 2
   for email.
 3
 4
            But, yes, it's done and we agreed to produce
 5
   it in writing. Our response, we agreed.
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          That's true.
 6
 7
            MR. GREER: We'll work with them, your Honor.
   We all need to get to the same point at trial here.
 8
   just think we all need -- it's better if we focus,
   really rather than throwing those broad nets everywhere
10
   which cause distractions.
11
            THE COURT: Is that what's set for the 23rd,
12
   the motion to compel and for sanctions?
13
14
            MR. ALDRICH: Yes.
15
            THE COURT: And with the documents that have
   been produced, does that satisfy some of the issues you
16
17
   pointed out in your motion to compel, or do you know at
   this point?
18
            MR. ALDRICH: No.
                                The documents that were
19
   produced were mostly emails and some of the
20
   transactional documents. Very little that I didn't
21
22
   already have.
23
            THE COURT: Okay.
24
            MR. GREER: Which makes sense because both
25
   parties had the transactional documents and the emails
```

```
between each other. There should be very little that
   either side has the other doesn't.
2
            THE COURT: Mr. Aldrich, do you remember --
3
   and I don't expect you to have an infallible
   computer-like recollection of specifically what was
5
   requested, but do you remember in a general sense, for
6
   example, what was requested from any documents in
   possession of the defendant as it relates to the
8
   Signature Bank?
9
            MR. GREER: I don't think we got that.
10
  it in the subpoena, not in the discovery. They're very
11
   general discovery demands. Nothing specific really.
12
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          I cannot make that
13
   representation because I don't remember.
                                             I will
14
15
   certainly look. I mean, with that 14-day order, I
   guess, I can send new requests.
16
            THE COURT: Let me look here.
17
                          The large majority of the
18
            MR. ALDRICH:
   requests were contention interrogatories related to the
19
20
   paragraphs of the complaint.
21
            MR. GREER: Excuse me, your Honor.
                                                 I just had
22
   notes after Mr. Aldrich's presentation.
                                            He made the
23
   comment they wanted to know where the money went.
   think that's exactly what case law says is
24
25
  inappropriate here.
```

```
1
            With regard to EB5 Impact Advisors, we gave
   them everything showing where the money went, including
 2
   the bank statements. Regarding what the lender does
 3
   with the interest money, what the lender does with his
   progress payments, with his incentive bonuses, they
 5
   have no right to that.
 6
 7
            That's like, you know, the mortgagee
   subpoenaing the bank saying where did you spend my
 8
   points I paid on the loan and where did you spend the
10
   interest I paid on the loan.
11
            Certainly not the personal banking
12
   information, everybody who's named as a defendant in
   this case.
13
14
            MR. ALDRICH: And we believe we do because it
   was money targeted for a specific purpose.
15
            MR. GREER: So we're going to be able to get
16
17
   |Piazza's banking statements and Mrs. Piazza's banking
18
   statements because LVD Fund gave Front Sight money we
   want to know where it went? That is Mr. Aldrich is
19
   going to stipulate to that being relevant and become
20
21
   the law of the case, is that the proposed stipulation?
22
            MR. ALDRICH: No. But I can look at what you
   asked for from Jennifer Piazza.
23
24
            THE COURT: Gentlemen, we're not going to go
25
   into -- and ladies, of course -- we're not going to go
```

there today.

You know what I'm going to do? And this is

what I think you really need, and I'm not going to

preclude any party from conducting meaningful

discovery, but my concern is we can't go overbroad and

just start subpoenaing bank accounts.

And that's why I think when I sat back and reflected, I made a distinction that these were common books and records, and you had to fight between shareholders of a corporation. Absolutely; right? And typically that's the type of -- that type of scenario, you have a business court where you might have partners fighting over things they want to know where the money went.

This is a different issue because we had -- we have different issues and entities that are litigating this case. There's allegations of fraud, fraud in the inducement. There's allegations of breach of contract, breach of covenant of good faith and fair dealing. I think that's a different scenario. I just don't think that gives you the right to start looking at all bank accounts. I just don't.

I do think that you have -- if something specifically tailored to a specific claim for relief, you can ask for that information, but it should be more

```
laser like and focused than just a broad, Hey,
   Signature Bank, I want all the stuff. Right?
2
                                                   Because
  I don't think that's proper. I really don't.
                                                   There's
3
  privacy issues there.
                          There's issues as to whether
   it's relevant or not, and that's kind of how I see
5
   that.
6
7
            Now, if we have any other comments you want to
  make on this specific issue, but I think I'm ready to
8
          Anything else?
9
   rule.
                         No, your Honor.
10
            MR. ALDRICH:
            THE COURT: Okay. This is what I'm going to
11
12
        As far as the banking records are concerned, two
   things: First and foremost, regarding defendant's
13
14
   motion to quash subpoenas for deposition and/or
   documents to Open Bank, I guess we can include Bank of
15
   Hope, Signature Bank, and, I guess, there's probably
16
17
   one more at Wells Fargo, I'm granting that.
18
            Mr. Aldrich, I want to make sure I'm perfectly
   clear on this. I'm not saying that potentially that
19
   information, you can't seek certain financials.
20
   not saying that. I'm just quashing the subpoenas.
21
22
            If you want to have a specific laser-like
   request for production of documents as it pertains to
23
   specific financials that you feel are important as it
24
25
  relates to your claims for relief, you can do it, sir.
```

```
And if they don't produce it, come in, we deal with it.
            You see what I mean?
 2
            MR. ALDRICH: I understand, so it's granted
 3
   today without prejudice. Something in the future if I
 5
   can --
            THE COURT:
                        Yeah.
 6
 7
            MR. ALDRICH: -- hone it in.
            THE COURT: No impact on a request for
 8
   production of documents, because I just -- I just feel
 9
   that it would be -- it's just opening up Pandora's Box.
10
   I really and truly do.
11
12
            Because, yes, you might have a right to -- if
   they're taking a position that, for example, monies are
13
14
   being spent for all these things and you feel, you know
   what, Judge, they mislead my client, they didn't do
15
   that -- I'm just being very general in nature -- you
16
17
   have a right to focus in on that.
            I think potentially that might be relevant,
18
   and even if it wasn't relevant for the purposes of
19
   admissibility at trial, it might be relevant for the
20
   purposes of discovery. But I think it's better to
21
22
   approach it from that regard.
            And that's one of the reasons, too, I don't
23
   want unnecessary delay. That's why I put a shortened
24
25
   time period on the responses to the request for
```

```
production of documents, not so this case won't get
 2
   bogged down; right?
            MR. GREER: Yes, your Honor.
 3
 4
            THE COURT: So is there more?
 5
            MR. GREER: One more.
            MS. HOLBERT: One more.
 6
 7
            THE COURT: So we're actually getting
   something done.
 8
            MS. HOLBERT: Yes, we are.
 9
            THE COURT: Ms. Holbert, it doesn't always
10
11
   seem that way to me.
12
            MS. HOLBERT: Right. We're making progress.
   We're doing good today.
13
14
            THE COURT: Right.
15
            MS. HOLBERT: The last one is for the
   defendant Sean Flynn.
16
17
                  (Brief pause in proceedings.)
18
            MR. GREER: We're working it out here, your
   Honor.
19
20
            THE COURT: I've been very patient.
   what I just told my clerk. I said, Maybe they're
21
22
   working it out.
            MS. HOLBERT: Right.
23
                  (Brief pause in proceedings.)
24
25
            MR. GREER:
                        Okay. So, your Honor.
```

```
1
            THE COURT:
                        Yes, sir.
                        To the last one with Sean Flynn,
 2
            MR. GREER:
   we've agreed to a compromise without prejudice to
 3
   plaintiff's right to bring the motion in its entirety
   again or as to specific issues raised. But as to Sean
 5
   Flynn, as to Items 3 and 4, we're going to fully
 6
 7
   comply.
            That has to do with the documents regarding
 8
   the economic study that he performed for EB5 impact at
 9
   the regional center, No. 3; No. 4, documents relating
10
   to his receipt of the equity in the company in lieu of
11
12
   $20,000 payment for doing the economic study in their
13
   entirety.
14
            As to 1 and 2, we're going to produce
   documents to Mr. Aldrich as requested with the names
15
   of -- sensitive names of any investors or brokers and
16
17
   identifying information redacted.
            And if there any communications which are not
18
   being produced for any reason, I will be discussing
19
20
   them with Mr. Aldrich and we will give him the
   opportunity to seek further intervention from the
21
22
   Court.
            MR. ALDRICH: Nevada law [indiscernible] --
23
24
            THE COURT REPORTER:
                                  I didn't get what you
25
   said.
```

```
1
                        Nevada law. Anything that's not
            MR. GREER:
   been provided, we'll provide a log with the general
 2
   subject matter and identifying information of the date
 3
   of the parties, and then the reason for the -- not
   producing them.
 5
            THE COURT:
                       So, in essence, that would be akin
 6
 7
   to a privilege log, is that it?
            MR. ALDRICH: Yes, it would be a privilege
 8
 9
   log.
10
            THE COURT: Which is appropriate.
                                                No
11
   question.
12
            So has that been resolved for now?
13
            MR. ALDRICH: Yes, it has.
14
            MR. GREER:
                        Now, we have your motion to quash
   our subpoenas to Morales Construction.
15
            MR. ALDRICH: We're almost there, your Honor.
16
17
            THE COURT: Is this plaintiff's motion to
18
   quash subpoenas of third parties?
            MR. ALDRICH:
                           Yes.
19
20
            So defendants issued three subpoenas or
   notices of intent to issue three subpoenas to Morales
21
22
   Construction, Top Rank and All American.
            The gist of our objection -- I mean, we've
23
   kind of laid it out in the motion. But we had a big
24
25
   discussion a few minutes ago about the breadth of my
```

```
requests. I had four to seven requests.
            These requests are essentially identical.
 2
   There's some typo as to some numbering, which is a
 3
   little bit confusing, but there's around 31 or 32
   requests to each of these entities.
 5
            And I think the main issue here is that
 6
   they're not -- nothing here is relevant. I mean, we
   have had some discussion about Morales Construction and
   this senior debt and whether they're -- they got senior
   debt and, you know, the contracts require them to use
10
   best efforts to get senior debt.
11
12
            But when we look at these requests -- I'll
   just kind of walk through. I'm going to walk through
13
14
   the -- it's my Exhibit A to the motion.
                                             I'm sorry,
15
   Exhibit 1 to the motion. And it's the one to Top Rank.
            My understanding is that this construction
16
17
   line of credit with Morales, I don't have an
   understanding, and I don't think one has articulated as
18
   to why Top Rank and All American are here, are being
19
   subpoenaed. But the first request to All American --
20
   I'm sorry, Top Rank is the one I'm looking at.
21
22
            The first request to Top Rank is:
            "All documents you used or relied on in
23
        entering into the construction line of credit."
24
25
            I don't believe that's this entity, which
```

```
1
   automatically makes them all nonrelevant.
            And then the next one is:
 2
            "Any communications that relate or refer to
 3
 4
        the construction line of credit."
 5
            Again not relevant to any of the issues here.
            And it goes on. I really -- I mean, I could
 6
   walk through each one, and I will if the Court wants me
   to. But if the Court looks at these, they are facially
   overbroad and frankly not relevant at all.
   don't serve any need or purpose in the case. And
10
11
   that's the gist of our objection.
12
            These are entities that Front Sight still
   works with. We think it's really just to harass them
13
   or make Front Sight look bad, or try to make Front
14
   Sight look bad.
15
            Some of these are duplicates, too, by the way.
16
17
   Numbers 19 and 20 are duplicative of 7 and 8. Anyway,
18
   this goes through like that. But they're just overly
   broad and not relevant. That's the gist of our
19
   objection, your Honor.
20
21
            THE COURT: Okay.
                               Thank you.
                        Your Honor, these three entities
22
            MR. GREER:
23
   are each identified as parties to the construction line
24
   of credit, so that's where we sent requests out to each
   of the three.
25
```

1 The issues that we have with regard to line of credit is, one, is it real? Is it a sham? 2 Two, what money, what has been done on the 3 property? LVD Fund, Mr. Dziubla have reporting 5 requirements which are coming up from its EB5 investors. They need to know how much work was done on 6 the project. The breach of the contract of the construction 8 loan agreements, Front Sight has not provided that 9 information. So, I mean, granted we had -- we have 10 11 roughly 30 requests on these. They are each very, very 12 specific and designed to address specific issues that are relevant in this case. 13 14 Documents that you used to rely on in entering into the construction line of credit, this goes to 15 whether or not this is a sham agreement or actually a 16 bona fide line of credit. The construction loan 17 18 agreement required Front Sight to get senior -- a senior lender. So we allege that that's not the case, 19 20 that this is a sham. It's not a senior lender, and that is a breach of the contract. So we need to have 21 evidence to show whether it's a sham or not. 22 So did Front Sight do an application? 23 they give their financial information like they would 24 25 to a lender? Did they provide any type of security to

the lender? That's the type of thing that the lenders 2 would rely upon that we have asked here, clearly relevant. 3 Communications that relate to the -- between Front Sight and each of the three companies regarding 5 the construction line of credit is directly relevant to 6 both issues. Documents have been given to you from Front Sight relating to the construction line of 8 Obviously directly on point. 9 credit. We then go into documents asking for monies 10 that have been spent, clearly directly on point. 11 12 Documents reflecting construction on the project, very relevant and very, very important for the EB5 13 reporting. 14 15 Remember, Front Sight has not given their bank statements on any of their prior productions. 16 17 have now missed their most recent required production 18 of EB5 documentations. They didn't give anything. now we're trying to figure, okay, where can we go to 19 get that information. Clearly here, the Morales and 20 21 this group are the companies that allegedly did the 22 work on the project. They got paid for the work on the 23 project. We just need to know what work was done and 24 what they were paid for. And every single one of these 25 questions goes directly to that.

OCTOBER 9, 2019

```
1
            We asked about construction schedules,
   construction plans, if they have any. That's something
 2
   there under the construction loan agreement that LVD
 3
   Fund has a right to. Any of the books and records of
   Front Sight that it has reviewed, that's something that
 5
   the construction loan agreement, we have a right to.
 6
   Any photographs or video recording of the project to
   see what has been done, that's something that we have a
 8
   right to.
 9
            There's nothing privileged in here.
10
   Everything we've asked is directly related to Front
11
12
   Sight's application for this line of credit, the basis
   for them granting it. And lastly, in the end, their
13
14
   ability to actually service this large a line of
   credit, the last handful of questions, ask each of
15
   these individual companies what portion of that
16
17
   $36 million line of credit are you responsible for.
18
   And then to provide the documentation to show that you
   are capable of servicing or carrying that portion of
19
   that debt.
               That goes right to whether this is a sham
20
   or not.
21
22
            I'll be very, very careful here to make sure
23
   that everything is relevant and carefully tailored.
   Your Honor, I think we did so. And it's just -- and we
24
25
   need these to proceed with the case.
```

```
1
            From what we can gather, this is the only
   company -- these are the only companies that have done
 2
   work on the property that have been able to figure out.
 3
   So this is the universe of, you know, the work that's
  been, and we're going to have, and it's got to be
 5
   reported to the immigration service before the end of
 6
 7
   the year.
 8
            Thank you. Good point.
            Yeah, these were included in our request for
 9
   production --
10
            THE COURT: I did see that.
11
12
            MR. GREER: Okay.
13
            THE COURT: There was a request for production
   of documents specifically --
14
15
            MS. HOLBERT: Right.
            THE COURT: -- dealing with a lot of these
16
17
   issues.
18
            MR. GREER: I did attempt an alternative
   method, yes.
19
20
            All right. Thank you.
            MR. ALDRICH: I haven't received any objection
21
22
   to my responses for request for production. Point that
   out.
23
24
            But a couple of things. First of all,
25
  Mr. Greer said that Front Sight is required to get
```

```
senior debt. They're not required to get senior debt;
   they're required to use best efforts to obtain senior
 2
   debt.
 3
 4
            And, by the way, Dr. Piazza testified about
 5
   this when he was here last time, and he talked about
   the fact that as he was entering into this agreement
 6
   with Morales, that he was communicating with
   Mr. Dziubla about it the entire time.
 8
            There was -- Mr. Greer just mentioned that
 9
   Front Sight has not given documents, and there is some
10
   most recent reporting or something that was due.
11
12
   don't know what that is. I know that they brought your
   Honor another thing they filed this morning called
13
14
   notice of further monetary default.
                                        It says nothing
   about not providing information.
15
            I know that we provided -- Front Sight has
16
17
   provided thousands and thousands of pages of documents.
18
   And so -- at any rate, this is all -- they're asking
   for information that they can get elsewhere. Although
19
   I will admit, it may be me that it would come from, you
20
21
   know.
22
            MR. GREER:
                        We asked.
23
            MR. ALDRICH: But like I said, I hadn't got
24
   any objection to the response that we prepared.
25
   anyway, that's -- I think I've said my piece.
                                                   I don't
```

```
have anything else to add.
            THE COURT: So you're saying that it's
 2
   premature, is that it? I'm trying to figure out what
 3
   your position is, Mr. Aldrich. Because I'm looking at
   it -- I think this is on page 13 of the subpoena duces
 5
           The Top Rank Builders, for example.
 6
   Request No. 1 would be:
            "All documents that you used or relied upon
 8
        in entering into a construction loan line of
 9
        credit."
10
11
            Is there anything specifically wrong with
12
   that?
13
            MR. ALDRICH: (No audible response.)
14
            THE COURT: Because I understand you said --
   earlier you said, Look, Judge, we're just required to
15
   make our best efforts to get one.
16
            MR. ALDRICH: Yeah.
17
18
            THE COURT: But it's my understanding, you
   used your best efforts and there was -- your client
19
   obtained a line of credit.
20
21
            MR. ALDRICH: Through Morales.
22
            THE COURT: Right.
            MR. ALDRICH: Yeah. And the consent of
23
24
   Mr. Dziubla.
25
            But, your Honor, doesn't that, right,
```

```
automatically -- first of all, it's best efforts.
   Okay. And then they did it. But the fact that it's
 2
   best efforts makes all of it not relevant in the first
 3
   place.
 5
            MR. GREER: If it's best efforts to get a
   senior, obtain a senior loan, then they said they got a
 6
   senior loan, but it becomes real relevant when it's
   fraud. And it's not a senior loan, it's a sham.
 8
            Best efforts don't include getting something
 9
   and faking like it is a valid senior loan.
10
            MR. ALDRICH: Huh.
11
12
            MR. GREER: They said they got it. We need to
   know whether they really did or whether using their
13
   best efforts they put together a sham to avoid having
14
   to use their best efforts.
15
            MR. ALDRICH: There wasn't a sham.
                                                 Dr. Piazza
16
   has already testified about it. He took the stand last
17
   time and talked about it.
18
            MR. GREER: I think he said it was a sham.
19
20
            MR. ALDRICH: No, he didn't.
            THE COURT: Well, ultimately, that might be a
21
22
   factual determination for someone else to make, so I
23
   won't call it one way or another, but I do think they
   have a right, just like we talked about before, if your
24
25
   client is taking the position that they did obtain a --
```

```
was it a $36 million line of credit, then okay.
          But what documents support that; right? What
 2
   fine.
   happened? How was it obtained?
 3
 4
            MR. GREER: And why did they use it if it's
          I mean, that's what caused all the suspicion.
 5
   real?
            MR. ALDRICH: Dr. Piazza already talked about
 6
 7
   that.
          He talked about it when he was here.
            MR. GREER: That's --
 8
            THE COURT: But here's the thing.
 9
                                               And I'm not
10
   saying you're wrong, Mr. Aldrich, but clients can talk
   about a lot of things, but you need -- is there
11
12
   evidence to support their position? And that's really
   all -- all they're doing is they're just testing his
13
14
   testimony.
15
            And hypothetically, if, for example -- and I
   don't know how this works under the new circumstances.
16
17
   But if he added a line of credit, who issued it?
18
   was it funded? How is there access? And I'm just
   talking in a very general nature.
19
20
            For example, it you go to every Bank of
   America and get a HELOC loan, it gets you a line of
21
22
   credit on the house, there is documents you submit to
23
   the bank, and they look at it. They approve it. And
   they issue a line of credit to you, and -- and you can
24
25
   access that typically at your own discretion; right?
```

```
Based upon the line of credit that was issued.
            Now, I don't know how much this differs from
 2
   that scenario, but that's typically how lines of credit
 3
   work. You're given a certain sum out there, whether
   it's $500 or whether it's $50 million, depending on
 5
   your financials that you can access that. And I think
 6
   that's all they're asking for.
            That's from what I can tell; right? So what's
 8
   wrong with that?
                     That's my ultimate question.
 9
                          I understand. Like I said, I've
10
            MR. ALDRICH:
   said my piece. I don't have anything to add to what
11
12
   I've already talked about.
13
            THE COURT:
                        Okay.
14
            You get the last word, sir. No, you don't.
   It's Mr. Aldrich gets the last word.
15
            Okay. And for the record, there was a request
16
   for production that wasn't responded to, so you're
17
   saying the subpoena the records directly from --
18
            MS. HOLBERT:
                          Still --
19
20
            MR. ALDRICH: I know there hasn't been any
   discussion or anything about my responses.
21
22
            MR. GREER: Your Honor, it's -- if we asked
23
   for it and they say, We're not going to give it,
   nothing says, Okay, I got to tie this up in court for
24
25
   three months on a motion to compel and what not.
                                                      You
```

```
know what, we asked them nicely. They said they
  weren't going to give them, so we go right to the
2
   source. We don't know if we can trust them.
3
   disparaging here. Going to the source is the safer way
   to go anyway, and so we did try to get it directly.
5
   They said no. We decided to go to the source.
6
7
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          I actually don't remember what I
   said to that one. I don't know if it was because there
8
   was 14 days and I didn't have time to get it.
   again, no one has mentioned anything to me about
10
   anything wrong with my responses. But I remind the
11
12
   Court, I did.
                  I wrote a 13-page single space letter to
   opposing counsel explaining the problems with their
13
14
   responses. And then repeatedly was told I was going to
   get supplemental responses, and I didn't get them, so I
15
   filed a motion to compel. But I get where we are.
16
17
   understand --
18
            THE COURT: Well, you filed a motion to
   quash --
19
20
            THE COURT REPORTER:
                                 I need one at a time.
            MR. ALDRICH: No, I filed a motion to compel.
21
22
   That's on the 23rd. Related to this -- I'm talking
   about related to the response.
23
24
            MR. GREER: Your Honor, I probably missed the
25
   call when Mr. Aldrich called me and said, Hey, Keith,
```

```
you know what, you got that motion filed.
                                               I'll go and
2
  give them to you. Let's work it out here.
            I didn't get that. I got an opposition back,
3
4
   so ...
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          That is true.
5
            THE COURT: All right. I mean, I do think
 6
7
   they have a right to that information at the end of the
        I don't want to side step the processes.
   day.
8
            So is there anything else I need to know?
9
10
  mean --
11
            MR. ALDRICH: I have nothing to add, your
12
  Honor.
13
            THE COURT: I mean, am I somehow prejudicing
  your client by making this determination without going
14
   through the process? I just want to make sure I'm not
15
   rushing to judgment here. That's all.
16
17
            There is nothing else, Mr. Aldrich?
18
            MR. GREER: No, your Honor.
            MR. ALDRICH: No, your Honor. I stated our
19
  position.
20
            THE COURT: Okay. Well, for the record we're
21
22
   talking about plaintiff's motion to quash subpoenas of
   third parties; right?
23
24
            MR. GREER: That's it.
25
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          That's correct.
```

```
1
            MS. HOLBERT: Yes.
            THE COURT: This is what I'm going to do
 2
   regarding the motion to quash, I'm going to deny it.
 3
 4
            MR. ALDRICH: No limitation at all on those
 5
   requests?
 6
            THE COURT: I'm asking -- I'm trying to get
 7
   you to qualify --
            MR. GREER: Limited to the dates.
 8
            THE COURT: You said no, you're limited.
 9
            MR. GREER: I limited each one to the dates,
10
   to the subject, to the type.
11
12
            MR. ALDRICH:
                           Okay.
            THE COURT:
13
                        That's why, Mr. Aldrich, I was
14
   wanting to make sure I understood your position, and
   you said -- I just -- is there something I'm missing?
15
   I need to dig in a little deeper.
16
            MR. ALDRICH:
17
                          I mean --
            THE COURT: That's why I wanted to know --
18
                          I've said my piece.
19
            MR. ALDRICH:
                                                They are
20
   completely overbroad. Okay?
                                  They're repetitive and
   everything else, but I can -- I can go on and on.
21
22
   know what the Court is going to do. I can see it.
   Court has indicated, and I don't want to waste the
23
24
   Court's time.
25
            THE COURT: Well, it's not necessarily -- I
```

```
don't -- whatever time is necessary to make sure the
   request is proper, I don't think I've rushed you out of
 2
          I probably should have done so on many
 3
   occasions, but I haven't, Mr. Aldrich.
 5
            MR. ALDRICH: I'm not saying you have, your
           Absolutely not.
 6
   Honor.
 7
            THE COURT: But if there's a concern with the
   request, just like we dealt with some of the prior
 8
   requests, I'm willing to listen. I realize it's late
   in the day, but I'm not ever going to just rush to
10
   judgment. If there's a concern you have, let me know
11
12
   with a little bit of particularity so I can address it.
   But I do think they have -- for example, they have a
13
14
   right, just like we talked about before, and your
   client has a right to test certain aspects of their
15
   case, they have a right to test whether or not there's
16
17
   a valid construction loan agreement.
18
            And, for example, I mean, I look at it and
   they do appear to be unlike, say hypothetically, just
19
   bank statements, but, for example, Request No. 1:
20
            "All documents you relied upon in entering
21
22
        into the construction loan" -- I'm sorry,
        "construction line of credit."
23
24
                    That's pretty specific.
            Right?
                                              That's not
25
   asking for anything else, but anything that they were
```

```
given that they relied upon before they issued this
   "construction line of credit." That is all. Nothing
 2
   more; nothing less.
 3
 4
            Request No. 2:
 5
             "All communications between and among you,
        Front Sight, that relate or refer to the
 6
        construction line of credit."
 7
            And it just seems to me, all documents -- I
 8
   mean, No. 3 and No. 4, they're all going to one item,
 9
   and that's the construction line of credit.
10
            Now I'm looking at these. Then it goes to
11
12
   project dates. Right? I'm just kind of going through
   it a little bit.
13
14
            Construction points, if any.
15
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          Okay. No. 14. No. 14 asks for:
             "Documents relating to or reflecting Front
16
17
        Sight's financial status, including without
        limitation, financial statements, banking
18
        records, tax returns, accounting records."
19
20
            They already have all that.
21
            MR. GREER: But that would only be to the
22
   extent they were in the lender's possession as part of
   the construction loan agreement, which would show if
23
   they had those things, it would tend to prove
24
25
   plaintiff's case that it was a legitimate process.
                                                         Ιf
```

```
they don't have any of those, it would tend to, I
   think, support defendant's position that it was not a
 2
   legitimate process.
 3
 4
            THE COURT: Well, for example, No. 14
 5
   potentially could be tweaked to reflect No. 15.
   what I mean by that is this. No. 14 says:
 6
 7
            "All documents referring to, related to, or
        reflecting Front Sight's financial status,
 8
        including without limitations, financial
 9
        statements, banking records, tax returns, and
10
11
        accounting rules."
12
            But No. 15 -- and this is a very cursory
   review by me on the bench. No. 15 says:
13
14
            "All documents that refer or relate to any
15
        of the Front Sight -- Front Sight's books and
        records you have reviewed."
16
17
            MR. GREER: Yeah.
                                The reason the two of those
18
   are distinct are, One, if they have any documents in
   their possession relating to that item; but, Two, if
19
   they went to Front Sight's, you know, offices and they
20
   reviewed books, they don't have copies themselves,
21
22
   maybe they just decided to go over and look at the
   books and records at Front Sight. They wouldn't keep
23
   copies, but they would say in their records, Today we
24
25
   reviewed, you know, whatever the progress was on the
```

OCTOBER 9, 2019

```
project or reviewed the cash flow statements, whatever,
   with Mr. Piazza at his offices, or anything like that.
 2
   That was just things they might not have, but they
 3
   actually reviewed.
 5
            MR. ALDRICH: All right. So Request No. 24, I
   see where the Court is so I'm going to jump down a
 6
   couple of those. Request No. 24:
            "All documents reflecting communications
 8
        between or among Top Rank Builders, Inc.,
 9
        Morales Construction Inc,. All American
10
        Concrete and Masonry, Inc., regarding the
11
12
        project."
13
            Those are third party to third party
14
   communications.
15
            No. 25:
            "All documents reflecting contracts between
16
17
        Front Sight and Top Rank Builders, other than
        relating to the construction line of credit or
18
        project."
19
20
            Now we're outside the construction line.
            THE COURT: These are -- Mr. Aldrich, these
21
22
   are the points you needed to bring up to me. I mean,
23
   really, they are.
24
            Are there more in here you want me to look at,
25
   sir?
```

```
1
            MR. ALDRICH: No. 26:
            "All documents reflecting the business
 2
        relationship between Top Rank Builders,
 3
 4
        Morales, and All American."
 5
            Again, not relevant. Overbroad.
 6
            Communications with the Nye County planning
 7
   department, No. 27.
            MR. GREER: Your Honor, this is -- these
 8
   are -- a lot of these are based in part on Front Sight
   not giving us any information about the projects.
10
   this was designed -- if there were discussions about
11
12
   any pertinence or any type of research into the project
13
   involving communications with Nye County and Front
14
   Sight's construction, which is the project, that would
15
   be relevant too.
            With regard to the communications between
16
17
   these three folks and what their relationship is,
18
   they're all three together on -- on the line of
   credits.
             They all three have the same president.
19
   They're all three the same office address. And so I
20
   was trying to figure out how they're related. So that
21
22
   was -- and actually, you know what, each of these --
23
   every one of these, excuse me, every one of these has
   to do with the project.
24
25
            Communications between you three regarding the
```

```
project.
             Communications with Front Sight regarding the
   project. Everything in there is related to -- it's all
 2
   limited by the project. It's limited by time, by scope
 3
   and by subject.
 5
            Yeah, that's right.
                                  They were the lenders and
   the ones working on the project. They are the ones
 6
   doing the work.
            MR. ALDRICH: So, your Honor, I reviewed the
 8
   rest, and I think I've noted everything, but 25 is not
 9
10
   related to the project.
11
            MR. GREER: It's not? I thought it was.
12
            MR. ALDRICH: I'm looking at All American.
   There was some confusion. This one -- for the record:
13
14
            "All documents reflecting contracts between
15
        Front Sight and Top Rank Builders, Inc., other
        than relating to the construction line of
16
17
        credit or the project."
18
            So that's everything not related to the
   project.
19
20
                        Again, this was establishing the
            MR. GREER:
   relationship between the parties and if there was any
21
22
   type of quid pro quo going on on a sham line of credit.
            THE COURT: You have a few more minutes,
23
   Mr. Aldrich. You can take your time and look at it
24
25
   from, like, 28 on.
```

```
1
                  (Brief pause in proceedings.)
                          The only other one, No. 32,
 2
            MR. ALDRICH:
   related to communications relevant to the litigation.
 3
   I don't know that that's relevant to anything.
   looked at the other ones.
 5
            THE COURT:
                        Okay.
 6
 7
            MR. ALDRICH: And based on the Court's
   comments previously, I understand how the Court's going
 8
   to find on those.
 9
            MR. GREER: And I think you'll notice the
10
   theme throughout, your Honor, is this is all caused by
11
12
   Front Sight, we allege, who breached the contract, not
   providing the information that's needed.
13
                                              There are
14
   reports due to the immigration services coming up
   shortly. The vast majority of the information
15
   requested here has to do with that. The remainder of
16
17
   the information has to do with whether or not that line
   of credit is really a line of credit or whether it's a
18
   sham: The two basic themes throughout which are both
19
20
   relevant.
21
            THE COURT: Mr. Aldrich, other than the ones
22
   that have been pointed out, are there any other ones
23
   you want me to look at?
24
            MR. ALDRICH: I don't have anything else to
25
   add, your Honor.
```

```
1
            THE COURT: All right. For the record, it's
   my understanding there were objections to Requests No.
 2
   14, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 32. And by my notes, regarding
 3
   14 --
 5
            MR. ALDRICH: Your Honor, I'm sorry, I just
   want to be clear. So I was operating off of the Top
 6
   Rank --
            THE COURT: I think that's --
 8
            MR. ALDRICH: -- ones. The numbering is a
 9
   little bit different because there's some typos.
10
   would this be -- if there are some that the Court is
11
12
   going to limit on, you may want to read that into the
   record so we can make sure we have the right ones.
13
14
            THE COURT: Okay.
            MR. ALDRICH: Yeah. And there is -- 24 and 25
15
   are -- there is a couple of --
16
17
            THE COURT: You know what I'm going to do?
18
   light of -- I know -- I understand what the respective
   positions of the parties are, and I think out of
19
   fundamental fairness, I'm not going to rush.
20
   want to -- when you get back to your office over the
21
22
   next day or two, and just file me some sort of document
23
   as to the ones you object to, I will at least look at
24
   that.
25
            I understand, Mr. Greer, what your position
```

```
is.
        I get it.
            MR. GREER: Yeah. We need it fast because we
2
   got reporting --
3
4
            THE COURT:
                        Fast.
5
            MR. GREER: -- requirements coming. We're not
   getting it from there.
6
7
            THE COURT:
                        I know, but I'm going to give
  him -- I'm not going to give him a week or two, just
8
   within the next 48 hours.
            And what I'll do, as soon as I get that, I'll
10
  look at it. Because, for example, this is kind of how
11
12
   I look at it, but I want to make sure he itemizes every
   one so I've looked at it. I don't want to rush.
13
14
            But, for example, there's an objection to
   Request No. 4, and I think this is under Top Rank.
15
   me look to make sure. And -- but I'll go through each
16
17
   one. I think it's the first one. Is that -- who's the
18
   tort. Yeah, it's Top Rank. And there's an objection
   to No. 24 that's been lodged by Mr. Aldrich. That one,
19
   after reviewing it, I don't mind telling you, I'm going
20
   to overrule that objection.
21
22
            But, for example, No. 25, there's an
   objection. And it's all documents reflecting contracts
23
24
   between Front Sight, Top Rank Builders, and -- and
25
  relating to the construction agreement. I'm going to
```

```
grant that one because I think that's going a little
  bit too far. But the gist of most of what you're
2
  requesting, I understand why.
3
4
            But what I want to do is this: I'm going to
5
  go back and look at each one with particularity. But I
   don't want you to be at a disadvantage, Mr. Aldrich,
6
   and just -- we cram it down. I want to give you a
   chance to look at it. You can lodge it. And then I'll
   go through it and read each one. And I just want
   everybody to understand, for example, I get what you're
10
11
   doing here, Counsel, Ms. Holbert, and Mr. Greer.
12
            You're looking to see, Look. For example,
   Request No. 1, which I think is clearly appropriate:
13
14
            "All documents that you used or relied upon
15
        in entering into the construction loan line of
        credit."
16
17
            It's like the first example I gave is
   regarding Bank of America in a HELOC. The same thing;
18
   right?
19
20
                        You know, do you know which ones
            MR. GREER:
   you object to? I don't mind dealing with it if I can
21
22
   stip to it. I'd rather have some clean requests and
23
   get this thing rolling.
24
            THE COURT: If you want to stip and narrow,
25
  maybe have the items that -- I mean, I'll give you a
```

```
1
   few minutes. We'll step down and you can talk.
            MR. ALDRICH: Just one second.
 2
            MR. GREER: Yeah.
 3
            THE COURT: For example, No. 1 is pretty good.
 4
 5
            MR. ALDRICH:
                           Okay.
            MR. GREER:
                        Understood.
 6
 7
            MR. ALDRICH: Your Honor, I'm going to provide
   the objections.
 8
            THE COURT:
                        Yes.
 9
            MR. ALDRICH: No later than Friday.
10
11
            THE COURT: Okay.
12
            MR. ALDRICH:
                          Today is Wednesday, so no later
   than Friday. I will try to do it in an easy way that
13
14
   the Court can turn that around pretty quickly.
15
            THE COURT:
                        Right.
16
            MR. ALDRICH:
                           Okay.
17
            THE COURT: Okay. I understand. And I think
18
   it's important to do that for the record. Because I
   don't want to rush you out of here, but we'll get it
19
   done. And if you get me -- I can --
20
21
            Can you remind me to do this Monday? We're in
22
   trial; right?
23
            I'm going to have my court clerk remind me
   once I get the objections to do a minute order on
24
25
   Monday, just kind of go through them. And this is one
```

```
that's -- that's -- it will be, I think, easier for me
   to make that quick turnaround than it would on other
2
   issues that are more complex.
3
4
            Sir.
5
            MR. ALDRICH: If I may, I have a suggestion to
   help with that. If it pleases the Court, perhaps we
6
   could provide a Word document with the specific
   requests in there, so literally the Court can instruct
   whoever is doing it to hit enter and type in "overrule"
   or whatever.
                 Speed it up so we wouldn't have to
10
   retype. We don't do that very often in state court,
11
12
   but I'd be happy to offer to do that.
13
            MS. HOLBERT: I can do it. I've already got
14
   it in Word.
15
            MR. ALDRICH: Yeah.
            MS. HOLBERT: So I can send you the Word of
16
17
   the 30 or however many there are, make sure that there
18
   aren't any typos and it's clean. I'll be happy to send
   it to you first. In fact, I'll send it to you first if
19
   you want and then you can make it red line, I object to
20
21
          Then he can red line --
   this.
22
            MR. GREER: In fact, why don't we send -- go
   through -- and there's a couple of numbering issues in
23
           Let's just clean them all up and send the Court
24
   there.
25
   a clean copy and him a clean copy, and when we're done
```

```
we'll have a nice --
 1
            MS. HOLBERT: Yeah, I'm happy to do that.
 2
            THE COURT: But to be candid with you, I want
 3
 4
   to tell everybody, all I would do is issue a simple
   minute order --
 5
            MS. HOLBERT:
                         Right.
 6
 7
            THE COURT: -- where, okay, Request No. 1,
   granted.
 8
 9
            Request No. 2, denied.
            MS. HOLBERT: Perfect.
10
            MR. ALDRICH: Okay.
11
12
            THE COURT: That's all.
13
            MS. HOLBERT:
                          Right.
14
            MR. GREER: Keep it simple.
15
            MR. ALDRICH: We'll work on a way that makes
   it make sense, because one of them doesn't have the
16
17
   typos, and we'll get it cleaned up. We will get it
   submitted to the Court. But I was just offering that
18
   in case the Court wanted to do it that way.
19
20
            THE COURT: No. We'll make it really, really
21
   simple.
22
            Mr. Aldrich, I want to make sure you have a
   chance, sir, to sit back and reflect.
23
24
            MR. ALDRICH: Um-hum.
25
            THE COURT: Versus on the run.
```

```
1
                          I appreciate that.
            MR. ALDRICH:
            MS. HOLBERT: And for the record, your Honor,
2
   we, of course, sent these starred with notices of
3
   intent to serve.
                     They have not yet been served, so --
5
            THE COURT: Okay.
            MS. HOLBERT: -- they're set for the 17th, but
 6
7
   we will, of course, get a new date. So they have not
   actually been served. So I don't think we need any
8
   interim order to stay or anything.
            THE COURT: And -- and here's the thing. You
10
  can always ask to reconsider issues; right?
11
                                                 I'm not
12
   going to --
13
            But is there anything else I need to know?
   Because I understand what your position is.
14
   focusing, Look, what did they rely upon to issue this
15
   line of credit; right? That's basically what it is.
16
17
   And I get it.
18
            And if, for whatever reason, after I issue my
   decision, if there's something there you want to -- I'm
19
   not saying you're waiving your right to come back
20
   again, but ultimately, who knows. When you get all the
21
22
   documents, for example, Request No. 1 might cover
23
   everything. Right?
24
            MR. ALDRICH: All right. Anyway, your Honor,
25
  we appreciate your time today.
```

```
1
            MS. HOLBERT: Yes.
            THE COURT:
 2
                        Okay.
            MR. GREER: Thank you, your Honor.
 3
 4
            THE COURT: Enjoy your day.
 5
            MS. HOLBERT:
                          Thank you.
            THE COURT: And remind me.
 6
 7
            In fact, as far as the requests are concerned,
   you're going to be sending me new requests; right? So
 8
   I don't have to rely upon these. I just need to go
   back through them again.
10
            MS. HOLBERT: Correct. Right?
11
12
            MR. GREER: What?
            MS. HOLBERT: You'll actually deliver that to
13
14
   him in a hard copy so that he's got a clean hard copy
15
   of what he needs to deal with?
            MR. ALDRICH: Yeah. I figure I'd just file a
16
17
   supplement.
18
            MS. HOLBERT: Okay. Right. Right.
19
20
                  (Proceedings were concluded.)
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	STATE OF NEVADA)
3	:SS COUNTY OF CLARK)
4	I, PEGGY ISOM, CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER DO
5	HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I TOOK DOWN IN STENOTYPE ALL OF THE
6	PROCEEDINGS HAD IN THE BEFORE-ENTITLED MATTER AT THE
7	TIME AND PLACE INDICATED, AND THAT THEREAFTER SAID
8	STENOTYPE NOTES WERE TRANSCRIBED INTO TYPEWRITING AT
9	AND UNDER MY DIRECTION AND SUPERVISION AND THE
10	FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT CONSTITUTES A FULL, TRUE AND
11	ACCURATE RECORD TO THE BEST OF MY ABILITY OF THE
12	PROCEEDINGS HAD.
13	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I HAVE HEREUNTO SUBSCRIBED
14	MY NAME IN MY OFFICE IN THE COUNTY OF CLARK, STATE OF
15	NEVADA.
16	
17	PEGGY ISOM, RMR, CCR 541
18	PEGGI ISOM, RMR, CCR 541
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	147/20 148/10	•	81/25 82/18 93/19	4:00 o'clock [1]
IN UNISON: [1]	150/2 150/5 151/20	' 70s [1] 115/2	108/1	14/19
4/7	152/3 152/6 153/22	700[2] 113/2	2013 [3] 18/24	5
MR. ALDRICH:	154/14 156/3 156/12	<u>-</u>	41/12 93/19 2014 [2] 82/5	50 million [2]
[246]	MS. HOLBERT:	- o0o [4] 31/3 31/4	93/19	20/24 37/12
MR. GREER: [157]	[56] 4/12 5/3 6/19	74/16 74/17	2015 [2] 31/10	500,000 [1]
4/14 7/19 8/5 8/13	7/24 9/1 9/13 9/17	1	82/5	111/23
8/17 8/25 9/2 9/11 9/16 9/19 10/3 10/7	13/16 13/20 15/8	10-13 [1] 13/17	2016 [12] 18/24	520-ish [1] 117/1
11/13 12/17 12/20	17/13 17/17 18/6	100 [4] 2/16 34/13	20/20 21/13 25/23	541 [2] 1/24
12/23 13/19 14/5	59/6 59/18 60/3	47/19 96/22	26/7 26/16 31/12	157/17
14/15 14/20 15/9	60/7 60/9 60/23	100 percent [1]	32/6 37/11 46/14	5490 [1] 3/10
16/12 16/15 16/21	61/10 61/14 62/25	94/18	108/15 111/12	550 [1] 116/9 579-3900 [1] 2/8
16/23 17/1 18/5	63/10 64/2 64/12 70/25 71/8 71/12	100,000 [1] 56/2	2017 [2] 25/25 96/17	5th [2] 5/15 8/20
18/10 18/14 18/18	71/15 71/18 71/24	11-13 [4] 13/18	2018 [1] 26/2	
18/20 24/4 24/9	73/19 100/21 101/6	13/19 13/20 13/21 12 [7] 20/20 21/13	2019 [2] 1/21 4/1	6
31/6 35/18 35/20	104/13 125/6 125/9	26/7 26/16 108/14	2020 [1] 64/21	6,000 [1] 118/11
35/23 36/2 36/16 43/24 44/1 44/24	125/12 125/15	111/12 117/12	206 [1] 2/6	600 [4] 116/9
45/1 45/9 45/11	125/23 133/15	13 [7] 13/17 13/18	227-1975 [1] 3/11	117/10 117/14
45/15 45/20 45/25	138/19 141/1	13/19 13/20 13/21	23rd [25] 5/20 6/9	117/24
46/3 48/20 48/23	153/13 153/16	117/13 135/5	7/2 7/17 8/19 9/7	613-6677 [1] 2/18 613-6680 [1] 2/19
50/19 50/23 53/3	154/2 154/6 154/10	13-page [1]	10/3 10/8 10/13	65 [9] 17/10 18/1
53/8 53/13 54/16	154/13 155/2 155/6 156/1 156/5 156/11	139/12	11/10 12/18 12/21 13/11 13/24 15/20	58/22 60/1 61/8
54/18 56/5 56/8	156/13 156/18	14 [10] 7/22	24/25 71/24 72/1	61/11 62/15 63/13
57/3 57/5 57/9 58/8	THE COURT	117/21 117/25	72/17 72/19 72/24	65/16
66/8 67/20 69/6	CLERK: [2] 14/11	139/9 143/15 143/15 144/4 144/6	73/7 73/14 119/12	6677 [1] 2/18
69/19 72/22 74/21	15/5	149/3 149/4	139/22	6680 [1] 2/19
74/23 75/4 83/15 85/21 88/2 89/8	THE COURT	14-day [2] 116/5	24 [5] 145/5 145/7	7
89/10 90/4 91/4	REPORTER: [7]	120/15	149/3 149/15	ļ -
91/7 92/4 92/11	8/3 74/9 96/24	140 [1] 46/19	150/19	7,000 [3] 91/23 99/14 99/18
94/20 94/22 96/9	118/7 118/16	14th [1] 8/15	25 [5] 145/15	70 million [1]
96/21 97/9 97/23	126/24 139/20	15 [3] 144/5	147/9 149/3 149/15	20/23
98/6 98/25 99/6	THE COURT: [304]	144/12 144/13	150/22 2510 [1] 2/5	702 [3] 2/8 3/10
99/17 100/4 101/18		15th [2] 5/15 8/19	26 [3] 87/19 146/1	3/11
101/20 101/23	\$	16 [4] 17/11 18/2 58/20 58/23	149/3	75 million [2]
102/3 102/7 102/23	\$100,000 [2]	16.1 [4] 58/20	27 [2] 146/7 149/3	37/13 37/20
103/1 103/3 103/9 104/23 104/25	55/22 56/1	60/17 61/3 118/19	28 [1] 147/25	8
105/3 105/8 105/10	\$20,000 [1]	160 [1] 3/8	3	853-5490 [1] 3/10
108/8 117/9 118/3	126/12	1601 [1] 3/7		858 [2] 2/18 2/19
118/11 118/15	\$36 [2] 132/17 137/1	17150 [1] 2/15	30 [3] 65/17	89074 [1] 2/7
118/20 118/24	\$36 million [2]	17th [1] 155/6	130/11 153/17 31 [1] 128/4	89146 [1] 3/9
119/2 119/7 119/24	132/17 137/1	19 [1] 129/17	32 [3] 128/4 148/2	
120/10 120/21	\$360,000 [1]	1975 [1] 3/11	149/3	9
121/16 125/3 125/5	46/18	1:00 [1] 14/1 1:27 [1] 4/2	35 million [1]	90 [1] 118/1
125/18 125/25	\$50 [1] 138/5		37/13	92127 [1] 2/17
126/2 127/1 127/14 129/22 133/12	\$500 [1] 138/5	2	3900 [1] 2/8	9:30 [1] 14/11
133/18 134/22	\$500,000 [3]	20 [14] 54/20	3:05 [1] 74/13	:
136/5 136/12	40/15 40/24 46/17	54/21 54/22 54/24	3:10 [1] 74/14	:SS [1] 157/2
136/19 137/4 137/8	\$6 [1] 55/9 \$6 million [1] 55/9	55/1 55/1 55/2 56/4	4	
138/22 139/24	\$6.3 [1] 55/14	56/9 56/10 56/14	40 [4] 54/21 54/25	<u>A</u>
140/18 140/24	\$6.3 million [1]	56/18 65/17 129/17	55/2 117/14	A's [1] 75/18
141/8 141/10	55/14	2011 [1] 23/1 2012 [8] 31/18	48 [1] 150/9	abide [3] 84/5
143/21 144/17	•	37/22 41/11 77/1	4:00 [3] 14/20	112/5 113/22 ability [7] 33/21
146/8 147/11		,==,-=	15/2 18/8	abinty [7] 33/41
	Pe	eggy Isom, CCR 541, RM	1R	(1) IN UNISON: - ability

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR (1) IN UNISON: - ability (702)671-4402 - CROERT48@GMAIL.COM Pursuant to NRS 239.053, illegal to copy without payment.

_	107/10 107/24	67/04	06/45 07/2 442/44	.1: 541 427/6
<u>A</u>	107/19 107/24	67/21	96/15 97/2 113/11	akin [1] 127/6
ability [6] 33/21	107/25 112/11 112/12 112/24	adjust [1] 103/5 administratively	126/5 129/5 139/10 146/5 147/20	al [1] 13/23 ALDRICH [51] 3/5
46/16 55/4 70/20	112/12 112/24	[2] 5/22 69/6	155/21 156/10	3/6 4/11 4/19 10/6
132/14 157/11	accountant [1]	admissibility [2]	against [4] 11/12	11/16 15/24 22/14
able [9] 21/20	40/17	82/9 124/20	11/14 11/17 105/18	30/1 31/7 32/7
36/20 65/12 67/16	accounting [11]	admissible [3]	agent [4] 75/24	38/13 46/17 48/25
84/2 84/22 95/19	40/16 79/20 79/20	23/16 69/16 82/7	76/21 90/24 112/2	53/15 57/18 58/1
121/16 133/3	94/17 105/23 106/1	admit [2] 112/19	agents [5] 31/15	67/9 68/1 70/22
about [87] 9/24	109/15 110/19	134/20	77/24 78/6 89/1	72/5 78/11 79/4
10/6 10/22 13/7	110/23 143/19	admitted [5] 69/14		79/5 85/21 86/21
17/21 18/1 21/11	144/11	69/22 80/11 91/18	aggressive [2]	90/1 95/25 97/3
24/19 24/24 26/7	accounts [6]	110/6	11/25 97/16	98/16 102/5 108/19
27/6 28/3 31/11	111/22 112/25	admittedly [2]	ago [9] 19/24	114/15 120/3
33/6 34/13 38/12	114/7 114/21 122/6	81/23 112/14	29/21 29/22 51/9	121/19 123/18
39/14 40/13 40/22	122/22	advance [4] 5/7	83/22 96/18 118/1	126/15 126/20
43/18 45/4 51/8	ACCURATE [1]	6/3 6/11 6/24	118/2 127/25	135/4 137/10
51/11 51/13 55/15	157/11	advanced [2] 6/8	agree [15] 11/22	138/15 139/25
59/14 63/2 64/8	achieved [2] 21/12		35/18 36/14 38/25	140/17 141/13
65/18 66/20 67/23 69/17 69/20 70/1	32/2	advantage [4]	39/3 39/7 49/23	142/4 145/21
73/13 74/13 77/22	across [1] 90/15	26/25 56/18 78/19	54/10 59/20 62/21	147/24 148/21
78/17 79/10 79/13	action [8] 26/20	97/18	64/11 65/22 70/22	150/19 151/6
83/6 83/7 84/8	26/21 36/24 51/14	adverse [1] 6/12	73/18 100/21	154/22
84/15 85/3 91/25	53/11 63/18 67/12	advise [1] 84/4	agreed [6] 37/11	Aldrich's [1]
92/1 92/7 93/17	95/13	advisor [2] 46/5	37/23 103/25 119/4	120/22
94/12 94/18 95/18	actions [3] 62/8	47/3	119/5 126/3	alerts [1] 95/17
97/10 98/12 99/21	62/9 78/16	advisors [19] 19/3	agreeing [1] 39/5	all [169]
102/17 104/19	acts [1] 53/10	31/13 32/9 32/9	agreement [65]	allegation [2]
108/7 108/11	actually [27] 9/5	36/8 46/10 46/19	19/2 19/7 19/15	106/13 109/23
110/19 110/21	13/17 16/12 17/13	47/9 47/12 49/5	19/20 20/14 22/2	allegations [13]
111/3 111/11 112/3	20/14 24/19 29/6	49/8 76/24 82/16	22/3 25/18 27/22	19/12 25/3 36/8
116/14 117/15	34/14 43/14 46/9	105/22 106/3	28/3 29/5 29/17	37/8 42/15 42/16
127/25 128/8 132/1	49/5 51/14 51/20	106/12 107/1 107/8	30/17 31/19 31/19	46/6 48/13 109/20
134/4 134/5 134/8	80/17 84/9 86/15	121/1	33/24 36/7 36/10	114/5 114/12
134/15 136/17	91/13 95/21 107/6 125/7 130/16	affect [1] 33/18 affecting [1] 77/3	37/1 37/7 37/10 37/18 37/22 38/2	122/17 122/18 allege [2] 130/19
136/18 136/24	132/14 139/7 145/4	affirmative [3]	38/5 38/9 39/7	148/12
137/6 137/7 137/11	146/22 155/8	42/8 42/13 104/25	39/20 39/24 40/7	alleged [4] 15/15
138/12 138/21	156/13	afforded [1]	41/7 41/20 42/17	21/10 25/21 69/9
139/10 139/23	add [8] 18/22	105/16	43/22 44/6 44/14	allegedly [2] 26/1
140/22 142/14	49/21 92/16 107/14	after [22] 6/10	44/19 45/8 45/17	131/21
146/10 146/11	135/1 138/11	7/21 10/24 16/9	47/2 48/11 48/13	alleging [1] 22/16
absolutely [11]	140/11 148/25	16/12 25/22 31/10	48/17 49/25 50/1	alleviating [1]
25/7 35/20 35/20	added [2] 47/21	31/18 32/5 32/10	50/8 50/13 50/25	33/7
36/15 40/4 92/10	137/17	35/23 45/13 46/14	51/1 52/8 52/20	allow [4] 20/9
94/18 111/19 117/5	addition [1] 98/12	57/23 63/15 71/10	52/22 53/6 53/21	22/20 80/5 95/4
122/10 142/6	additional [4]	103/24 106/15	54/4 54/6 68/6	allowed [2] 22/20
abuse [1] 52/2	26/15 60/18 72/20	111/11 120/22	130/16 130/18	80/14
accelerate [1]	105/25	150/20 155/18	132/3 132/6 134/6	allowing [1] 47/21
70/20 accept [3] 25/25	address [11] 4/18	afternoon [6] 4/6	142/17 143/23	allows [2] 37/6
31/9 84/3	79/6 79/14 80/2	4/7 4/10 4/12 14/15	150/25	84/18
access [5] 93/11	85/6 85/7 96/14	23/19	agreements [6]	almost [3] 47/19
100/1 137/18	104/6 130/12	again [26] 19/24	18/25 25/5 25/6	96/17 127/16
137/25 138/6	142/12 146/20	32/13 33/4 33/6	39/13 40/25 130/9	along [2] 53/6
accommodation	addressed [6]	67/8 70/9 72/16	ahead [4] 4/8	105/24
[1] 13/10	55/16 81/21 83/12	77/2 77/9 77/9	13/24 54/17 55/24	already [29] 5/19
according [1] 22/8	85/13 91/13 112/6	78/22 81/6 82/2	ahold [1] 84/24	9/10 11/13 16/1
account [8] 107/12	adequate [1]	84/1 90/4 90/12	air [1] 73/3	22/17 23/12 39/17

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR (2) ability... - already (702)671-4402 - CROERT48@GMAIL.COM Pursuant to NRS 239.053, illegal to copy without payment.

LAS VEGAS DEVELOPINE	INT TOND LLC			October 9, 2013
A	134/13 136/23	138/21 139/10	33/13 33/13 35/16	argue [1] 81/17
already [22]	answer [5] 43/15	139/11 140/9	36/5 36/5 36/12	argued [2] 15/25
40/5 42/25 49/13	43/24 46/1 58/14	142/25 142/25	36/18 36/24 37/8	29/21
50/14 61/21 68/1	92/3	145/2 148/4 148/24	39/25 40/2 40/2	argument [10]
	answered [1] 67/9	155/9 155/13	40/6 41/3 41/13	18/20 33/6 46/24
78/19 82/7 97/12	answers [1]	anyway [11] 16/6	43/18 45/2 45/3	49/11 55/14 81/13
105/24 106/3 108/6	116/13	16/7 24/23 48/2	45/10 46/22 47/9	82/2 83/12 86/8
110/6 112/6 112/20	ante [1] 102/13	50/15 82/9 87/21	48/21 50/11 50/17	93/18
113/19 119/22	anticipate [1] 72/4		52/1 54/12 54/12	arguments [2]
136/17 137/6	anticipated [2]	139/5 155/24	56/21 57/15 57/16	85/15 93/17
138/12 143/20	20/23 73/15	anywhere [3]	58/13 59/1 59/5	around [11] 6/5
153/13	any [80] 7/18	80/12 91/19 94/5	59/8 61/18 61/23	6/12 14/21 50/25
also [27] 4/15 5/2	11/17 12/8 12/13	apparently [1]	63/25 64/20 66/2	51/2 51/3 54/23
8/22 23/20 25/23	15/15 28/7 33/10	83/4	69/9 69/13 69/21	78/3 98/18 128/4
26/6 27/1 27/11	35/10 37/24 47/13	appear [3] 38/15	70/3 71/1 73/2 75/3	152/14
32/21 39/23 55/14	55/3 60/16 61/12	48/14 142/19	75/16 75/18 78/7	•
66/9 71/5 80/13				arrangement [1]
81/8 82/15 82/16	62/6 64/1 75/24	appearances [3]	78/7 78/23 78/25	19/16
82/17 83/4 85/11	76/20 76/20 77/12	1/25 2/21 4/9	80/15 80/16 84/10	articulated [1]
86/24 95/16 98/10	77/17 80/19 81/6	appears [3] 65/20	84/11 84/13 85/4	128/18
103/1 108/14	84/9 85/18 86/2	95/24 114/11	85/9 85/15 85/22	as [112] 8/9 11/12
111/21 113/10	86/6 86/6 86/11	appellate [1]	86/1 86/11 87/15	12/2 12/23 12/24
alternative [3]	86/14 87/10 87/12	57/21	87/19 89/21 90/23	13/22 13/22 19/8
4/22 20/13 133/18	89/15 89/19 89/20	application [4]	92/17 93/3 93/20	19/19 20/19 21/13
Although [2] 52/22	89/23 89/23 91/20	63/16 63/20 130/23	93/21 98/9 98/22	26/8 28/13 28/15
134/19	93/19 93/20 95/21	132/12	99/17 100/22	29/3 29/24 30/19
always [4] 34/11	96/1 98/8 100/6	applies [3] 36/4	101/10 102/9	34/5 35/2 36/11
63/4 125/10 155/11	103/24 107/22	44/6 50/21	105/17 105/19	36/23 38/23 38/23
am [6] 39/15 42/18	110/6 111/7 111/24	apply [8] 33/17	105/19 106/8	39/11 41/3 41/10
68/18 98/23 109/11	112/13 112/25	47/1 47/4 51/18	106/18 107/18	42/15 44/12 45/6
140/13	113/14 120/7 122/4	53/8 53/9 85/15	109/6 112/3 113/25	47/10 48/9 48/14
amend [1] 28/11	123/7 126/16	103/1	114/20 117/25	48/16 50/2 52/20
amended [2]	126/18 126/19	appoint [1] 9/3	118/4 122/16	52/21 52/24 53/19
28/10 28/16	129/3 129/5 129/10	appointing [1]	123/12 123/24	53/20 53/22 53/25
America [2]	130/25 131/16	116/4	124/13 125/9	57/1 58/21 60/14
137/21 151/18	132/2 132/4 132/7	appreciate [3]	126/18 128/2	60/17 61/18 61/18
American [6]	133/21 134/18	13/10 155/1 155/25	128/19 128/19	62/22 63/14 65/11
127/22 128/19	134/24 138/20	appreciates [1]	129/8 129/12	66/2 66/15 67/9
128/20 145/10	143/14 144/1	13/9	129/16 129/17	69/15 71/1 72/5
146/4 147/12	144/14 144/18	approach [1]	129/23 130/5	72/5 77/19 77/19
among [4] 17/21	146/10 146/12	124/22	130/11 130/13	78/22 79/3 80/12
25/17 143/5 145/9	146/12 147/21	appropriate [6]	131/21 132/17	80/13 81/1 84/14
amount [5] 24/15	148/22 153/18	29/4 29/9 98/4	132/19 133/2	86/9 87/17 90/20
65/3 66/3 82/3	155/8	107/3 127/10	139/16 141/19	93/1 95/12 96/11
91/21	anybody [4] 86/15	151/13	144/18 144/18	101/20 104/2
amounts [2] 20/22	89/11 89/20 112/18	approve [1]	145/13 145/21	104/19 105/14
	anymore [1] 23/17	137/23	145/22 145/23	105/15 106/22
46/22	anyone [2] 11/23	April [1] 66/6	145/24 146/9 146/9	106/25 107/7
analogous [1]	99/25	arbitration [6]	147/6 148/13	108/16 109/9 111/6
115/9	anything [36] 13/5		148/19 148/22	111/17 111/17
analysis [2] 48/22	42/20 44/13 45/16	51/6 51/10 51/12	149/11 149/16	111/18 112/7 113/4
114/22	49/20 62/17 68/18	are [153] 6/17	149/19 153/3	114/16 116/1 117/7
Angeles [1] 14/16	78/24 79/17 79/17	9/11 11/8 11/9	153/17 156/7	120/8 121/12 123/4
animal [3] 109/11	92/16 94/8 94/17	15/14 15/25 18/17	aren't [9] 25/4	123/12 123/12
114/11 114/20	106/2 106/E 100/7	19/8 19/24 20/2	36/9 36/25 68/24	123/23 123/24
another [14] 29/23	117/11 117/13	20/5 21/5 21/10	82/4 86/22 108/20	126/5 126/5 126/6
34/20 34/25 54/24	117/19 123/9 127/1	25/2 25/5 26/20	109/24 153/18	126/14 126/15
64/5 67/23 72/15	131/18 135/1	27/1 27/2 28/7	arguably [2] 75/13	
86/24 88/10 99/8	135/11 138/11	28/17 29/9 32/7	76/11	129/23 134/6
101/23 109/4			,	
	_	eggy Isom CCR 541 RM		(3) already - as
	D.	2001 100m (71) E/1 DM		())) () () () ()

(3) already... - as

LAS VEGAS DEVELOPINE	INT TOND LLC			OCIODEI 9, 2013
A	39/6 39/16 41/6	83/11 107/10	107/18 111/22	120/14 121/14
as [6] 143/22	42/6 42/24 43/4	authorizations [2]	base [1] 90/20	121/18 122/15
	43/6 43/19 43/21	115/7 115/7	based [11] 23/22	123/2 124/9 124/12
149/23 150/10	44/5 46/24 47/6	automatically [2]	28/18 42/25 45/6	135/4 135/14 139/8
150/10 156/7 156/7	48/1 48/8 49/13	129/1 136/1	56/24 92/7 115/5	149/10 150/2
aside [1] 55/23	51/6 52/6 53/25	availability [2]	117/2 138/1 146/9	150/11 151/1
ask [16] 15/19	55/12 57/16 59/3	71/16 102/18	148/7	152/18 154/16
24/1 29/17 75/20	62/14 63/3 63/12	available [2] 42/14		155/14
87/22 89/19 99/15	65/10 66/5 66/10	78/8	basically [1]	become [3] 63/8
102/17 103/9	66/12 66/13 67/15	AVENUE [1] 3/7	155/16	82/7 121/20
112/25 115/14	70/3 70/16 72/24	avoid [3] 47/16	basis [3] 33/10	becomes [1] 136/7
115/14 117/4	77/10 77/18 79/3	99/8 136/14	79/23 132/12	been [43] 5/2 5/3
122/25 132/15	80/19 81/14 82/11	Awada [1] 30/11	bat [1] 80/6	7/9 11/25 13/14
155/11	83/5 84/11 87/22	away [7] 20/25	battles [2] 64/25	22/16 24/24 25/16
asked [15] 24/16	88/22 88/24 89/11	27/16 39/25 64/22	64/25	29/10 29/12 34/8
24/21 28/20 109/1	89/20 93/4 93/25	87/12 94/15 94/16	be [186]	38/16 52/6 60/22
112/23 116/3	95/21 96/24 96/25	0//12 34/13 34/10	because [134]	68/6 70/10 71/21
117/16 117/19	99/14 99/25 100/3	В	4/25 5/24 6/17 7/4	72/9 72/11 75/9
121/23 131/2 132/1		back [31] 7/10	10/4 10/10 10/15	
132/11 134/22	100/8 100/18	10/1 11/23 21/1	11/18 12/7 13/2	79/16 81/13 85/13
138/22 139/1	101/15 102/1 102/3	23/1 30/10 35/3		105/18 105/24
asking [16] 5/13	102/13 102/20	47/8 54/23 55/1	13/14 14/25 15/10	106/3 113/3 113/5
15/16 24/24 25/2	105/22 106/3 111/7	55/4 55/14 56/10	15/13 16/15 19/6	119/16 125/20
40/14 65/3 80/17	118/7 118/8 118/16	56/15 57/6 74/13	21/10 25/4 25/16	127/2 127/12 130/3
106/9 112/10	118/17 119/8		27/13 27/14 28/9	131/7 131/11 132/8
113/21 118/13	119/17 121/22	83/22 85/10 86/19 91/23 100/12	28/21 29/10 29/12	133/3 133/5 138/20
131/10 134/18	122/21 123/17	100/12 101/14	29/18 29/21 31/8	148/22 150/19
138/7 141/6 142/25	124/20 126/9	106/18 122/7 140/3	31/8 31/18 32/14	155/4 155/8
asks [5] 76/17	128/12 128/21	149/21 151/5	32/23 33/12 34/8	before [28] 1/18
88/17 89/19 107/21	129/8 129/9 134/18		34/23 35/4 35/20	4/16 6/14 14/8
143/15	135/4 137/23	154/23 155/20	36/24 37/10 37/22	17/21 18/2 23/15
aspect [2] 12/4	137/25 139/20	156/10	38/4 38/13 39/4	29/9 29/16 29/16
39/4	140/7 141/4 142/18	bad [2] 129/14	40/14 40/24 41/2	30/19 35/15 39/12
aspects [2] 96/2	143/11 144/22	129/15	41/10 42/12 43/20	47/24 52/18 59/3
142/15	144/23 145/2	balances [1] 46/20	44/2 44/8 44/19	63/15 66/18 77/25
aspiring [1] 32/2	145/24 147/12	balls [1] 73/3	47/21 47/25 50/7	90/15 95/6 103/8
assert [1] 28/12	147/24 148/5	bank [38] 37/14	50/17 50/23 51/18	105/17 133/6
asserted [1] 28/15	148/23 149/23	40/14 40/22 105/4	51/22 55/2 57/22	136/24 142/14
assets [2] 114/5	149/23 150/11	105/5 105/5 105/5	58/9 59/12 59/23	143/1 157/6
114/6	150/12 150/13	105/21 105/23	63/25 64/7 66/22	BEFORE-ENTITLED
associated [2]	151/5 151/6 151/8	106/5 107/6 107/11	67/9 67/25 68/16	[1] 157/6
75/6 75/14	157/6 157/8	107/17 107/20	68/24 69/7 69/23	begging [1] 26/12
ASSOCIATES [1]	attached [2] 20/19	107/21 107/22	/0/14 /0/16 /1/18	begin [1] 60/13
2/13	118/14	108/12 108/22	74/7 76/16 77/18	beginning [2]
association [1]	attachments [2]	111/3 111/18 112/9	78/10 78/12 78/14	93/25 108/1
88/13	118/13 118/21	112/11 112/22	78/25 79/19 81/15	behalf [5] 4/11
assume [1] 92/8	attempt [1] 133/18	121/0 122/6 122/21	81/24 83/1 84/12	4/13 4/14 67/16
assumed [1] 25/19	attempting [2]	121/8 122/6 122/21	84/23 85/22 85/25	71/2
assuming [3] 65/4	95/25 9//13	123/2 123/15	87/12 93/17 93/20	behold [1] 56/1
72/24 84/11	attended [1] 96/11		93/21 95/1 97/25	being [18] 19/3
at [132] 8/3 8/4	attorney [3] 77/4	131/15 137/20	98/13 99/6 101/10	26/8 33/1 34/2
14/2 14/11 15/1	87/17 89/16	137/23 142/20	102/9 102/15 104/8	
15/2 17/6 18/8	Attorney's [1]	151/18	107/10 110/6	105/12 107/4 107/4
20/13 20/16 20/21	100/4	banked [1] 105/22	112/15 112/20	107/5 107/19
21/7 21/14 21/24	attorney-client [3]	banking [7] 107/5	114/12 114/14	117/18 121/20
22/19 24/16 25/24	77/4 87/17 89/16	121/11 121/17	114/20 114/23	124/14 124/16
28/21 30/6 31/19	audible [1] 135/13	121/17 123/12	115/24 116/24	126/19 128/19
31/24 32/5 32/22	August [1] 24/22	143/18 144/10	117/20 118/13	belabor [2] 26/17
35/7 35/15 37/25	authority [2]	banks [6] 105/8	119/2 119/24	98/1
		105/8 105/9 105/11		
	P	eggy Isom, CCR 541, RM	B	(4) as belabo

LAS VEGAS DEVELOPINE	INT TOND LLC	T	T	October 9, 201:
В	149/10 151/2	broad [8] 75/17	134/13 139/25	28/14 35/1 35/6
believe [11] 5/4	blanche [1] 98/22	76/14 76/16 77/5	came [10] 26/11	35/10 36/12 36/17
15/17 33/22 37/20	blank [1] 98/24	88/20 119/10 123/1	30/2 55/21 59/3	37/19 52/7 55/20
49/6 49/8 67/2	block [1] 66/5	129/19	74/7 90/15 106/18	56/2 57/6 57/7 66/6
70/10 96/11 121/14	blush [1] 43/6	broader [3] 60/13	111/13 113/13	79/25 84/18 86/6
128/25	board [1] 15/22 bogged [1] 125/2	81/23 82/8 broken [1] 74/24	116/3 CAMPO [1] 2/15	88/3 94/4 113/18 114/17 115/10
bench [3] 34/7	bona [1] 130/17	broker [6] 92/20	can [125] 5/22 6/4	115/13 122/5
42/22 144/13	bonuses [2] 46/15	92/23 94/23 94/24	6/5 11/22 12/20	123/20
benefit [2] 47/21	121/5	94/25 95/8	13/1 13/25 14/2	candid [1] 154/3
56/16	books [5] 122/9	broker's [1] 95/11	14/2 17/24 20/5	cannot [3] 11/11
best [13] 6/23	132/4 144/15	brokers [23] 31/15	22/24 23/5 24/2	83/20 120/13
102/4 128/11 134/2	144/21 144/23	77/24 78/2 78/4	28/3 35/13 36/10	capable [1] 132/19
135/16 135/19	borrow [1] 54/19	78/20 86/10 86/11	36/14 38/25 39/13	capital [30] 19/3
136/1 136/3 136/5	borrower [2]	86/16 87/8 88/15	39/15 40/18 47/3	25/11 31/13 32/9
136/9 136/14	19/16 21/16	90/7 90/8 90/9	48/5 49/1 50/19	32/19 32/24 33/14
136/15 157/11	both [9] 17/8 18/9	90/19 92/14 92/18	52/23 53/3 54/21	45/20 46/5 46/10
better [4] 14/17	19/8 22/1 35/21	92/19 93/3 93/19	54/21 55/22 55/23	47/3 47/9 47/12
67/7 119/9 124/21	35/25 119/24 131/7	95/10 97/24 98/8	55/25 56/4 56/9	49/5 75/8 76/1
between [27]	148/19	126/16	56/16 57/23 60/12	76/23 76/23 76/24
20/15 21/9 48/12 75/24 76/20 77/8	bothers [1] 94/12	brought [4] 6/8	60/14 62/21 64/15	77/16 80/25 81/2
80/19 82/11 82/12	bottom [1] 30/10	22/15 43/17 134/12	64/23 65/18 66/8	81/4 82/13 82/14
88/25 89/11 90/23	Box [1] 124/10	bucks [1] 54/20	66/14 67/4 70/25	82/17 82/24 93/10
92/17 92/18 116/9	brainer [1] 94/19	builder [1] 23/5	71/10 73/2 73/13	93/10 111/13
120/1 122/9 131/4	breach [16] 26/23	Builders [6] 135/6	74/7 74/11 79/24	cards [3] 23/12
143/5 145/9 145/16	26/23 27/21 28/4	145/9 145/17 146/3	80/5 84/3 84/16	67/15 88/18
146/3 146/16	35/14 41/7 42/7	147/15 150/24	87/5 90/22 93/15	care [3] 70/6 78/16
146/25 147/14	42/16 43/21 47/13	bunch [3] 113/17	95/3 95/10 96/23	78/17
147/21 150/24	52/8 114/12 122/18	116/13 116/18	97/5 97/6 98/3 98/3	careful [1] 132/22
beyond [1] 26/16	122/19 130/8	burden [5] 76/6	98/18 98/21 99/3	carefully [1]
bifurcate [25]	130/21	89/21 114/15	99/15 99/22 99/25	132/23
17/8 17/25 18/12	breached [2] 19/18 148/12	114/18 117/23 burdensome [3]	100/3 102/1 102/3 102/8 102/12	carrying [1] 132/19
20/16 25/1 27/10	breaches [1] 19/20		102/8 102/12	carte [1] 98/22
30/11 30/16 30/22	breadth [2] 102/9	business [17] 8/1	102/12 102/14	Carter [9] 75/2
32/14 35/23 40/8	127/25	20/8 62/2 62/6 62/6	102/15 102/10	75/19 80/7 82/11
40/20 41/17 43/20	break [4] 74/9	63/5 63/11 86/15	102/10 102/20	85/3 96/10 103/2
44/2 44/3 44/16	74/11 74/12 74/15	88/11 90/9 90/9	105/8 105/9 108/21	103/3 104/2
47/17 48/1 49/15	bridge [4] 23/2	106/22 114/2 114/7	112/6 113/4 115/18	case [92] 1/1 2/3
51/24 52/16 52/25	23/3 23/6 23/7	114/9 122/12 146/2	117/4 120/16	9/23 10/20 11/18
53/3	brief [9] 18/16	but [218]	121/22 122/25	11/20 12/8 12/16
bifurcated [6] 30/16 37/17 38/1	23/23 27/5 30/15		123/15 123/25	15/22 17/4 18/23
47/18 49/15 52/7	83/12 99/19 125/17	<u>C</u>	124/5 131/19 133/1	19/4 20/3 20/10
bifurcates [1]	125/24 148/1	CA [1] 2/17	134/19 137/10	20/15 22/14 23/9
46/23	briefed [3] 34/2	calculation [2]	137/24 138/6 138/8	27/7 27/17 30/11
bifurcating [4]	34/9 38/16	24/17 24/21	139/3 141/21	30/14 30/15 34/6
20/9 27/6 27/7	briefing [8] 29/18	calendar [6] 6/12	141/21 141/22	35/10 35/21 37/3
44/22	38/17 42/24 43/15	8/1 15/3 15/19 64/5	142/12 147/24	38/1 38/9 38/11
bifurcation [3]	50/6 52/23 53/19	71/25	149/13 151/8	38/21 39/7 41/4
28/1 37/3 52/3	53/23	calendaring [1]	151/21 152/1	41/17 43/5 43/10
big [5] 45/13 45/20	bring [12] 6/25	17/18 California [2]	152/14 152/20	44/3 46/24 47/3
46/7 119/2 127/24	37/12 37/12 37/13		152/21 153/8	47/8 51/4 51/7
biggest [1] 68/24	43/4 87/16 93/25	51/19 51/21 call [10] 9/20	153/13 153/16	51/14 51/19 51/21
birthday [1] 88/18	99/24 102/12 118/25 126/4	14/23 16/5 24/19	153/20 153/21 155/11	51/25 56/25 57/16
bit [12] 32/6 63/13	145/22	56/12 72/7 97/10	can't [31] 5/6	59/2 59/15 59/19 60/10 61/4 61/13
64/23 65/1 66/9	bringing [1] 4/24	102/17 136/23	11/16 11/23 12/3	61/21 62/2 62/6
81/23 107/18 128/4	brings [1] 22/14	139/25	12/8 12/13 27/21	62/7 62/16 67/6
142/12 143/13		called [3] 24/19	12,012,132//21	32,7 32,10 37,10
		nggy Igom, CCD E41, DM	ID.	(5) believe - case
	Pe	eggy Isom, CCR 541, RM	IK	(5) pelleve - case

LAS VEGAS DEVELOPME	NT FUND LLC			October 9, 2019
С	157/4	clause [6] 50/20	commencement	comply [2] 33/11
case [33] 67/25	CERTIFY [1] 157/5	50/21 50/24 50/25	[1] 63/15	126/7
71/3 72/9 79/16	cetera [2] 19/14	51/2 51/3	comment [2]	component [1]
92/7 92/16 93/13	78/8	clauses [2] 51/6	29/16 120/23	39/9
96/2 97/5 97/6 97/9	chair [1] 96/16	51/10	comments [3]	compromise [1]
	challenge [1] 8/19	clean [6] 151/22	23/22 123/7 148/8	126/3
112/13 113/7 114/1 114/2 114/21	chance [3] 98/17	153/18 153/24	common [4] 28/18	computer [1]
114/25 115/2 115/3	151/8 154/23	153/25 153/25	50/11 50/17 122/8	120/5
115/4 116/22	change [6] 55/21	156/14	communicating [1]	computer-like [1]
120/24 121/13	61/12 65/1 103/4	cleaned [1] 154/17	134/7	120/5
121/21 122/17	111/13 111/23	clear [10] 28/6	communication [3]	Concepcion [1]
125/1 129/10	changed [2] 7/7	30/13 43/17 44/20	89/15 89/19 92/20	51/7
130/13 130/19	31/18	45/16 78/15 107/13	communications	concern [13]
132/25 142/16	charge [1] 110/17	107/14 123/19	[26] 75/23 76/18	10/19 17/21 64/19
143/25 154/19	chart [1] 98/23	149/6	76/19 77/8 80/18	65/8 68/21 68/24
cases [14] 12/10	check [8] 13/25	clearly [8] 56/12	82/10 88/25 89/10	70/2 77/19 99/20
12/12 12/13 20/9	14/13 17/14 60/1	105/19 106/23	89/17 89/18 90/14	113/7 122/5 142/7
21/9 21/25 28/5	64/6 72/20 73/21	114/14 131/2	90/25 91/4 92/17	142/11
35/25 36/5 51/24	102/12	131/11 131/20	126/18 129/3 131/4	
52/11 58/13 71/3	checked [1] 13/17	151/13	143/5 145/8 145/14	
114/24	checks [2] 31/20	clerk [3] 102/17	146/6 146/13	156/7
cash [1] 145/1	32/8	125/21 152/23	146/16 146/25	concerns [1] 112/3
categories [1]	child [1] 63/5	client [18] 13/9	147/1 148/3	concessions [1]
74/25	chooses [1] 27/10	24/1 40/14 40/24	companies [4]	15/15
category [1] 77/18	chose [1] 22/25	77/4 84/2 84/4	131/5 131/21	concise [1] 18/21
causation [1] 70/7	circumstances [2]	87/17 89/16 97/6	132/16 133/2	concluded [1]
causation-type [1]	84/19 137/16	108/11 111/23	company [14]	156/20
70/7	circumvent [1]	117/1 124/15	75/6 76/1 81/1 81/5	
cause [3] 27/7	12/3	135/19 136/25	82/14 82/15 88/6	35/11
87/5 119/11	citation [2] 83/11	140/14 142/15	88/14 89/20 89/22	Concrete [1]
caused [3] 93/5	116/21	client's [2] 53/21	90/23 93/6 126/11	145/11
137/5 148/11	cite [1] 107/9	80/24	133/2	concurrently [1]
causes [4] 26/20	cited [3] 30/11	clients [2] 113/14	company's [1]	67/5
26/21 36/24 67/12	30/14 114/24	137/10	88/10	conditions [3]
CCR [2] 1/24	civil [2] 26/22 27/3	close [2] 65/5	compel [10] 9/14	48/16 52/3 52/21
157/17	CLA [1] 40/7	88/16	70/16 107/3 109/2	conduct [2] 11/25
center [12] 21/2	claim [9] 27/6	combining [1]	115/20 119/13	34/14
25/11 31/15 49/6	28/24 35/12 35/25	65/21	119/17 138/25	conducting [1]
76/5 76/25 82/17	38/23 41/19 52/21 67/12 122/24	come [27] 14/22	139/16 139/21	122/4
82/25 93/11 106/11	claims [34] 27/12	16/6 16/7 20/24 20/24 34/13 56/12	compelling [1] 22/1	confer [1] 98/18 conference [12]
110/15 126/10	27/15 28/7 28/12		complain [2] 25/14	
cents [1] 66/8	28/17 29/9 30/16	56/13 72/11 72/14 74/13 79/18 86/18	108/4	59/2 59/11 59/13
CEO [2] 25/9	30/22 35/16 36/5	88/16 91/23 95/6	complaint [6]	59/19 60/11 61/4
110/14	36/12 36/18 36/22	98/19 99/10 100/12	28/10 28/16 36/6	61/13 61/21 71/3
certain [10] 57/15	36/22 36/25 37/4	102/1 102/21	36/18 117/12	conferred [1]
62/19 84/19 96/1	37/24 41/15 43/18	102/1 102/21	120/20	78/11
109/19 114/15	50/10 50/11 50/17	124/1 134/20	complete [1] 22/7	confident [1]
114/17 123/20	53/4 53/7 53/19	155/20	completely [2]	47/18
138/4 142/15	52/22 57/1 57/15	comes [11] 12/7	107/1 141/20	confidential [1]
certainly [14] 7/16	60/18 62/19 80/15	30/13 37/7 52/11	completion [2]	92/25
28/11 28/17 55/13	108/14 116/25	52/21 56/1 64/19	22/5 106/16	confirm [1] 88/8
72/15 80/11 82/4	123/25	65/8 96/1 101/13	complex [5] 12/9	confirming [2]
82/5 83/25 100/7	clarify [1] 49/4	114/17	52/12 54/13 62/7	19/24 75/14
113/11 113/20	CLARK [3] 1/7	coming [8] 31/12	153/3	conflict [1] 8/17
120/15 121/11	157/3 157/14	32/24 33/6 72/13	compliance [2]	confusing [2]
CERTIFICATE [1]	class [2] 51/14	118/23 130/5	68/7 70/7	118/14 128/4
157/1	95/13	148/14 150/5	complied [1] 79/15	
CERTIFIED [1]				_ <u></u>
	<u> </u>	l	<u> </u>	1

6	70/7	114/5	court [13E] 1/6	104/4 1EE/22
<u>C</u>	78/7 contained [4] 45/7	114/5 corporation [2]	court [125] 1/6 1/19 5/9 6/5 6/11	104/4 155/22 covered [1] 88/18
confusion [3]	48/10 53/20 69/24	114/7 122/10	6/13 8/5 8/7 8/12	covering [1] 77/2
49/10 103/24	contemplate [1]	correct [23] 18/12	8/24 9/20 9/20	covers [1] 49/14
147/13	34/11	24/14 27/23 28/23	10/19 13/4 13/6	cram [1] 151/7
consent [1] 135/23	contention [3]	30/8 57/11 58/2	14/18 15/11 15/11	crawling [1] 88/10
consider [2] 20/19	23/17 46/7 120/19	60/3 61/6 61/9	15/13 15/21 16/23	create [1] 23/3
87/20	context [1] 86/4	61/10 65/15 71/19	17/24 20/18 23/16	created [2] 22/17
consistency [1]	continue [4] 17/5	72/2 74/20 90/1	23/21 25/2 27/9	22/24
consistent [2]	25/14 83/10 84/8	90/3 104/8 104/10	27/16 28/2 28/25	creative [1] 97/16
30/6 39/21	continued [8] 3/1	109/17 109/22	29/1 29/22 29/23	credit [33] 22/24
consolidated [1]	17/14 25/20 25/25	140/25 156/11	29/24 30/12 30/15	23/6 128/17 128/24
63/19	31/9 71/5 83/6 94/9	corrected [2] 24/9	30/21 30/24 33/16	129/4 129/24 130/2
consolidating [1]	continues [1]	24/10	34/23 40/8 40/11	130/15 130/17
64/3	84/21	correspondence	40/15 41/11 41/16	131/6 131/9 132/12
conspiracy [2]	continuing [2]	[4] 78/19 85/23	43/19 44/2 44/9	132/15 132/17
26/23 27/4	26/3 26/19	86/2 99/1	47/24 49/15 51/21	135/10 135/20
CONSTITUTES [1]	continuous [2] 30/20 31/8	could [20] 11/2 23/11 26/4 26/17	52/2 59/13 59/15	137/1 137/17 137/22 137/24
157/10	30/20 31/8 contract [19]	28/11 44/20 87/4	61/24 62/2 62/6 62/6 63/4 63/5	138/1 138/3 142/23
construction [82]	26/23 27/13 33/5	88/11 93/7 98/15	63/12 63/17 64/24	143/2 143/7 143/10
18/25 19/7 19/15	33/25 36/17 36/21	99/1 99/13 99/14	65/2 65/16 66/10	145/18 147/17
19/19 20/3 20/5	41/15 42/7 43/8	100/13 100/15	66/11 66/18 67/16	147/22 148/18
20/10 22/2 22/3	44/10 51/13 62/18	102/22 117/10	67/20 67/22 71/16	148/18 151/16
22/12 23/4 25/18	68/5 84/18 114/12	129/6 144/5 153/7	77/24 78/16 79/11	155/16
27/21 29/4 33/12	122/18 130/8	couldn't [3] 8/16	79/16 79/19 79/24	credits [1] 146/19
33/24 35/14 36/7	130/21 148/12	56/12 56/17	80/4 80/8 82/6	current [6] 41/12
36/9 37/1 37/10 37/18 37/21 38/2	contracts [6]	counsel [9] 6/12	83/20 84/1 84/23	56/24 59/2 59/20
38/4 39/6 40/7 41/7	18/23 19/5 128/10	17/21 58/15 69/14	85/18 87/20 95/6	65/9 71/3
41/20 42/16 43/22	145/16 147/14	87/23 104/3 117/23	95/13 95/16 97/3	cursory [1] 144/12
44/6 44/14 44/19	150/23	139/13 151/11	98/2 98/19 98/21	cut [2] 31/21 45/12
45/7 47/1 47/22	contractual [3]	count [2] 11/12	99/25 103/13	D
48/11 48/13 48/16	19/6 27/3 43/8	11/17	104/14 105/22	-
49/25 50/1 50/13	control [9] 32/15	counter [4] 17/12	111/9 112/6 113/23	damage [1] 93/4
52/8 53/6 53/20	46/12 46/15 47/11	60/19 60/20 71/2	114/2 115/1 115/8	damages [3] 52/1 55/15 69/9
54/3 54/6 68/6	69/9 75/23 77/13	counter-defendant		damaging [2]
127/15 127/22	80/18 82/21 controlled [1]	s [4] 17/12 60/19 60/20 71/2	117/21 122/12 126/22 129/7 129/8	78/19 93/13
128/8 128/16	95/19	counterclaims [3]	138/24 139/12	dangerous [1]
128/24 129/4	controlling [1]	27/2 41/15 59/12	141/22 141/23	69/19
129/23 130/8	76/19	counterdefendants		date [12] 5/13
130/15 130/17	convenient [1]	[1] 58/21	152/14 152/23	6/21 9/23 13/15
131/6 131/8 131/12	73/1	countries [2] 87/2	153/6 153/8 153/11	
132/1 132/2 132/3	Conversely [2]	87/4	153/24 154/18	71/5 71/15 108/2
132/6 135/9 142/17	19/10 47/4	country [1] 87/1	154/19	127/3 155/7
142/22 142/23	conversion [2]	COUNTY [5] 1/7	Court's [6] 65/19	DATED [1] 1/21
143/2 143/7 143/10	26/22 27/3	146/6 146/13 157/3	71/16 84/5 141/24	dates [13] 59/20
143/14 143/23 145/10 145/18	conviction [1]	157/14	148/7 148/8	60/14 61/12 61/18
145/20 146/14	59/17	couple [11] 23/22	CourtCall [4]	61/19 61/20 65/9
147/16 150/25	coordinate [1]	64/20 65/1 72/10	14/23 15/4 15/6	66/2 71/1 73/21
151/15	102/15	80/9 83/8 102/16	18/9	141/8 141/10
consumer [2]	copies [3] 15/7	133/24 145/7	courtroom [2]	143/12
51/13 52/22	144/21 144/24	149/16 153/23	9/22 95/18	Dave [3] 80/7
contact [4] 77/23	copy [5] 7/11	course [11] 39/3	Courts [2] 51/8	82/11 85/3
78/21 90/19 97/19	153/25 153/25	40/24 42/2 42/3	51/17 covenant [2] 26/24	David [1] 75/2
contacting [1]	156/14 156/14 corner [1] 54/23	42/4 64/7 70/4 70/20 121/25 155/3	122/19	14/11 14/18 14/25
97/20	corner [1] 54/23 corporate [1]	155/7	cover [3] 104/3	16/17 52/7 54/13
contacts [2] 78/6	corporate [1]	133//	COAC! [2] 104/2	70/16 72/16 82/1
				, 3, 10 , 2, 10 02, 1
	_		AD.	(7)
	Po	eggy Isom, CCR 541, RM	ΊK	(7) confusion day

LAS VEGAS DEVELOPME	INT FUND LLC	r	Γ	October 9, 2019
D	19/22 19/25 24/7	designed [2]	81/10 81/24 83/4	66/21 70/18 72/7
day [8] 84/15	24/14 24/17 24/21	130/12 146/11	89/4 91/14 93/23	80/5 85/17 86/5
94/1 116/5 120/15	97/15 134/14	desire [2] 10/20	96/3	120/11 120/12
140/8 142/10	defendant [7] 1/13		difference [1] 36/2	
149/22 156/4	2/2 109/3 114/21	destroyed [2]	different [30] 19/1	
days [20] 7/21	120/8 121/12	110/18 110/22	19/5 19/5 21/25	31/22 52/2 65/19
7/22 7/23 7/25 8/1	125/16	determination [10]		66/10 87/20 137/25
19/23 25/16 26/10	defendant's [4]	47/23 48/7 48/12	46/9 46/21 46/22	discuss [2] 71/13
41/25 71/21 71/22	17/7 88/23 123/13	48/17 53/18 54/2	46/22 56/3 56/8	90/7
71/23 72/5 72/20	144/2	70/17 70/21 136/22	59/16 71/10 75/21	discussed [2]
73/8 117/21 117/25	defendants [24]	140/14	79/22 91/24 94/2	78/11 87/4
118/1 118/2 139/9	4/13 4/15 17/12	determine [1] 44/5 determined [1]		discussing [2]
deadline [1] 116/6	19/4 25/2 26/8 29/6		114/11 114/14	105/15 126/19
deadlines [1] 59/1	29/12 30/14 39/17 59/11 60/19 60/20	53/9 determines [1]	114/20 114/22 115/3 122/15	discussion [13] 8/10 9/18 16/20
deal [8] 5/22 47/3				
69/11 78/4 81/18	65/10 69/8 71/2 79/18 91/5 93/13	46/25 detrimental [1]	122/16 122/20 149/10	17/10 17/20 17/25 43/11 56/24 58/22
105/13 124/1	107/7 109/6 110/13	78/9	differs [1] 138/2	66/1 127/25 128/8
156/15	114/25 127/20	developing [2]	difficult [2] 40/3	138/21
dealing [8] 18/11	defense [2] 51/20		112/15	discussions [3]
26/24 43/5 43/7	67/17	75/11 90/20 DEVELOPMENT	dig [2] 54/1 141/16	
105/4 122/19	defenses [4] 42/8	[20] 1/12 19/2	dilatory [1] 11/24	disingenuous [2]
133/16 151/21	42/13 51/17 114/17	19/17 19/23 25/11	dire [1] 34/15	31/11 32/21
dealt [7] 38/8 51/9	defer [1] 16/8	25/19 31/9 31/21	directed [1] 87/23	disparaging [1]
92/14 92/15 95/14	deficient [1]	32/16 32/18 39/19	DIRECTION [1]	139/4
115/4 142/8	109/16	76/2 76/25 81/8	157/9	disparate [1]
debt [8] 4/22	definitely [1]	82/18 93/9 106/14	directly [13] 42/14	
128/9 128/10	73/14	107/24 110/14	75/11 78/2 78/3	dispute [4] 24/13
128/11 132/20	defrauded [1] 50/7		78/20 105/20 131/6	
134/1 134/1 134/3	degree [1] 50/16	dialogue [1] 49/1	131/9 131/11	distinct [5] 21/25
decide [8] 4/18 34/2 34/9 35/14	DEL [1] 2/15	dictate [1] 50/1	131/25 132/11	25/5 33/4 33/5
37/14 70/14 72/17	Delaware [1] 63/8	did [43] 7/4 13/8	138/18 139/5	144/18
98/7	delay [2] 16/8	24/1 29/7 29/7	disadvantage [1]	distinction [1]
decided [7] 21/7	124/24	30/16 33/20 47/11	151/6	122/8
35/17 39/24 48/15	deliberate [1] 35/9		disagree [8] 34/23	
51/7 139/6 144/22	deliver [1] 156/13	79/10 83/21 85/8	39/8 39/17 49/23	114/1
decides [5] 28/21	demand [8] 29/7	86/2 92/12 92/13	50/16 98/20 117/11	distract [1] 20/7
28/25 40/8 44/9	29/12 33/20 36/4	95/9 96/5 109/9	117/13	distractions [1]
45/18	36/10 36/19 36/20	111/17 115/18	disagreeing [1]	119/11
decision [18]	36/23	116/23 117/5 118/3	43/18	DISTRICT [3] 1/6
20/25 29/17 35/7	demands [1] 120/12	121/9 130/23	disagrees [1] 48/5	
40/12 42/24 42/25	denied [4] 53/17	130/23 130/25	disclose [1] 90/10 disclosed [2]	dividing [1] 21/8 do [180]
44/11 44/12 45/3	104/7 104/18 154/9	131/21 132/24	86/11 95/6	DOCKET [1] 1/2
47/5 47/7 47/7	deny [4] 52/16	133/11 133/18	disclosure [1]	doctrine [1] 33/17
52/19 64/1 66/13	80/5 88/9 141/3	136/2 136/13	64/21	document [3]
66/19 67/22 155/19	department [2]	136/25 137/4 139/5	disclosures [3]	116/18 149/22
decisions [3]	52/13 146/7	139/12 155/15	72/12 118/10	153/7
44/17 47/16 49/2	depending [2]	didn't [17] 24/6	118/19	documentation [3]
declaration [2]	107/19 138/5	51/18 55/13 67/24	discover [1] 82/6	86/12 105/25
20/20 68/11	deposition [7]	79/20 85/7 91/18	discoverability [1]	132/18
declarations [2]	62/24 85/12 88/23	110/6 117/19	82/8	documentations
69/13 75/10 deed [2] 4/21	100/23 100/25	119/21 124/15	discoverable [5]	[1] 131/18
13/23	101/7 123/14	126/24 131/18	86/3 92/2 94/21	documents [74]
deemed [1] 27/13	depositions [2]	136/20 139/9	112/8 113/22	40/16 40/18 70/19
deeper [2] 54/1	69/23 100/22	139/15 140/3	discovery [16]	75/23 76/18 77/7
141/16	DEPT [1] 1/3	DIEGO [11] 2/17	11/9 59/12 60/13	77/12 77/17 81/14
default [9] 19/21	derivative [1] 62/8	75/8 76/2 80/10	64/24 64/25 65/12	82/3 82/4 82/21
	P	eggy Isom, CCR 541, RM	IR	(8) day document

D	11/16 13/5 14/3	152/20 153/25	105/15 120/1 128/5	136/9 136/14
	14/16 14/22 15/10	double [1] 13/17	129/7 129/23	136/15
documents [62]	16/17 22/17 22/20	double-checked	129/24 130/11	eight [2] 51/8 74/3
87/10 87/10 88/5	24/20 24/22 25/14	[1] 13/17	131/5 132/15	Eighth [1] 114/25
88/6 88/13 88/24	28/9 28/16 33/9	doubt [1] 50/22	141/10 146/22	either [7] 20/16
89/10 91/24 94/15	34/5 34/8 34/24	down [16] 5/12	150/16 151/5 151/9	28/17 36/17 42/23
94/16 98/7 99/22 100/15 101/2 101/5	39/3 39/7 40/21	7/8 12/7 14/22 28/4	earlier [2] 56/13	91/21 102/21 120/2
107/18 107/23	42/9 45/12 46/1	49/12 69/2 73/2	135/15	element [1] 20/18
112/7 112/21	46/19 46/20 48/19	74/24 93/16 111/22	early [3] 66/6	else [13] 49/20
113/16 114/8	49/6 49/20 51/24	125/2 145/6 151/7	80/12 96/11	62/17 94/15 106/25
115/14 116/6	53/3 53/9 54/13	152/1 157/5	easier [3] 79/3	123/9 135/1 136/22
117/11 117/12	54/14 55/7 55/7	Dr. [10] 26/6 26/9	117/22 153/1	140/9 140/17
118/5 119/15	55/8 56/16 57/24	79/13 79/15 108/16	easy [7] 26/4	141/21 142/25
119/19 119/21	58/9 58/14 59/4	108/16 111/10	69/11 94/19 97/2	148/24 155/13
119/25 120/7	61/17 61/18 62/5	134/4 136/16 137/6	97/3 97/8 152/13	elsewhere [1]
123/15 123/23	62/12 64/2 64/9	Dr. Piazza [10]	EB5 [63] 19/3 20/2	
124/9 125/1 126/8	64/12 64/15 66/20	26/6 26/9 79/13	22/4 22/12 22/17	email [7] 20/20
126/10 126/15	66/24 68/17 69/17 69/20 69/21 69/22	79/15 108/16	23/4 23/10 23/17	26/7 26/16 37/11
128/23 130/14		108/16 111/10	25/10 25/10 25/21	108/15 111/12
131/7 131/10	70/11 72/7 81/16 83/22 83/23 86/18	134/4 136/16 137/6 draft [1] 87/24	31/13 31/16 32/24 33/12 39/19 40/16	119/3 emails [5] 24/18
131/12 133/14	86/21 90/13 90/18	dragged [1] 20/6	46/18 47/22 49/5	118/13 118/21
134/10 134/17	90/18 91/17 91/19	dragged [1] 20/6 dropped [1] 116/9	49/8 68/12 75/8	119/20 119/25
135/8 137/2 137/22	92/7 92/14 93/18	duces [1] 135/5	75/11 75/15 76/3	employee [5]
142/21 143/8	93/20 94/8 94/8	due [11] 7/21 8/2	76/24 76/24 77/14	75/24 76/20 80/19
143/16 144/7	95/22 96/18 97/18	8/6 8/15 12/3 49/7	77/15 80/14 82/16	89/1 90/24
144/14 144/18	97/18 99/13 99/21	59/8 68/24 70/11	82/16 82/22 82/24	Empyrean [20]
145/8 145/16 146/2	101/4 107/13 110/1	134/11 148/14	84/13 86/15 86/17	75/2 75/5 75/20
147/14 150/23	110/4 111/16	duplicates [1]	86/20 86/22 89/5	75/25 76/3 76/7
151/14 155/22	111/24 115/17	129/16	89/13 90/2 90/15	76/21 80/7 80/20
does [23] 13/6	116/9 120/4 120/10	duplicative [4]	90/20 91/14 92/13	82/12 85/3 88/24
18/4 29/1 30/24	120/14 122/20	27/8 47/7 47/16	93/10 93/10 93/22	89/2 89/5 89/11
33/17 38/15 39/25	122/22 123/3 123/3	129/17	94/15 96/3 105/22	89/13 91/22 92/18
47/1 47/4 51/2 54/3 56/6 67/22 83/16	124/1 124/23	during [3] 39/14	106/3 106/12	102/25 104/2
85/18 88/24 93/20	128/17 128/18	70/4 89/13	110/15 110/16	encourage [1]
95/15 103/13 104/5	128/25 129/10	duty [1] 47/13	112/12 121/1 126/9	67/18
119/16 121/3 121/4	134/12 134/25	Dziubla [41] 4/15	130/5 131/13	end [15] 25/24
doesn't [27] 7/5	136/9 137/16 138/2	20/21 23/13 25/9	131/18	34/6 35/7 37/25
7/6 22/23 23/17	138/11 138/14	25/17 25/23 26/11	EB5 IA [5] 25/10	52/7 55/12 65/5
27/16 29/20 36/19	139/3 139/7 139/8	39/14 75/6 75/9	25/21 39/19 40/16	66/5 66/11 70/16
44/16 47/7 54/10	140/8 141/23 142/1	75/25 76/22 80/8	112/12	78/2 96/17 132/13
78/14 78/16 81/24		80/11 80/20 82/12	EB5 IC [1] 110/15	
86/1 89/18 92/16	148/4 148/24	87/13 90/14 90/17	economic [3]	ended [3] 21/13
92/16 92/20 98/14	150/13 150/20	91/18 92/18 92/19	26/25 126/9 126/12	
99/18 107/10	151/6 151/21	93/9 94/6 94/11	economist [2]	enforceability [2]
110/24 112/18	152/19 153/11 153/22 155/8 156/9	95/9 96/15 106/10	22/22 23/8	51/5 51/10
120/2 125/10	done [33] 8/20	108/10 108/15 110/6 110/14	economy [1] 23/8 effect [1] 65/6	engagement [8] 18/24 19/4 19/11
135/25 154/16	22/6 22/7 22/7	110/0 110/14	efficiency [4] 12/6	
doing [12] 32/20	23/12 39/22 42/25	111/6 111/12	14/4 62/16 63/22	39/23 81/2
47/21 60/4 64/13	47/17 52/12 57/24	112/15 113/8 130/4	efficient [2] 43/2	Enjoy [1] 156/4
67/14 71/13 125/13	62/15 64/10 64/14	134/8 135/24	74/24	enough [8] 22/16
126/12 137/13	66/4 66/14 68/25	Dziubla's [7] 76/9	efficiently [2]	25/13 47/19 66/12
147/7 151/11 153/9	71/18 71/19 71/20	81/1 82/14 88/5	46/11 47/16	68/22 71/11 81/17
dollars [4] 26/1	73/12 79/17 105/1	88/13 89/24 90/8	efforts [12] 86/7	101/19
93/22 113/18 117/1	106/21 119/4 125/8		90/8 128/11 134/2	enter [2] 37/10
don't [139] 5/1 5/14 6/2 6/4 6/6 6/9	120/2 120/6 121/22	<u>E</u>	135/16 135/19	153/9
6/9 8/11 9/24 9/24	132/8 133/2 142/3	each [18] 19/1	136/1 136/3 136/5	entered [3] 37/21
0/2 0/11 3/27 3/24		20/25 75/19 91/1		
<u> </u>	D _i	ı eggy Isom, CCR 541, RM	1D (0) documents entered

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR (9) documents... - entered (702)671-4402 - CROERT48@GMAIL.COM Pursuant to NRS 239.053, illegal to copy without payment.

LAS VEGAS DEVELOPME		ove ethy [6] 27/11	overeged [4]	October 9, 2019
<u>E</u>	58/11 64/9 69/11 70/13 76/16 81/6	exactly [6] 27/11 44/1 48/20 96/22	expressed [4] 10/19 10/20 50/15	February [3] 10/23 18/24 64/16
entered [2]	83/3 87/9 90/13	102/19 120/24	61/24	February 2013 [1]
105/18 107/4	90/16 98/4 100/19	example [22]	extended [1]	18/24
entering [8] 50/8	102/7 102/16 113/6	34/12 35/11 45/5	39/24	federal [1] 30/15
104/14 128/24	113/16 113/18	48/7 114/24 120/7	extensive [1]	FEDOR [1] 2/3
130/14 134/6 135/9	116/19 124/19	124/13 135/6	34/14	fee [1] 21/22
142/21 151/15	eventually [2]	137/15 137/20	extent [6] 53/8	feel [6] 46/12
entire [1] 134/8	20/11 47/18	142/13 142/18	53/9 78/25 92/11	52/18 109/15
entirely [1] 85/7	ever [4] 12/8 86/2	142/20 144/4	93/7 143/22	123/24 124/9
entirety [2] 126/4	86/11 142/10	150/11 150/14	extinguish [2]	124/14
126/13	every [15] 19/18	150/22 151/10	4/21 13/23	feels [1] 41/20
entities [10] 25/10 89/12 106/7 106/12	32/6 54/13 69/3	151/12 151/17	extraneous [1]	few [7] 12/11
109/3 111/21	69/7 90/24 94/9	152/4 155/22	66/21	19/23 26/10 40/22
122/16 128/5	107/6 109/8 112/1	except [7] 25/9	eyes [1] 100/4	127/25 147/23
129/12 129/22	131/24 137/20	26/8 73/12 79/11	F	152/1
entitled [4] 82/5	146/23 146/23	79/12 79/25 100/1		fide [1] 130/17
85/5 85/16 157/6	150/12	exception [1]	facially [1] 129/8	fight [3] 28/3
entity [5] 25/22	everybody [9]	113/4	fact [17] 6/10	64/25 122/9
106/6 110/17	37/11 52/14 62/4	exclude [1] 93/2	11/25 22/21 28/22	fighting [1] 122/13
110/18 128/25	67/21 67/21 106/25	excluding [2]	31/25 42/19 76/16	figure [8] 12/5
envelope [3]	121/12 151/10	88/14 90/12	92/20 94/23 95/4	33/9 84/25 131/19
101/14 101/18	154/4	excuse [2] 120/21	98/1 117/1 134/6	133/3 135/3 146/21
101/14 101/18	everybody's [1]	146/23	136/2 153/19	156/16
equally [1] 50/21	57/13	Exhibit [5] 20/19	153/22 156/7	file [10] 6/3 6/14
equitable [9] 28/7	everyone [2]	75/18 88/22 128/14	facts [4] 26/18	7/10 7/12 23/14
28/12 28/24 36/12	54/14 73/1	128/15	35/4 42/15 101/11	60/25 71/1 91/3
36/22 43/5 43/7	everything [19]	Exhibit 1 [2] 20/19		149/22 156/16
43/10 43/18	8/24 10/5 13/4 15/7	128/15	136/22	filed [23] 5/2 5/3
equity [1] 126/11	57/17 66/18 73/11	Exhibit A [2] 88/22		5/10 7/9 7/17 13/14
escape [1] 87/2	76/12 97/23 112/19	128/14	fair [4] 18/4 26/24	19/22 29/6 29/12
escrow [6] 21/21	118/4 121/2 132/11		101/19 122/19	29/13 74/3 74/4
21/21 32/11 32/25	132/23 141/21	75/18	fairness [1] 149/20	
107/23 112/2	147/2 147/9 147/18	exist [1] 22/23	faith [3] 26/24	103/23 105/14
especially [1]	155/23	existence [1]	37/19 122/19	111/1 134/13
42/20	everywhere [1]	90/17	faking [1] 136/10	139/16 139/18
ESQ [3] 2/4 2/14	119/10	expect [2] 108/4	fall [1] 73/6	139/21 140/1
3/6	evidence [27]	120/4	falls [1] 78/24	files [1] 5/10
essence [3] 20/3	22/16 23/7 23/15	expectations [2]	far [9] 13/22 61/18	
22/4 127/6	25/15 27/8 28/12	21/5 21/14	68/19 69/14 72/5	filings [1] 5/6
essentially [2]	35/8 37/7 37/17	expedition [1]	104/1 123/12 151/2	
27/8 128/2	40/21 41/22 44/5	115/11	156/7	52/19
establish [1] 31/16	44/6 44/12 47/1	experience [9]	Fargo [9] 105/12 105/21 106/3 107/7	finances [4] 107/4
establishing [1]	47/0 00/13 00/22	75/11 75/15 87/14	112/14 112/17	110/8 110/10
147/20	67/2 67/11 69/22	90/2 90/18 92/12	113/16 113/21	110/11
estoppel [1] 42/9	84/10 86/11 92/2	109/21 109/25	123/17	financial [12]
et [3] 13/23 19/14	109/25 130/22	110/7	FARMER [1] 2/3	68/15 68/21 105/16
78/8	137/12	expert [6] 64/21	FARMERCASE.COM	105/17 106/9 107/2
et al [1] 13/23	evidentiary [13]	68/12 68/15 68/21	[1] 2/9	,,
et cetera [2] 19/14	64/3 64/6 64/9 64/14 65/11 65/21	69/14 70/19 experts [9] 59/8	fascinating [2]	143/17 143/18 144/8 144/9
78/8	66/11 66/17 71/6	64/20 65/7 68/2	29/18 43/16	Financial's [1]
Evans [2] 22/22	72/21 73/22 92/22	68/24 69/23 70/3	fashion [2] 74/24	107/23
23/8	110/24	72/6 73/12	96/19	financials [4]
even [32] 9/24	ex [2] 4/19 6/9	explain [1] 35/5	fast [2] 150/2	109/12 123/20
11/24 13/4 21/10	ex parte [1] 4/19	explain [1] 35/5 explained [1] 26/9	150/4	123/24 138/6
22/9 31/10 34/23	exact [3] 41/24	explaining [2]	faster [1] 61/24	financing [1]
35/2 35/6 36/11	75/20 112/11	49/5 139/13	favor [1] 67/14	15/15
38/7 40/6 46/16	, 5/20 112/11	1010 100110	Fax [2] 2/19 3/11	13/13
	_			10)
	Po	eggy Isom, CCR 541, RM	IK (1	10) entered financing

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR (10) entered... - financing (702)671-4402 - CROERT48@GMAIL.COM Pursuant to NRS 239.053, illegal to copy without payment.

F	following [1] 8/16	122/17 136/8	31/9 31/21 32/10	56/4 56/9 57/14
	follows [1] 63/14	fraudulent [2]	32/16 32/19 32/22	57/21 64/17 65/6
find [6] 13/6 84/20	force [1] 115/6	19/12 26/15	32/23 39/19 46/20	65/7 66/4 66/16
99/15 108/21 114/9	foreclosure [2]	fraudulently [1]	67/17 76/2 76/25	67/13 69/18 69/22
148/9	20/12 27/4	37/9	77/25 78/4 78/5	69/24 70/19 71/6
finder [1] 28/22	FOREGOING [1]	Friday [9] 7/17	78/9 81/8 82/18	72/10 72/25 73/11
finds [1] 28/2	157/10	9/19 9/25 10/9 14/1	86/14 86/19 86/19	73/24 74/23 77/21
fine [11] 7/15	foremost [1]	14/9 18/8 152/10	93/9 97/14 106/15	79/6 79/20 79/24
14/20 14/21 61/23	123/13	152/13	106/19 106/22	83/21 83/23 84/24
65/9 66/1 71/9	forget [1] 14/8	friend [4] 54/19	107/24 110/14	86/6 86/13 95/3
73/10 101/25	formal [1] 68/25	54/24 55/21 56/7	112/23 121/18	95/10 97/4 97/23
103/19 137/2	forms [1] 114/17	front [91] 1/9	130/4 132/4	98/13 98/17 98/18
finish [2] 64/7 71/6	forth [5] 22/15	15/15 19/18 19/18	Fund's [1] 77/23	98/23 99/15 100/12
FIRM [1] 3/5	23/20 48/16 52/22	19/23 20/14 20/21	fundamental [2]	100/15 101/16
first [36] 4/22	89/3	21/7 21/16 21/22	22/21 149/20	102/1 104/21 109/4
10/24 23/24 27/13	fortunate [1] 9/22	21/22 22/15 22/22	funded [2] 47/22	109/18 112/18
28/1 30/14 30/23	forums [1] 79/21	22/24 23/16 23/25	137/18	113/6 113/20
35/25 37/4 38/8	forward [18]	25/21 26/1 29/22	funding [2] 90/2	117/10 117/14
40/5 43/6 44/3	11/12 20/10 21/5	29/23 31/12 31/23	93/22	117/16 117/19
44/12 44/17 44/22	21/8 21/9 21/17	31/24 32/11 32/15	fundraising [4]	119/8 121/16 125/1
50/8 64/13 74/7	37/7 41/1 41/3	32/17 32/20 32/22	31/16 77/14 80/14	126/24 128/11
79/2 80/3 81/2 99/2	65/11 66/15 67/9	33/1 33/1 33/7	82/23	130/18 131/20
104/1 105/12	77/1 82/5 86/18	43/11 46/7 46/10	funds [8] 19/13	133/25 134/1
111/18 123/13	109/24 110/1 117/2	46/15 46/19 47/11	19/14 21/18 55/8	134/19 135/16
128/20 128/22	found [1] 65/18	47/13 50/12 50/18	89/6 89/13 106/16	136/5 137/21
133/24 136/1 136/3	foundation [1]	69/7 75/1 75/7	106/17	138/14 139/5 139/9
150/17 151/17	83/15	77/13 77/15 77/20	further [4] 15/20	139/15 139/15
153/19 153/19	founder [1] 110/14		106/5 126/21	139/16 140/3 141/6
fishing [1] 115/10	four [5] 71/22	84/16 90/10 90/16	134/14	149/21 150/1
fits [1] 33/9	71/23 93/25 105/10	91/4 93/11 93/18	future [2] 7/15	150/10 151/10
five [5] 5/16 7/25	128/1	95/23 98/12 105/24	124/4	151/23 152/19
8/1 64/22 93/25	frame [3] 82/1	106/17 106/19		152/20 152/24
fix [1] 97/2 fixed [1] 118/15	82/19 91/9	106/20 106/23	<u>G</u>	154/17 154/17
Fleming [9] 26/11	frankly [1] 129/9	121/18 129/12	gather [2] 85/21	155/7 155/17
76/1 76/22 80/22	fraud [71] 25/3	129/14 129/14	133/1	155/21
82/13 93/9 106/10	26/3 26/19 26/21	130/9 130/18	gave [7] 19/21	gets [4] 7/10 86/19
110/20 110/20	27/12 27/15 27/20	130/23 131/5 131/8	55/2 59/24 69/8	137/21 138/15
Fleming's [2] 81/5	28/3 28/17 30/13	131/15 132/5	121/1 121/18	getting [10] 11/9
82/15	30/16 30/20 30/22	132/11 133/25	151/17	32/23 44/17 78/1
flow [1] 145/1	31/8 33/7 33/9	134/10 134/16	general [6] 78/9	84/22 93/11 118/4
flowing [1] 70/14	35/12 35/16 35/16	143/6 143/16 144/8	120/6 120/12	125/7 136/9 150/6
fly [1] 94/10	35/24 37/2 37/4	144/15 144/15	124/16 127/2	gist [4] 127/23
Flynn [3] 125/16	37/9 37/16 37/24	144/20 144/23	137/19	129/11 129/19
126/2 126/6	38/7 38/17 39/5	145/17 146/9	gentleman [1]	151/2
focus [6] 34/25	40/5 40/9 41/6	146/13 147/1	97/16	give [28] 6/21 21/1
38/10 95/22 117/24	41/10 41/14 41/19	147/15 148/12	gentleman's [1]	32/4 32/19 34/25
119/9 124/17	41/25 42/6 42/15	150/24	39/24	40/18 40/19 56/10
focused [2] 117/15	43/21 44/4 44/13	fruit [1] 26/5	Gentlemen [1]	56/11 66/3 70/6
123/1	45/5 45/1/ 46/24	full [4] 29/18 53/23		83/24 94/8 95/19
focuses [2] 34/16	46/25 47/5 48/14	79/20 157/10	get [114] 4/16	98/18 99/1 100/7
115/2	49/14 49/24 50/10	fully [3] 34/9 38/16		105/6 126/20
focusing [2]	50/11 50/18 50/23	126/6	11/11 11/11 12/3 12/20 14/18 15/7	130/24 131/18
109/11 155/15	51/1 52/7 52/21	functions [1]	21/3 21/20 22/11	138/23 139/2 140/2
FOIA [1] 83/21	53/4 53/7 53/18	76/10	22/24 23/6 23/11	150/7 150/8 151/7
folks [2] 90/16	53/22 54/2 54/2 57/1 67/11 80/15	FUND [42] 1/12	24/2 32/19 32/20	151/25
146/17	92/8 108/13 114/13	15/16 19/2 19/17 19/23 21/15 21/18	41/18 47/16 47/23	given [17] 31/13 31/20 32/8 32/9
follow [3] 34/22	116/25 122/17	21/19 25/12 25/19	50/25 51/2 51/3	32/10 32/12 33/1
104/22 113/15	110/23 122/17	21/13 23/12 23/13	52/5 55/25 56/2	32/10 32/12 33/1
			22,3 33,23 30,2	
	Pe	eggy Isom, CCR 541, RM	IR	(11) find - giver

LAS VEGAS DEVELOFINE	INT TOIND LLC			OCTOBEL 3, 2013
G	34/2 34/6 34/7	46/13 49/18 54/24	guys [1] 111/15	10/20 11/24 13/14
given [10] 40/15	35/19 37/12 37/12	55/23 56/10 64/24	н	22/15 23/21 26/21
46/10 67/20 106/14	37/13 37/15 37/20	65/6 65/11 66/3		27/11 29/12 35/25
111/7 131/7 131/15	37/23 39/4 39/15	66/12 68/15 69/14	HAC [1] 2/12	38/18 38/19 38/20
134/10 138/4 143/1	40/22 41/3 41/13	69/25 72/6 72/7	had [51] 7/8 12/8	39/12 39/14 40/14
gives [4] 65/2 78/5	41/24 41/25 44/21	73/21 79/19 84/22	12/9 12/10 12/11	44/18 44/22 47/21
107/25 122/21	4//2 40/1 49/13	84/24 110/13	12/14 12/15 23/25	48/15 50/13 55/3
giving [3] 78/8	52/15 52/16 53/16	110/16 110/20	26/10 29/23 32/15	61/24 66/10 67/20
98/22 146/10	53/18 55/1 56/13	111/14 112/19	32/17 32/19 43/4	67/21 71/21 72/9
go [76] 4/8 10/1	57/4 57/25 58/10	114/18 116/13	43/8 43/11 46/12	75/1 77/19 78/20
13/21 13/23 14/16	58/12 58/13 59/14	116/17 116/18	46/15 47/13 52/9	79/5 79/15 83/14
20/10 21/2 21/7	61/12 64/8 64/10	116/19 120/10	54/25 55/1 55/2	83/19 84/11 86/15
24/11 26/4 26/14	65/4 65/13 66/2	120/10 128/9	55/15 56/23 71/22	87/20 90/14 94/14
26/17 27/11 27/12	66/18 66/19 66/22	131/22 133/5	75/15 77/25 82/2	95/16 105/18 106/3
27/16 28/1 30/22	66/23 67/2 67/3	134/23 136/6	93/19 95/13 96/11	106/23 108/12
31/22 32/19 34/18	67/10 67/14 67/16	136/12 138/24	106/20 109/21	112/6 120/2 126/8
37/12 40/25 41/3	70/8 70/9 72/23	140/1 140/3 150/3	109/25 111/7	127/12 127/13
46/4 47/2 47/8	73/5 78/2 78/17	153/13 156/14	111/21 116/3 116/8	128/18 130/3 130/9
54/17 54/18 54/23	78/17 78/18 83/5	gotten [2] 81/6	117/9 119/25	131/15 132/4 132/5
55/24 57/24 58/5	83/21 84/7 89/21	113/19	120/21 122/9	132/8 134/10
58/11 58/23 59/22	90/22 90/23 91/7	grant [4] 4/22 13/5		134/16 136/17
60/5 61/15 61/24	93/24 94/5 94/10	52/2 151/1	128/1 128/8 130/10	139/10 141/23
63/24 67/9 74/18	94/14 97/3 97/4	granted [6] 87/18	143/24 157/6	142/15 146/23
75/18 78/3 80/1	97/19 98/23 99/7	104/7 104/18 124/3	157/12	148/16 148/17
90/23 91/18 92/8	99/9 99/10 100/22	130/10 154/8	hadn't [3] 7/9	hasn't [9] 34/8
94/3 95/4 97/6 99/9	101/7 101/10 102/8	granting [2]	24/17 134/23	79/16 79/17 81/13
102/12 106/4 108/3	108/4 109/24	123/17 132/13	Hallmark [1] 70/5	84/6 94/16 113/3
111/17 112/25	111/24 113/6	great [2] 10/13	hand [4] 26/11	113/5 138/20
115/10 116/8	115/10 116/5 117/6	63/1	94/8 113/11 113/12	hat [1] 26/11
121/24 121/25	117/25 121/16	GREER [24] 2/13	handful [2] 78/20	hate [1] 73/1
122/5 131/10	121/20 121/24	2/14 4/14 23/22	132/15	have [283]
131/19 137/20	121/25 122/2 122/3	23/24 24/19 25/8	handle [4] 6/24	haven't [22] 22/9
139/2 139/5 139/6	123/11 126/6	31/5 39/2 41/20	13/1 14/2 18/1	32/2 38/16 40/13
140/1 141/21	126/14 128/13	49/4 54/10 72/25	handled [4] 13/1	48/8 51/15 57/1
144/22 150/16	133/5 138/23 139/2	79/9 80/19 85/6	36/22 60/22 79/6	64/1 64/14 68/16
151/5 151/9 152/25	139/4 139/14	85/14 91/13 98/19	handling [1] 13/8	68/25 72/14 78/10
153/22 156/9	140/14 141/2 141/3	103/8 133/25 134/9	hands [4] 33/17	81/6 82/2 84/9
goals [1] 32/2	141/22 142/10	149/25 151/11	70/19 77/21 98/13	85/13 86/6 91/20
goes [23] 24/23	143/9 143/12 145/6	Greer's [1] 10/14	hanging [1] 26/5	95/21 133/21 142/4
37/17 41/12 44/9	147/22 148/8	GREERLAW.BIZ	happen [8] 7/8	having [11] 5/6
44/15 48/4 49/10	149/12 149/17	[1] 2/20	15/17 27/8 37/23 48/20 84/7 84/12	6/11 31/21 34/13
57/6 60/15 63/21	149/20 150/7 150/8	group [5] 46/5		49/1 53/19 53/23
65/11 83/25 85/1	150/20 150/25	78/22 79/2 79/3	113/12	86/17 90/17 100/1
86/20 92/6 103/8	151/1 151/4 152/7	131/21	happened [4] 26/9	136/14
108/6 129/6 129/18	152/23 155/12	guarded [4] 77/21	84/7 113/1 137/3	he [77] 25/20 26/6
130/15 131/25	156/8	77/22 83/7 90/11	happening [2] 69/5 94/7	39/18 39/22 39/22
132/20 143/11	gone [4] 12/10	guess [24] 7/11		39/23 39/24 40/18
going [156] 7/3	39/12 40/6 114/10	16/5 17/12 29/3	happens [1] 95/18	40/18 40/19 54/19
7/19 8/14 8/19 9/7	good [20] 4/6 4/7	29/8 32/1 39/4	happy [5] 110/19 110/23 153/12	54/25 56/8 63/6
10/4 10/4 11/9	4/10 4/12 14/5	50/16 60/24 60/25	153/18 154/2	63/8 69/15 75/14
14/17 16/4 16/6	14/13 17/1 23/19	67/8 68/5 68/20	harass [1] 129/13	75/15 76/10 76/10
16/7 16/23 17/4	25/2 25/3 26/24	69/21 70/18 74/18	hard [4] 64/8	78/16 78/20 79/13
20/22 20/23 20/24	28/8 37/19 50/4	79/9 83/8 100/25	′	79/16 79/17 79/17
21/6 21/11 21/12	67/10 104/5 122/19	102/8 104/6 120/16	83/23 156/14	80/12 80/13 81/1
21/15 21/16 21/17	125/13 133/8 152/4	123/15 123/16	156/14 Hardesty [1] 63/6	84/4 88/7 88/9
21/18 25/14 27/7	got [50] 11/13	guide [1] 16/3		88/24 89/3 90/15
27/25 30/22 31/25	17/10 18/15 19/17	gun [1] 26/8	harm [1] 112/17 has [70] 5/2 5/3	90/19 92/11 92/12
32/1 32/3 33/10	23/21 40/16 40/17	guy [1] 56/17	10/9 10/10 10/19	92/13 92/14 92/15
•			10/3 10/10 10/13	

LAS VEGAS DEVELOPME	INT FUND LLC	T	T	October 9, 2019
Н	here [102] 4/15	153/25 156/14	117/17 119/7	137/15 142/19
he [36] 92/21	6/25 8/13 11/8	his [32] 23/13 55/3		I
94/15 94/24 95/15	12/20 13/8 15/14	55/4 56/18 63/7	125/3 125/19	
95/17 96/2 96/15	16/4 16/7 16/17	67/11 67/12 67/14	125/25 127/16	I'd [9] 6/25 7/16
96/16 97/17 97/17	18/20 22/2 22/23	67/15 69/14 75/7	129/20 129/22	15/18 29/17 73/24
98/13 98/14 108/12	23/6 25/5 25/16	75/10 78/15 78/18	132/24 134/13	105/12 151/22
108/17 110/6	26/6 28/13 29/4	79/21 87/14 90/1	135/25 138/22	153/12 156/16
110/18 110/22	33/15 36/2 37/7	90/9 90/20 95/16	139/24 140/12	I'll [21] 7/14 11/14
111/7 111/12	40/20 41/11 46/9	95/16 95/17 97/17	140/18 140/19	16/8 16/8 23/23
111/17 113/11	46/17 46/19 49/1	98/13 98/25 102/3	142/6 146/8 147/8	49/1 52/9 103/25
120/22 126/9 134/5	53/16 54/14 58/5	113/10 121/4 121/5	148/11 148/25	103/25 104/2
134/5 134/6 134/7	59/25 62/1 63/24	126/11 137/13	149/5 152/7 155/2	104/21 128/12
136/17 136/19	66/8 66/15 67/10	145/2	155/24 156/3	132/22 140/1
136/20 137/7 137/7	71/9 72/23 78/14	historically [1]	HONORABLE [1]	150/10 150/10
137/17 150/12	80/2 83/20 86/4	12/3	1/18	150/16 151/8
153/21 156/15	86/9 86/18 86/23	history [2] 34/19	hope [4] 93/15	151/25 153/18
he's [22] 11/13	87/9 87/13 88/4	90/2	105/5 112/22	153/19
25/9 25/12 39/5	90/5 90/16 91/12	hit [1] 153/9	123/16	I'm [128] 4/24 5/9
67/14 78/16 78/17	91/25 92/1 93/8	HOLBERT [8] 2/4	hopeful [1] 113/20	9/7 9/23 10/4 10/4
78/18 78/19 88/25	94/3 94/12 94/13	4/13 59/22 73/18	hopefully [3]	10/21 12/5 13/5
92/8 94/11 94/13	95/1 95/8 98/11	100/20 103/7	12/20 20/10 111/9	14/6 14/21 16/7
94/22 95/18 96/16	99/7 99/12 100/1	125/10 151/11	horse [1] 49/12	18/17 23/21 25/13
97/13 97/16 112/16	100/12 102/1	hold [3] 24/4 59/23		28/6 30/6 34/2
117/18 118/4	102/12 102/21	101/25	hours [1] 150/9	34/10 35/19 38/19
156/14	108/9 108/17	holds [1] 107/6	house [1] 137/22	40/13 41/11 41/22
head [1] 42/10	108/17 110/9	holiday [3] 8/5 8/7	how [55] 6/17 10/6	42/9 43/19 45/14
hear [10] 8/16	110/12 113/4	8/12	10/15 11/18 17/21	45/22 45/23 47/18
16/3 16/9 16/12	114/12 115/8	home [1] 87/4	26/3 27/11 28/3	49/12 49/19 52/15
35/3 37/3 44/16	115/10 116/2 117/7	homeless [1]	32/14 32/15 32/17	52/16 53/1 53/5
83/6 83/10 84/8	117/18 119/8	26/12	32/21 33/9 34/10	53/14 53/16 53/18
heard [16] 5/19	120/17 120/25	hone [1] 124/7	35/5 35/13 38/20	55/1 55/3 55/6
7/16 11/10 12/23	125/18 128/6 128/7	Honestly [1] 91/21	39/25 46/6 46/7	55/25 57/4 59/10
13/10 19/8 26/6	128/19 129/5 131/2		46/20 47/10 50/1	63/3 65/3 65/4 65/9
35/25 36/19 36/20	131/20 132/10	4/10 4/12 7/19 8/18		65/13 66/1 66/1
38/3 38/8 43/21	132/22 134/5 137/7	8/22 11/13 13/16	65/25 71/21 72/4	68/15 70/1 70/9 71/19 73/13 75/3
45/6 50/18 62/20	139/4 140/2 140/16	15/9 16/21 18/14	72/5 90/13 90/16	
hearing [21] 5/4	142/3 145/24	18/18 18/20 19/8	90/22 91/8 91/17	79/12 80/18 83/16
5/13 5/19 7/12	148/16 151/11	19/21 23/19 24/5	91/19 98/3 98/3	83/21 85/7 85/9 88/24 90/1 91/4
15/20 17/15 24/16	152/19	28/14 29/20 31/6	99/4 99/21 100/19	93/16 94/13 96/12
63/16 63/19 64/4	here's [16] 8/17	35/18 36/4 36/17	108/11 111/6	97/3 97/8 97/22
64/6 64/10 64/14	9/2 34/4 35/11 41/5	38/4 40/20 42/21	117/16 123/5 130/6	99/23 101/12 108/8
65/11 65/21 66/11	44/24 44/25 48/3	44/1 44/4 44/10	137/3 137/16	110/19 113/4 113/5
71/6 72/8 72/21	51/22 55/5 55/5	44/10 44/11 44/11	137/17 137/18	113/20 114/22
73/22 116/3	93/14 95/24 117/24	44/13 44/16 44/18	138/2 138/3 146/21	116/5 122/2 122/3
hearings [1] 9/9	137/9 155/10 HEREBY [1] 157/5	45/18 46/23 47/4	148/8 150/11	123/8 123/11
hears [2] 44/10	- - '	47/5 47/25 48/1	however [4] 27/9 52/4 75/15 153/17	123/17 123/11
44/10	HEREUNTO [1] 157/13	54/18 55/11 66/17 66/23 67/3 69/12		123/17 123/16
hearsay [4] 22/15	Hey [5] 20/22		huge [1] 82/3 Huh [1] 136/11	123/19 123/20
22/20 22/20 69/13	98/17 117/24 123/1	70/25 73/19 74/21 74/23 75/5 79/4	hum [2] 43/13	128/13 128/14
held [3] 8/10 9/18	139/25	79/5 79/8 87/15	154/24	128/21 128/21
16/20	hide [1] 94/7	89/14 90/4 90/5	hundred [1] 56/18	135/3 135/4 137/9
HELOC [2] 137/21	highlight [1] 23/23		hurt [1] 112/18	137/18 139/22
151/18	highly [1] 66/16	93/14 93/15 94/4	Hyatt [10] 75/8	140/15 141/2 141/3
help [5] 16/3 49/9	him [12] 11/14	94/14 94/20 95/7	76/3 80/10 81/10	141/6 141/6 141/15
58/15 74/23 153/6	68/16 94/12 94/14	97/9 98/19 102/21	81/24 83/4 89/4	142/5 142/9 142/10
helps [1] 78/13	95/14 95/14 95/14	105/7 105/10	91/14 93/23 96/3	142/22 143/11
HENDERSON [1]	126/20 150/8 150/8	105/14 106/8 107/9	hypothetically [2]	143/12 145/6
2/7			, pourceioning [2]	147/12 149/5
				,===.,,0
	_	 eggy Isom, CCR 541, RM	10	(40) !
	D _i	2000 ICOM IIV 541 DN	I I	(13) he I'm

(13) he... - I'm

LAS VEGAS DEVELOPME	INT FUND LLC	T	T	October 9, 2019
I	82/16 82/16 82/24	26/15 27/12 27/15		investor [3] 21/20
I'm [12] 149/17	93/10 105/21	27/21 30/13 33/10	30/19	78/3 106/16
149/20 150/7 150/8	105/22 106/3	35/12 35/16 35/24	instead [1] 116/4	investor's [1]
150/20 150/25	106/12 106/25	37/2 37/4 37/16	instruct [2] 100/19	33/12
151/4 152/7 152/23	107/8 110/24 121/1	37/24 38/8 41/6	153/8	investors [37]
154/2 155/11	124/8 126/9	41/10 41/14 42/1	instruction [1]	20/2 21/1 22/4
155/19	impacts [1] 62/18	44/4 44/9 44/13	101/20	22/13 22/17 23/5
I've [41] 7/8 12/8	implied [1] 26/23	45/5 45/18 46/24	instructional [1]	23/11 32/24 47/22
12/11 12/13 12/15	important [19]	46/25 47/6 48/14	103/9	76/4 77/14 77/23
23/21 24/18 27/5	8/21 11/8 12/2	50/24 51/1 53/7	instructions [3]	82/23 83/8 84/8
27/11 39/17 40/5	34/24 35/2 44/8	67/12 92/9 114/13	18/9 34/22 35/8	84/10 84/13 84/19
40/17 45/3 45/4	52/24 53/25 56/19	122/18	intend [1] 85/11	86/9 86/17 86/20
49/3 49/12 50/14	62/12 62/22 77/21	inducements [2]	intent [2] 127/21	86/22 86/25 87/8
52/9 62/15 62/20	83/1 90/6 114/1	19/12 33/7	155/4	88/15 89/14 90/7
65/6 68/11 68/14	114/16 123/24	infallible [1] 120/4	intentional [3]	90/15 92/15 93/3
68/15 70/9 72/11	131/13 152/18	information [64]	26/22 26/24 27/2	97/24 98/8 108/11
74/24 83/12 95/13	impose [1] 116/5	15/4 65/3 68/17	interaction [1]	111/7 112/4 126/16
111/14 112/19	imposes [1]	68/22 69/10 75/14	95/10	130/6
112/23 125/20	113/23	75/21 77/22 77/23	interest [16] 19/25	investors' [1]
134/25 138/10	impression [1]	78/1 78/21 79/1	22/1 24/6 24/7	23/14
138/12 141/19	109/15	79/11 79/24 83/7	24/14 24/17 24/21	involved [17]
142/2 147/9 150/13	improvements [1]	83/14 83/24 84/2	33/11 56/15 87/2	11/23 19/1 20/2
153/13	55/24	84/22 84/23 84/23	87/3 92/24 97/15	25/10 30/18 76/11
IA [6] 25/10 25/21	in [342]	85/5 86/13 87/16	106/22 121/4	77/18 78/15 86/23
	inappropriate [2]	87/17 88/14 90/11	121/10	87/14 88/9 92/11
39/19 40/16 110/16 112/12	107/1 120/25	90/19 93/12 95/1	interesting [7]	92/21 92/23 94/23
IC [1] 110/15	Inc [5] 80/25 145/9	95/12 96/12 97/4	29/14 29/15 51/22	94/24 98/9
	145/10 145/11	105/16 105/17	67/19 79/18 81/15	involvement [2]
identical [1] 128/2	147/15	106/9 107/2 107/2	93/15	75/7 88/14
identified [3] 116/18 116/19	incentive [1] 121/5	107/5 107/12 108/5	Interestingly [2]	involves [4] 18/23
129/23	inclined [1] 59/14	108/21 109/5	25/13 81/17	19/12 22/3 75/7
identify [3] 76/8	include [7] 36/23	111/25 112/24	interests [1] 22/1	involving [10]
90/9 90/25	41/14 41/15 45/17	113/6 113/9 113/21	interference [2]	19/2 36/25 38/1
	104/4 123/15 136/9	113/24 121/12	26/25 27/2	47/9 51/5 62/8 62/9
identifying [7]	included [3] 85/12	122/25 123/20	interim [1] 155/9	67/17 85/23 146/13
88/5 88/6 88/13 92/23 95/12 126/17	103/10 133/9	126/17 127/3	internal [1] 89/15	Irrelevant [1]
127/3	including [6]	130/10 130/24	interpretation [1]	89/18
identity [5] 87/3	19/20 62/7 107/6	131/20 134/15	68/5	is [389]
92/19 94/25 95/8	121/2 143/17 144/9	134/19 140/7	interrelated [1]	ish [2] 117/1
112/4	income [2] 97/13	146/10 148/13	59/24	118/10
if [171]	115/7	148/15 148/17	interrogatories [1]	isn't [10] 12/1
Ignatius [3] 78/10	incredibly [4] 77/2	infrastructure [1]	120/19	12/14 15/13 25/4
78/14 98/13	88/19 93/5 102/10	31/16	intertwined [2]	48/8 86/12 87/9
ignore [1] 25/3	indemnity [4] 43/6	inherently [1]	40/3 52/1	91/25 96/7 108/20
imagine [1] 90/22	43/7 43/8 43/10	45/17	intervention [1]	ISOM [3] 1/24
immediately [1]	indicated [2]	initial [3] 41/16	126/21	157/4 157/17
102/14	141/23 157/7	64/21 118/10	into [23] 21/20	issue [51] 4/17
immigrant [2]	indiscernible [2]	initially [1] 79/14	26/2 37/10 37/17	16/24 29/3 29/14
84/8 84/10	76/4 126/23	initials [4] 95/3	37/21 46/8 50/8	29/19 29/22 30/3
immigration [2]	individual [2]	95/11 99/2 99/2	60/15 69/22 74/25	30/18 32/14 33/19
	71/14 132/16	injunction [9] 9/5	88/10 98/19 121/25	34/3 34/10 37/25
133/6 148/14 impact [34] 19/3	individually [1]	15/13 17/15 20/12	128/24 130/15	38/17 43/16 45/6
25/10 31/13 32/9	81/21	63/17 66/17 67/5	131/10 134/6 135/9	52/5 53/23 56/3
	individuals [4]	67/13 72/8	142/22 146/12	58/11 58/24 59/1
33/23 36/8 38/18	78/23 89/4 91/1	innocent [2] 33/15	149/12 151/15	60/15 63/22 64/5
38/20 46/5 46/18 47/12 48/10 49/5	106/9	33/18	157/8	69/11 71/4 81/18
49/8 54/3 55/3 56/6	induced [1] 37/9	input [1] 6/12	investment [2]	85/16 86/8 87/9
76/24 76/24 77/16	inducement [34]	inside [1] 93/16	89/5 90/21	88/20 90/5 91/24
/0/27/0/27///10				
		aggy Isom CCD 5/11 DM	<u> </u>	(14) I'm - iccu

(14) I'm... - issue

I	114/19 114/22	joint [5] 59/2 61/4	45/22 48/3 48/21	75/19 80/7 82/11
issue [17] 92/9	115/2 115/3 115/9	61/13 61/21 71/3	48/25 49/1 52/9	85/3 96/10 103/2
96/14 100/2 100/16	115/25 116/24	journey [1] 70/4	52/24 53/4 53/25	103/3 104/2
102/13 110/3 110/5	116/24 116/25	judge [15] 1/18	58/6 60/25 62/16	Kenworth [6] 76/1
110/7 110/9 122/15	117/6 117/20	1/19 27/20 34/5	62/22 63/2 64/22	76/22 80/25 81/2
123/8 127/21 128/6	118/23 119/2 119/2	35/3 41/24 44/18	65/17 66/4 66/5	82/13 93/10
137/24 154/4	119/4 119/9 123/5	44/21 44/21 45/6	66/8 69/6 71/1	kept [1] 32/23
155/15 155/18	124/3 124/10	46/23 72/6 74/10	71/15 71/25 72/25	key [2] 20/18
issued [5] 75/1	124/21 128/14	124/15 135/15	75/16 75/20 75/21	115/4
127/20 137/17	128/15 129/13	judges [1] 57/21	76/12 76/13 76/14	KHOLBERT [1] 2/9
138/1 143/1	130/20 130/22	judgment [12]	77/5 79/3 79/14	kicking [2] 49/12
issues [34] 5/24	132/24 133/5 135/2	29/25 35/1 57/8	84/14 85/25 87/22	73/2
10/16 11/21 15/14	135/18 136/1 136/2		88/2 88/3 88/19	kind [27] 4/17
19/7 40/5 40/6 40/8	136/5 136/7 136/8	70/9 70/10 105/18	88/20 89/19 90/6	5/23 6/10 13/2 39/5
41/13 42/24 43/1	136/8 137/4 138/5	107/4 140/16	90/13 93/24 95/22	40/5 49/3 49/10
43/6 45/4 47/10	138/5 138/15	142/11	96/14 98/6 98/15	49/10 49/11 49/12
54/12 54/13 67/17	138/22 141/25	judicial [3] 13/3	98/18 99/1 99/1	55/12 55/15 59/23
74/3 105/12 110/12	142/9 147/2 147/3	27/4 115/1	99/2 102/20 105/6	59/24 65/7 67/22
114/16 119/16	147/11 148/18	judiciously [1]	105/6 107/10 109/9	69/4 89/21 114/22
122/16 123/4 123/4	149/1 150/17	117/23	114/16 114/17	115/9 123/5 127/24
126/5 129/5 130/1	150/18 150/23	July [2] 24/22	114/23 115/10	128/13 143/12
130/12 131/7	151/17 152/18	116/3	115/13 119/9	150/11 152/25
133/17 153/3	153/18 155/14	jump [1] 145/6	120/21 122/6	kinds [1] 36/24
153/23 155/11	item [2] 143/9	jumping [1] 93/16	122/20 122/22	knew [2] 32/24
it [445]	144/19	June [3] 11/2	123/1 123/21 124/9	56/2
it's [152] 5/1 5/5	itemizes [1]	24/22 59/8	124/9 124/10	know [132] 6/9
6/4 6/22 6/22 7/24	150/12	jury [48] 15/1 19/9	124/16 125/21	7/7 7/25 8/23 9/19
8/15 8/22 11/1	items [2] 126/6	28/19 28/21 29/4	128/13 129/13	9/24 10/9 11/25
11/25 13/14 16/6	151/25	29/5 29/7 29/10	129/18 131/23	14/2 14/16 15/10
16/7 23/10 27/6	its [11] 23/25	29/11 33/19 33/20	132/24 134/9	20/4 28/20 31/23
28/21 28/24 30/19	48/10 69/8 77/21	34/1 34/7 34/13	135/15 136/24	33/15 34/5 34/8
32/21 33/12 34/7	77/23 77/24 78/5	34/17 34/22 34/24	137/13 137/18	35/6 36/16 39/3
34/23 34/25 35/1	78/6 93/12 126/4	35/5 36/3 36/5	140/15 141/15	41/20 41/23 42/3
36/21 38/23 39/13	130/5	36/10 36/11 36/12	142/8 142/10	42/9 43/15 46/1
40/3 41/25 43/16	itself [2] 34/21	36/19 36/19 36/20	142/14 142/19	46/16 46/20 46/20
43/16 44/20 45/20	51/2	36/21 38/5 42/21 44/15 44/17 47/2	143/8 143/12 144/22 145/3 149/5	46/25 47/12 48/19
46/18 47/2 47/25	J	47/6 47/14 47/14	149/22 145/3 149/3	49/9 50/16 52/3 54/10 54/19 55/22
49/11 51/6 51/24	JALDRICH [1]	48/9 50/2 50/3		56/9 57/13 58/14
54/5 57/18 57/23	3/12	50/12 50/14 50/18	151/9 152/2 152/25	58/19 59/4 59/4
64/8 65/19 66/2	jammed [1] 8/14	50/12 50/14 50/16 50/21 51/3 51/12	153/24 154/18	
66/12 66/16 66/18			156/9 156/16	61/12 61/17 61/23
66/25 66/25 67/2	January [3] 10/21 10/23 64/14	52/5 53/11 53/22	Justice [1] 63/6	64/3 64/9 64/12
68/1 69/5 69/5 69/6	JEA [1] 102/17	62/19 just [151] 4/17 7/1	justification [1] 116/20	64/15 64/23 65/4 65/9 66/4 66/20
69/9 72/8 74/2 74/3	jealously [2] 77/21		110/20	67/1 67/11 69/2
76/12 76/13 76/14	83/7	10/13 10/18 11/7	K	69/21 72/15 80/5
77/5 78/15 81/14	Jennifer [1]		KATHRYN [3] 2/4	82/6 83/24 84/4
81/20 83/10 83/11	121/23	12/2 13/2 13/6 13/7 13/13 13/16 14/1	4/13 59/4	86/3 88/6 88/17
83/13 83/23 85/14	jeopardy [1] 22/13		keep [5] 11/18	90/13 90/13 91/7
86/14 90/6 90/14	job [2] 67/10 89/24	10/20 20/16 21/4	86/4 100/11 144/23	91/17 91/19 91/19
91/7 91/7 91/8	jobs [4] 22/17	21/15 21/24 22/2	154/14	92/7 93/18 95/7
91/20 91/23 93/12	22/24 23/3 68/15	23/9 23/15 30/3	keeping [2] 87/2	95/9 95/15 96/2
94/7 94/9 97/1 97/3	JOHN [7] 3/6 4/11	31/20 33/20 34/16	92/25	96/18 97/12 99/4
97/4 98/11 99/6	75/25 76/22 80/22	37/16 38/2 40/19	keeps [1] 17/4	99/8 99/13 99/22
99/9 99/18 106/8	82/13 106/10	41/17 41/22 42/3	KEITH [3] 2/14	100/14 101/5
107/14 108/14	JOHNALDRICHLA	42/5 42/9 42/23	4/14 139/25	106/20 106/24
109/10 109/15	WFIRM.COM [1]	43/2 43/19 45/1	KEITH.GREER [1]	107/20 110/4
111/19 114/1	3/12	45/2 45/4 45/10	2/20	111/24 112/12
114/14 114/19	joinder [1] 71/2	.5,2 .5,1 15,10	Keller [9] 75/2	
	,			
	_			(45) 100 0
	Pe	eggy Isom, CCR 541, RM	IK .	(15) issue know

LAS VEGAS DEVELOPME	INT FUND LLC			October 9, 2019
K	138/15	102/8 120/17	30/10 128/17	22/3 23/2 23/3 23/6
	lasted [1] 91/18	142/11 150/15	128/24 129/4	23/7 25/18 27/22
know [38]	lastly [2] 33/19	let's [11] 4/8 11/18		29/4 33/8 33/12
113/13 119/17	132/13	15/22 21/4 37/14	130/15 130/17	33/24 35/14 36/7
120/23 121/7	late [3] 14/15 80/4	58/23 94/14 97/10	131/6 131/8 132/12	36/9 37/1 37/6
121/19 122/2	142/9	105/2 140/2 153/24	132/14 132/17	37/10 37/18 37/21
122/13 124/14	later [10] 26/10	letter [11] 18/24	135/9 135/20 137/1	38/2 38/5 38/9 39/6
128/10 130/6	33/21 44/18 47/7	19/4 19/11 19/11	137/17 137/21	40/7 41/7 41/20
131/23 133/4	47/20 70/13 74/14	23/1 38/11 39/23	137/24 138/1	42/16 43/22 44/6
134/12 134/12		103/10 104/3 104/4		
134/16 134/21	100/25 152/10	139/12	142/23 143/2 143/7 143/10 145/18	44/14 44/19 45/7
136/13 137/16	152/12			47/1 48/11 48/13
138/2 138/20 139/1	law [22] 3/5 12/15		145/20 146/18	48/16 49/25 50/1
139/3 139/8 140/1	22/19 28/18 28/21	81/3	147/16 147/22	50/13 52/8 52/22
140/9 141/18	33/16 48/15 50/11	letters [2] 45/20	148/17 148/18	53/6 53/20 54/3
141/22 142/11	50/17 50/19 50/20	81/2	151/15 153/20	54/6 56/12 67/18
144/20 144/25	51/25 53/19 57/1	letting [1] 98/12	153/21 155/16	68/6 84/17 106/20
146/22 148/4	71/25 102/17	level [2] 12/5	lined [3] 26/14	121/9 121/10 130/9
149/17 149/18	107/13 107/15	58/10	111/15 111/16	130/17 132/3 132/6
150/7 151/20	120/24 121/21	liability [1] 52/1	lines [1] 138/3	135/9 136/6 136/7
151/20 155/13	126/23 127/1	Liberty [1] 76/4	linked [1] 49/24	136/8 136/10
knowing [3] 21/5	lawsuit [1] 88/11	lied [1] 54/25	list [3] 88/25 89/11	137/21 142/17
21/15 56/16	lawyer [1] 96/1	lien [1] 4/23	89/12	142/22 143/23
knowledge [1]	lawyers [2] 43/9	lieu [1] 126/11	listen [2] 93/15	151/15
78/6	69/22	light [3] 31/25	142/9	loans [1] 20/5
known [1] 56/3	laying [1] 20/21	56/1 149/18	listened [1] 35/8	location [1] 115/16
knows [6] 69/7	leads [1] 65/25	like [49] 5/6 5/18	listening [2] 48/4	lodge [2] 60/25
69/8 82/7 95/13	learned [1] 25/23	5/24 6/24 7/21 7/25	94/13	151/8
98/2 155/21	least [6] 30/6	9/5 12/15 12/23	litany [1] 34/18	lodged [1] 150/19
90/2 133/21	42/24 72/24 82/11	15/18 26/12 28/13	literally [2] 89/14	log [3] 127/2 127/7
L	93/4 149/23	31/14 42/14 51/4	153/8	127/9
Lacks [11 83/15	leave [1] 71/1	59/7 59/8 63/8	litigants [1] 20/7	logical [2] 47/15
Lacks [1] 83/15	left [10] 41/8 42/7	63/12 66/10 66/12	litigating [1]	48/23
ladies [1] 121/25	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14	litigating [1] 122/16	48/23 long [12] 10/19
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21	left [10] 41/8 42/7	63/12 66/10 66/12	litigating [1] 122/16	48/23
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15]	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7 45/15 48/8 48/10	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12 79/25 80/21 80/22 83/9 84/3 85/24	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7 45/15 48/8 48/10 49/25 53/20 115/5	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25 Legacy [4] 76/1	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6 114/10 114/22	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12 79/25 80/21 80/22	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11 51/15 68/25 83/22
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7 45/15 48/8 48/10 49/25 53/20 115/5 115/11	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25 Legacy [4] 76/1 76/23 81/4 82/14	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6 114/10 114/22 115/7 117/14 120/5	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12 79/25 80/21 80/22 83/9 84/3 85/24	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11 51/15 68/25 83/22 91/8 91/17
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7 45/15 48/8 48/10 49/25 53/20 115/5 115/11 large [2] 120/18	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25 Legacy [4] 76/1 76/23 81/4 82/14 legal [3] 33/10	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6 114/10 114/22 115/7 117/14 120/5 121/7 123/1 123/22	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12 79/25 80/21 80/22 83/9 84/3 85/24 86/1 94/5 97/11	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11 51/15 68/25 83/22 91/8 91/17 longer [1] 72/16
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7 45/15 48/8 48/10 49/25 53/20 115/5 115/11 large [2] 120/18 132/14	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25 Legacy [4] 76/1 76/23 81/4 82/14 legal [3] 33/10 48/22 50/11 legitimate [2]	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6 114/10 114/22 115/7 117/14 120/5 121/7 123/1 123/22 129/18 130/24 134/23 136/10	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12 79/25 80/21 80/22 83/9 84/3 85/24 86/1 94/5 97/11 112/2 113/2 148/3	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11 51/15 68/25 83/22 91/8 91/17 longer [1] 72/16 look [36] 27/20 39/16 44/5 53/17
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7 45/15 48/8 48/10 49/25 53/20 115/5 115/11 large [2] 120/18 132/14 LAS [22] 1/12 3/9	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25 Legacy [4] 76/1 76/23 81/4 82/14 legal [3] 33/10 48/22 50/11 legitimate [2] 143/25 144/3	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6 114/10 114/22 115/7 117/14 120/5 121/7 123/1 123/22 129/18 130/24 134/23 136/10 136/24 138/10	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12 79/25 80/21 80/22 83/9 84/3 85/24 86/1 94/5 97/11 112/2 113/2 148/3 little [19] 18/22 54/1 63/13 64/22	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11 51/15 68/25 83/22 91/8 91/17 longer [1] 72/16 look [36] 27/20 39/16 44/5 53/17 55/22 57/16 62/1
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7 45/15 48/8 48/10 49/25 53/20 115/5 115/11 large [2] 120/18 132/14 LAS [22] 1/12 3/9 3/17 19/2 19/17	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25 Legacy [4] 76/1 76/23 81/4 82/14 legal [3] 33/10 48/22 50/11 legitimate [2] 143/25 144/3 lend [4] 21/4 21/15	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6 114/10 114/22 115/7 117/14 120/5 121/7 123/1 123/22 129/18 130/24 134/23 136/10 136/24 138/10 142/8 142/14 145/2	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12 79/25 80/21 80/22 83/9 84/3 85/24 86/1 94/5 97/11 112/2 113/2 148/3 little [19] 18/22 54/1 63/13 64/22 64/23 65/1 66/9	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11 51/15 68/25 83/22 91/8 91/17 longer [1] 72/16 look [36] 27/20 39/16 44/5 53/17 55/22 57/16 62/1 62/14 88/22 95/22
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7 45/15 48/8 48/10 49/25 53/20 115/5 115/11 large [2] 120/18 132/14 LAS [22] 1/12 3/9 3/17 19/2 19/17 19/22 25/11 25/18	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25 Legacy [4] 76/1 76/23 81/4 82/14 legal [3] 33/10 48/22 50/11 legitimate [2] 143/25 144/3 lend [4] 21/4 21/15 54/21 54/22	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6 114/10 114/22 115/7 117/14 120/5 121/7 123/1 123/22 129/18 130/24 134/23 136/10 136/24 138/10 142/8 142/14 145/2 147/25 151/17	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12 79/25 80/21 80/22 83/9 84/3 85/24 86/1 94/5 97/11 112/2 113/2 148/3 little [19] 18/22 54/1 63/13 64/22 64/23 65/1 66/9 70/12 81/23 107/18	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11 51/15 68/25 83/22 91/8 91/17 longer [1] 72/16 look [36] 27/20 39/16 44/5 53/17 55/22 57/16 62/1 62/14 88/22 95/22 99/25 100/8 101/15
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7 45/15 48/8 48/10 49/25 53/20 115/5 115/11 large [2] 120/18 132/14 LAS [22] 1/12 3/9 3/17 19/2 19/17 19/22 25/11 25/18 31/8 31/21 32/16	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25 Legacy [4] 76/1 76/23 81/4 82/14 legal [3] 33/10 48/22 50/11 legitimate [2] 143/25 144/3 lend [4] 21/4 21/15 54/21 54/22 lender [10] 4/22	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6 114/10 114/22 115/7 117/14 120/5 121/7 123/1 123/22 129/18 130/24 134/23 136/10 136/24 138/10 142/8 142/14 145/2 147/25 151/17 likely [1] 66/16	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12 79/25 80/21 80/22 83/9 84/3 85/24 86/1 94/5 97/11 112/2 113/2 148/3 little [19] 18/22 54/1 63/13 64/22 64/23 65/1 66/9 70/12 81/23 107/18 113/21 119/21	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11 51/15 68/25 83/22 91/8 91/17 longer [1] 72/16 look [36] 27/20 39/16 44/5 53/17 55/22 57/16 62/1 62/14 88/22 95/22 99/25 100/8 101/15 102/1 102/13
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7 45/15 48/8 48/10 49/25 53/20 115/5 115/11 large [2] 120/18 132/14 LAS [22] 1/12 3/9 3/17 19/2 19/17 19/22 25/11 25/18 31/8 31/21 32/16 32/18 39/18 76/1	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25 Legacy [4] 76/1 76/23 81/4 82/14 legal [3] 33/10 48/22 50/11 legitimate [2] 143/25 144/3 lend [4] 21/4 21/15 54/21 54/22 lender [10] 4/22 19/16 47/22 106/22	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6 114/10 114/22 115/7 117/14 120/5 121/7 123/1 123/22 129/18 130/24 134/23 136/10 136/24 138/10 142/8 142/14 145/2 147/25 151/17 likely [1] 66/16 limit [4] 69/23	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12 79/25 80/21 80/22 83/9 84/3 85/24 86/1 94/5 97/11 112/2 113/2 148/3 little [19] 18/22 54/1 63/13 64/22 64/23 65/1 66/9 70/12 81/23 107/18 113/21 119/21 120/1 128/4 141/16	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11 51/15 68/25 83/22 91/8 91/17 longer [1] 72/16 look [36] 27/20 39/16 44/5 53/17 55/22 57/16 62/1 62/14 88/22 95/22 99/25 100/8 101/15 102/1 102/13 120/15 120/17
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7 45/15 48/8 48/10 49/25 53/20 115/5 115/11 large [2] 120/18 132/14 LAS [22] 1/12 3/9 3/17 19/2 19/17 19/22 25/11 25/18 31/8 31/21 32/16 32/18 39/18 76/1 76/25 81/8 82/17	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25 Legacy [4] 76/1 76/23 81/4 82/14 legal [3] 33/10 48/22 50/11 legitimate [2] 143/25 144/3 lend [4] 21/4 21/15 54/21 54/22 lender [10] 4/22 19/16 47/22 106/22 121/3 121/4 130/19	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6 114/10 114/22 115/7 117/14 120/5 121/7 123/1 123/22 129/18 130/24 134/23 136/10 136/24 138/10 142/8 142/14 145/2 147/25 151/17 likely [1] 66/16 limit [4] 69/23 81/24 93/4 149/12	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12 79/25 80/21 80/22 83/9 84/3 85/24 86/1 94/5 97/11 112/2 113/2 148/3 little [19] 18/22 54/1 63/13 64/22 64/23 65/1 66/9 70/12 81/23 107/18 113/21 119/21 120/1 128/4 141/16 142/12 143/13	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11 51/15 68/25 83/22 91/8 91/17 longer [1] 72/16 look [36] 27/20 39/16 44/5 53/17 55/22 57/16 62/1 62/14 88/22 95/22 99/25 100/8 101/15 102/1 102/13 120/15 120/17 121/22 128/12
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7 45/15 48/8 48/10 49/25 53/20 115/5 115/11 large [2] 120/18 132/14 LAS [22] 1/12 3/9 3/17 19/2 19/17 19/22 25/11 25/18 31/8 31/21 32/16 32/18 39/18 76/1 76/25 81/8 82/17 93/9 106/14 107/24	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25 Legacy [4] 76/1 76/23 81/4 82/14 legal [3] 33/10 48/22 50/11 legitimate [2] 143/25 144/3 lend [4] 21/4 21/15 54/21 54/22 lender [10] 4/22 19/16 47/22 106/22 121/3 121/4 130/19 130/20 130/25	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6 114/10 114/22 115/7 117/14 120/5 121/7 123/1 123/22 129/18 130/24 134/23 136/10 136/24 138/10 142/8 142/14 145/2 147/25 151/17 likely [1] 66/16 limit [4] 69/23 81/24 93/4 149/12 limitation [3] 93/2	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12 79/25 80/21 80/22 83/9 84/3 85/24 86/1 94/5 97/11 112/2 113/2 148/3 little [19] 18/22 54/1 63/13 64/22 64/23 65/1 66/9 70/12 81/23 107/18 113/21 119/21 120/1 128/4 141/16 142/12 143/13 149/10 151/1	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11 51/15 68/25 83/22 91/8 91/17 longer [1] 72/16 look [36] 27/20 39/16 44/5 53/17 55/22 57/16 62/1 62/14 88/22 95/22 99/25 100/8 101/15 102/1 102/13 120/15 120/17 121/22 128/12 129/14 129/15
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7 45/15 48/8 48/10 49/25 53/20 115/5 115/11 large [2] 120/18 132/14 LAS [22] 1/12 3/9 3/17 19/2 19/17 19/22 25/11 25/18 31/8 31/21 32/16 32/18 39/18 76/1 76/25 81/8 82/17 93/9 106/14 107/24 110/13 112/22	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25 Legacy [4] 76/1 76/23 81/4 82/14 legal [3] 33/10 48/22 50/11 legitimate [2] 143/25 144/3 lend [4] 21/4 21/15 54/21 54/22 lender [10] 4/22 19/16 47/22 106/22 121/3 121/4 130/19 130/20 130/25 131/1	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6 114/10 114/22 115/7 117/14 120/5 121/7 123/1 123/22 129/18 130/24 134/23 136/10 136/24 138/10 142/8 142/14 145/2 147/25 151/17 likely [1] 66/16 limit [4] 69/23 81/24 93/4 149/12 limitation [3] 93/2 141/4 143/18	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12 79/25 80/21 80/22 83/9 84/3 85/24 86/1 94/5 97/11 112/2 113/2 148/3 little [19] 18/22 54/1 63/13 64/22 64/23 65/1 66/9 70/12 81/23 107/18 113/21 119/21 120/1 128/4 141/16 142/12 143/13 149/10 151/1 live [1] 69/25	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11 51/15 68/25 83/22 91/8 91/17 longer [1] 72/16 look [36] 27/20 39/16 44/5 53/17 55/22 57/16 62/1 62/14 88/22 95/22 99/25 100/8 101/15 102/1 102/13 120/15 120/17 121/22 128/12 129/14 129/15 135/15 137/23
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7 45/15 48/8 48/10 49/25 53/20 115/5 115/11 large [2] 120/18 132/14 LAS [22] 1/12 3/9 3/17 19/2 19/17 19/22 25/11 25/18 31/8 31/21 32/16 32/18 39/18 76/1 76/25 81/8 82/17 93/9 106/14 107/24 110/13 112/22 laser [2] 123/1	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25 Legacy [4] 76/1 76/23 81/4 82/14 legal [3] 33/10 48/22 50/11 legitimate [2] 143/25 144/3 lend [4] 21/4 21/15 54/21 54/22 lender [10] 4/22 19/16 47/22 106/22 121/3 121/4 130/19 130/20 130/25 131/1 lender's [1] 143/22	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6 114/10 114/22 115/7 117/14 120/5 121/7 123/1 123/22 129/18 130/24 134/23 136/10 136/24 138/10 142/8 142/14 145/2 147/25 151/17 likely [1] 66/16 limit [4] 69/23 81/24 93/4 149/12 limitation [3] 93/2 141/4 143/18 limitations [2]	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12 79/25 80/21 80/22 83/9 84/3 85/24 86/1 94/5 97/11 112/2 113/2 148/3 little [19] 18/22 54/1 63/13 64/22 64/23 65/1 66/9 70/12 81/23 107/18 113/21 119/21 120/1 128/4 141/16 142/12 143/13 149/10 151/1 live [1] 69/25 lives [1] 21/25	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11 51/15 68/25 83/22 91/8 91/17 longer [1] 72/16 look [36] 27/20 39/16 44/5 53/17 55/22 57/16 62/1 62/14 88/22 95/22 99/25 100/8 101/15 102/1 102/13 120/15 120/17 121/22 128/12 129/14 129/15 135/15 137/23 142/18 144/22
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7 45/15 48/8 48/10 49/25 53/20 115/5 115/11 large [2] 120/18 132/14 LAS [22] 1/12 3/9 3/17 19/2 19/17 19/22 25/11 25/18 31/8 31/21 32/16 32/18 39/18 76/1 76/25 81/8 82/17 93/9 106/14 107/24 110/13 112/22 laser [2] 123/1 123/22	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25 Legacy [4] 76/1 76/23 81/4 82/14 legal [3] 33/10 48/22 50/11 legitimate [2] 143/25 144/3 lend [4] 21/4 21/15 54/21 54/22 lender [10] 4/22 19/16 47/22 106/22 121/3 121/4 130/19 130/20 130/25 131/1 lender's [1] 143/22 lenders [3] 20/4	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6 114/10 114/22 115/7 117/14 120/5 121/7 123/1 123/22 129/18 130/24 134/23 136/10 136/24 138/10 142/8 142/14 145/2 147/25 151/17 likely [1] 66/16 limit [4] 69/23 81/24 93/4 149/12 limitation [3] 93/2 141/4 143/18 limitations [2] 93/6 144/9	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12 79/25 80/21 80/22 83/9 84/3 85/24 86/1 94/5 97/11 112/2 113/2 148/3 little [19] 18/22 54/1 63/13 64/22 64/23 65/1 66/9 70/12 81/23 107/18 113/21 119/21 120/1 128/4 141/16 142/12 143/13 149/10 151/1 live [1] 69/25 lives [1] 21/25 LLC [9] 1/9 1/12	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11 51/15 68/25 83/22 91/8 91/17 longer [1] 72/16 look [36] 27/20 39/16 44/5 53/17 55/22 57/16 62/1 62/14 88/22 95/22 99/25 100/8 101/15 102/1 102/13 120/15 120/17 121/22 128/12 129/14 129/15 135/15 137/23 142/18 144/22 145/24 147/24
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7 45/15 48/8 48/10 49/25 53/20 115/5 115/11 large [2] 120/18 132/14 LAS [22] 1/12 3/9 3/17 19/2 19/17 19/22 25/11 25/18 31/8 31/21 32/16 32/18 39/18 76/1 76/25 81/8 82/17 93/9 106/14 107/24 110/13 112/22 laser [2] 123/1 123/22 laser-like [1]	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25 Legacy [4] 76/1 76/23 81/4 82/14 legal [3] 33/10 48/22 50/11 legitimate [2] 143/25 144/3 lend [4] 21/4 21/15 54/21 54/22 lender [10] 4/22 19/16 47/22 106/22 121/3 121/4 130/19 130/20 130/25 131/1 lender's [1] 143/22 lenders [3] 20/4 131/1 147/5	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6 114/10 114/22 115/7 117/14 120/5 121/7 123/1 123/22 129/18 130/24 134/23 136/10 136/24 138/10 142/8 142/14 145/2 147/25 151/17 likely [1] 66/16 limit [4] 69/23 81/24 93/4 149/12 limitation [3] 93/2 141/4 143/18 limitations [2] 93/6 144/9 limited [8] 81/25	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12 79/25 80/21 80/22 83/9 84/3 85/24 86/1 94/5 97/11 112/2 113/2 148/3 little [19] 18/22 54/1 63/13 64/22 64/23 65/1 66/9 70/12 81/23 107/18 113/21 119/21 120/1 128/4 141/16 142/12 143/13 149/10 151/1 live [1] 69/25 lives [1] 21/25 LLC [9] 1/9 1/12 77/1 82/16 82/25	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11 51/15 68/25 83/22 91/8 91/17 longer [1] 72/16 look [36] 27/20 39/16 44/5 53/17 55/22 57/16 62/1 62/14 88/22 95/22 99/25 100/8 101/15 102/1 102/13 120/15 120/17 121/22 128/12 129/14 129/15 135/15 137/23 142/18 144/22 145/24 147/24 148/23 149/23
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7 45/15 48/8 48/10 49/25 53/20 115/5 115/11 large [2] 120/18 132/14 LAS [22] 1/12 3/9 3/17 19/2 19/17 19/22 25/11 25/18 31/8 31/21 32/16 32/18 39/18 76/1 76/25 81/8 82/17 93/9 106/14 107/24 110/13 112/22 laser [2] 123/1 123/22 laser-like [1] 123/22	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25 Legacy [4] 76/1 76/23 81/4 82/14 legal [3] 33/10 48/22 50/11 legitimate [2] 143/25 144/3 lend [4] 21/4 21/15 54/21 54/22 lender [10] 4/22 19/16 47/22 106/22 121/3 121/4 130/19 130/20 130/25 131/1 lender's [1] 143/22 lenders [3] 20/4 131/1 147/5 lending [1] 22/12	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6 114/10 114/22 115/7 117/14 120/5 121/7 123/1 123/22 129/18 130/24 134/23 136/10 136/24 138/10 142/8 142/14 145/2 147/25 151/17 likely [1] 66/16 limit [4] 69/23 81/24 93/4 149/12 limitation [3] 93/2 141/4 143/18 limitations [2] 93/6 144/9 limited [8] 81/25 85/23 115/15 141/8	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12 79/25 80/21 80/22 83/9 84/3 85/24 86/1 94/5 97/11 112/2 113/2 148/3 little [19] 18/22 54/1 63/13 64/22 64/23 65/1 66/9 70/12 81/23 107/18 113/21 119/21 120/1 128/4 141/16 142/12 143/13 149/10 151/1 live [1] 69/25 lives [1] 21/25 LLC [9] 1/9 1/12 77/1 82/16 82/25 89/2 107/24 114/6	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11 51/15 68/25 83/22 91/8 91/17 longer [1] 72/16 look [36] 27/20 39/16 44/5 53/17 55/22 57/16 62/1 62/14 88/22 95/22 99/25 100/8 101/15 102/1 102/13 120/15 120/17 121/22 128/12 129/14 129/15 135/15 137/23 142/18 144/22 145/24 147/24 148/23 149/23 150/11 150/12
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7 45/15 48/8 48/10 49/25 53/20 115/5 115/11 large [2] 120/18 132/14 LAS [22] 1/12 3/9 3/17 19/2 19/17 19/22 25/11 25/18 31/8 31/21 32/16 32/18 39/18 76/1 76/25 81/8 82/17 93/9 106/14 107/24 110/13 112/22 laser [2] 123/1 123/22 laser-like [1] 123/22 last [15] 7/17	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25 Legacy [4] 76/1 76/23 81/4 82/14 legal [3] 33/10 48/22 50/11 legitimate [2] 143/25 144/3 lend [4] 21/4 21/15 54/21 54/22 lender [10] 4/22 19/16 47/22 106/22 121/3 121/4 130/19 130/20 130/25 131/1 lender's [1] 143/22 lenders [3] 20/4 131/1 147/5 lending [1] 22/12 lengthy [1] 38/10	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6 114/10 114/22 115/7 117/14 120/5 121/7 123/1 123/22 129/18 130/24 134/23 136/10 136/24 138/10 142/8 142/14 145/2 147/25 151/17 likely [1] 66/16 limit [4] 69/23 81/24 93/4 149/12 limitation [3] 93/2 141/4 143/18 limitations [2] 93/6 144/9 limited [8] 81/25 85/23 115/15 141/8 141/9 141/10 147/3	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12 79/25 80/21 80/22 83/9 84/3 85/24 86/1 94/5 97/11 112/2 113/2 148/3 little [19] 18/22 54/1 63/13 64/22 64/23 65/1 66/9 70/12 81/23 107/18 113/21 119/21 120/1 128/4 141/16 142/12 143/13 149/10 151/1 live [1] 69/25 lives [1] 21/25 LLC [9] 1/9 1/12 77/1 82/16 82/25 89/2 107/24 114/6 114/8	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11 51/15 68/25 83/22 91/8 91/17 longer [1] 72/16 look [36] 27/20 39/16 44/5 53/17 55/22 57/16 62/1 62/14 88/22 95/22 99/25 100/8 101/15 102/1 102/13 120/15 120/17 121/22 128/12 129/14 129/15 135/15 137/23 142/18 144/22 145/24 147/24 148/23 149/23 150/11 150/12 150/16 151/5 151/8
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7 45/15 48/8 48/10 49/25 53/20 115/5 115/11 large [2] 120/18 132/14 LAS [22] 1/12 3/9 3/17 19/2 19/17 19/22 25/11 25/18 31/8 31/21 32/16 32/18 39/18 76/1 76/25 81/8 82/17 93/9 106/14 107/24 110/13 112/22 laser [2] 123/1 123/22 laser-like [1] 123/22 last [15] 7/17 24/16 77/11 82/20	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25 Legacy [4] 76/1 76/23 81/4 82/14 legal [3] 33/10 48/22 50/11 legitimate [2] 143/25 144/3 lend [4] 21/4 21/15 54/21 54/22 lender [10] 4/22 19/16 47/22 106/22 121/3 121/4 130/19 130/20 130/25 131/1 lender's [1] 143/22 lenders [3] 20/4 131/1 147/5 lending [1] 22/12 lengthy [1] 38/10 lent [1] 86/18	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6 114/10 114/22 115/7 117/14 120/5 121/7 123/1 123/22 129/18 130/24 134/23 136/10 136/24 138/10 142/8 142/14 145/2 147/25 151/17 likely [1] 66/16 limit [4] 69/23 81/24 93/4 149/12 limitation [3] 93/2 141/4 143/18 limitations [2] 93/6 144/9 limited [8] 81/25 85/23 115/15 141/8 141/9 141/10 147/3 147/3	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12 79/25 80/21 80/22 83/9 84/3 85/24 86/1 94/5 97/11 112/2 113/2 148/3 little [19] 18/22 54/1 63/13 64/22 64/23 65/1 66/9 70/12 81/23 107/18 113/21 119/21 120/1 128/4 141/16 142/12 143/13 149/10 151/1 live [1] 69/25 lives [1] 21/25 LLC [9] 1/9 1/12 77/1 82/16 82/25 89/2 107/24 114/6 114/8 lo [1] 56/1	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11 51/15 68/25 83/22 91/8 91/17 longer [1] 72/16 look [36] 27/20 39/16 44/5 53/17 55/22 57/16 62/1 62/14 88/22 95/22 99/25 100/8 101/15 102/1 102/13 120/15 120/17 121/22 128/12 129/14 129/15 135/15 137/23 142/18 144/22 145/24 147/24 148/23 149/23 150/11 150/12 150/16 151/5 151/8 151/12 155/15
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7 45/15 48/8 48/10 49/25 53/20 115/5 115/11 large [2] 120/18 132/14 LAS [22] 1/12 3/9 3/17 19/2 19/17 19/22 25/11 25/18 31/8 31/21 32/16 32/18 39/18 76/1 76/25 81/8 82/17 93/9 106/14 107/24 110/13 112/22 laser [2] 123/1 123/22 laser-like [1] 123/22 last [15] 7/17 24/16 77/11 82/20 99/3 108/17 111/10	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25 Legacy [4] 76/1 76/23 81/4 82/14 legal [3] 33/10 48/22 50/11 legitimate [2] 143/25 144/3 lend [4] 21/4 21/15 54/21 54/22 lender [10] 4/22 19/16 47/22 106/22 121/3 121/4 130/19 130/20 130/25 131/1 lender's [1] 143/22 lenders [3] 20/4 131/1 147/5 lending [1] 22/12 lengthy [1] 38/10 lent [1] 86/18 less [1] 143/3	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6 114/10 114/22 115/7 117/14 120/5 121/7 123/1 123/22 129/18 130/24 134/23 136/10 136/24 138/10 142/8 142/14 145/2 147/25 151/17 likely [1] 66/16 limit [4] 69/23 81/24 93/4 149/12 limitation [3] 93/2 141/4 143/18 limitations [2] 93/6 144/9 limited [8] 81/25 85/23 115/15 141/8 141/9 141/10 147/3 147/3 limits [2] 21/3 89/4	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12 79/25 80/21 80/22 83/9 84/3 85/24 86/1 94/5 97/11 112/2 113/2 148/3 little [19] 18/22 54/1 63/13 64/22 64/23 65/1 66/9 70/12 81/23 107/18 113/21 119/21 120/1 128/4 141/16 142/12 143/13 149/10 151/1 live [1] 69/25 lives [1] 21/25 LLC [9] 1/9 1/12 77/1 82/16 82/25 89/2 107/24 114/6 114/8 lo [1] 56/1 loan [76] 18/25	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11 51/15 68/25 83/22 91/8 91/17 longer [1] 72/16 look [36] 27/20 39/16 44/5 53/17 55/22 57/16 62/1 62/14 88/22 95/22 99/25 100/8 101/15 102/1 102/13 120/15 120/17 121/22 128/12 129/14 129/15 135/15 137/23 142/18 144/22 145/24 147/24 148/23 149/23 150/11 150/12 150/16 151/5 151/8 151/12 155/15 looked [8] 48/8
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7 45/15 48/8 48/10 49/25 53/20 115/5 115/11 large [2] 120/18 132/14 LAS [22] 1/12 3/9 3/17 19/2 19/17 19/22 25/11 25/18 31/8 31/21 32/16 32/18 39/18 76/1 76/25 81/8 82/17 93/9 106/14 107/24 110/13 112/22 laser [2] 123/1 123/22 laser-like [1] 123/22 last [15] 7/17 24/16 77/11 82/20 99/3 108/17 111/10 118/20 125/15	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25 Legacy [4] 76/1 76/23 81/4 82/14 legal [3] 33/10 48/22 50/11 legitimate [2] 143/25 144/3 lend [4] 21/4 21/15 54/21 54/22 lender [10] 4/22 19/16 47/22 106/22 121/3 121/4 130/19 130/20 130/25 131/1 lender's [1] 143/22 lenders [3] 20/4 131/1 147/5 lending [1] 22/12 lengthy [1] 38/10 lent [1] 86/18 less [1] 143/3 let [12] 14/2 56/11	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6 114/10 114/22 115/7 117/14 120/5 121/7 123/1 123/22 129/18 130/24 134/23 136/10 136/24 138/10 142/8 142/14 145/2 147/25 151/17 likely [1] 66/16 limit [4] 69/23 81/24 93/4 149/12 limitation [3] 93/2 141/4 143/18 limitations [2] 93/6 144/9 limited [8] 81/25 85/23 115/15 141/8 141/9 141/10 147/3 147/3 limits [2] 21/3 89/4 Linda [3] 76/23	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12 79/25 80/21 80/22 83/9 84/3 85/24 86/1 94/5 97/11 112/2 113/2 148/3 little [19] 18/22 54/1 63/13 64/22 64/23 65/1 66/9 70/12 81/23 107/18 113/21 119/21 120/1 128/4 141/16 142/12 143/13 149/10 151/1 live [1] 69/25 lives [1] 21/25 LLC [9] 1/9 1/12 77/1 82/16 82/25 89/2 107/24 114/6 114/8 lo [1] 56/1 loan [76] 18/25 19/2 19/7 19/15	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11 51/15 68/25 83/22 91/8 91/17 longer [1] 72/16 look [36] 27/20 39/16 44/5 53/17 55/22 57/16 62/1 62/14 88/22 95/22 99/25 100/8 101/15 102/1 102/13 120/15 120/17 121/22 128/12 129/14 129/15 135/15 137/23 142/18 144/22 145/24 147/24 148/23 149/23 150/11 150/12 150/16 151/5 151/8 151/12 155/15 looked [8] 48/8 59/3 63/3 63/12
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7 45/15 48/8 48/10 49/25 53/20 115/5 115/11 large [2] 120/18 132/14 LAS [22] 1/12 3/9 3/17 19/2 19/17 19/22 25/11 25/18 31/8 31/21 32/16 32/18 39/18 76/1 76/25 81/8 82/17 93/9 106/14 107/24 110/13 112/22 laser [2] 123/1 123/22 laser-like [1] 123/22 last [15] 7/17 24/16 77/11 82/20 99/3 108/17 111/10 118/20 125/15 126/2 132/15 134/5	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25 Legacy [4] 76/1 76/23 81/4 82/14 legal [3] 33/10 48/22 50/11 legitimate [2] 143/25 144/3 lend [4] 21/4 21/15 54/21 54/22 lender [10] 4/22 19/16 47/22 106/22 121/3 121/4 130/19 130/20 130/25 131/1 lender's [1] 143/22 lenders [3] 20/4 131/1 147/5 lending [1] 22/12 lengthy [1] 38/10 lent [1] 86/18 less [1] 143/3 let [12] 14/2 56/11 59/25 62/1 80/2	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6 114/10 114/22 115/7 117/14 120/5 121/7 123/1 123/22 129/18 130/24 134/23 136/10 136/24 138/10 142/8 142/14 145/2 147/25 151/17 likely [1] 66/16 limit [4] 69/23 81/24 93/4 149/12 limitation [3] 93/2 141/4 143/18 limitations [2] 93/6 144/9 limited [8] 81/25 85/23 115/15 141/8 141/9 141/10 147/3 147/3 limits [2] 21/3 89/4 Linda [3] 76/23 82/15 106/10	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12 79/25 80/21 80/22 83/9 84/3 85/24 86/1 94/5 97/11 112/2 113/2 148/3 little [19] 18/22 54/1 63/13 64/22 64/23 65/1 66/9 70/12 81/23 107/18 113/21 119/21 120/1 128/4 141/16 142/12 143/13 149/10 151/1 live [1] 69/25 lives [1] 21/25 LLC [9] 1/9 1/12 77/1 82/16 82/25 89/2 107/24 114/6 114/8 lo [1] 56/1 loan [76] 18/25 19/2 19/7 19/15 19/19 20/3 20/10	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11 51/15 68/25 83/22 91/8 91/17 longer [1] 72/16 look [36] 27/20 39/16 44/5 53/17 55/22 57/16 62/1 62/14 88/22 95/22 99/25 100/8 101/15 102/1 102/13 120/15 120/17 121/22 128/12 129/14 129/15 135/15 137/23 142/18 144/22 145/24 147/24 148/23 149/23 150/11 150/12 150/16 151/5 151/8 151/12 155/15 looked [8] 48/8 59/3 63/3 63/12 95/21 96/13 148/5
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7 45/15 48/8 48/10 49/25 53/20 115/5 115/11 large [2] 120/18 132/14 LAS [22] 1/12 3/9 3/17 19/2 19/17 19/22 25/11 25/18 31/8 31/21 32/16 32/18 39/18 76/1 76/25 81/8 82/17 93/9 106/14 107/24 110/13 112/22 laser [2] 123/1 123/22 laser-like [1] 123/22 last [15] 7/17 24/16 77/11 82/20 99/3 108/17 111/10 118/20 125/15	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25 Legacy [4] 76/1 76/23 81/4 82/14 legal [3] 33/10 48/22 50/11 legitimate [2] 143/25 144/3 lend [4] 21/4 21/15 54/21 54/22 lender [10] 4/22 19/16 47/22 106/22 121/3 121/4 130/19 130/20 130/25 131/1 lender's [1] 143/22 lenders [3] 20/4 131/1 147/5 lending [1] 22/12 lengthy [1] 38/10 lent [1] 86/18 less [1] 143/3 let [12] 14/2 56/11	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6 114/10 114/22 115/7 117/14 120/5 121/7 123/1 123/22 129/18 130/24 134/23 136/10 136/24 138/10 142/8 142/14 145/2 147/25 151/17 likely [1] 66/16 limit [4] 69/23 81/24 93/4 149/12 limitation [3] 93/2 141/4 143/18 limitations [2] 93/6 144/9 limited [8] 81/25 85/23 115/15 141/8 141/9 141/10 147/3 147/3 limits [2] 21/3 89/4 Linda [3] 76/23	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12 79/25 80/21 80/22 83/9 84/3 85/24 86/1 94/5 97/11 112/2 113/2 148/3 little [19] 18/22 54/1 63/13 64/22 64/23 65/1 66/9 70/12 81/23 107/18 113/21 119/21 120/1 128/4 141/16 142/12 143/13 149/10 151/1 live [1] 69/25 lives [1] 21/25 LLC [9] 1/9 1/12 77/1 82/16 82/25 89/2 107/24 114/6 114/8 lo [1] 56/1 loan [76] 18/25 19/2 19/7 19/15	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11 51/15 68/25 83/22 91/8 91/17 longer [1] 72/16 look [36] 27/20 39/16 44/5 53/17 55/22 57/16 62/1 62/14 88/22 95/22 99/25 100/8 101/15 102/1 102/13 120/15 120/17 121/22 128/12 129/14 129/15 135/15 137/23 142/18 144/22 145/24 147/24 148/23 149/23 150/11 150/12 150/16 151/5 151/8 151/12 155/15 looked [8] 48/8 59/3 63/3 63/12
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7 45/15 48/8 48/10 49/25 53/20 115/5 115/11 large [2] 120/18 132/14 LAS [22] 1/12 3/9 3/17 19/2 19/17 19/22 25/11 25/18 31/8 31/21 32/16 32/18 39/18 76/1 76/25 81/8 82/17 93/9 106/14 107/24 110/13 112/22 laser [2] 123/1 123/22 laser-like [1] 123/22 last [15] 7/17 24/16 77/11 82/20 99/3 108/17 111/10 118/20 125/15 126/2 132/15 134/5	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25 Legacy [4] 76/1 76/23 81/4 82/14 legal [3] 33/10 48/22 50/11 legitimate [2] 143/25 144/3 lend [4] 21/4 21/15 54/21 54/22 lender [10] 4/22 19/16 47/22 106/22 121/3 121/4 130/19 130/20 130/25 131/1 lender's [1] 143/22 lenders [3] 20/4 131/1 147/5 lending [1] 22/12 lengthy [1] 38/10 lent [1] 86/18 less [1] 143/3 let [12] 14/2 56/11 59/25 62/1 80/2	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6 114/10 114/22 115/7 117/14 120/5 121/7 123/1 123/22 129/18 130/24 134/23 136/10 136/24 138/10 142/8 142/14 145/2 147/25 151/17 likely [1] 66/16 limit [4] 69/23 81/24 93/4 149/12 limitation [3] 93/2 141/4 143/18 limitations [2] 93/6 144/9 limited [8] 81/25 85/23 115/15 141/8 141/9 141/10 147/3 147/3 limits [2] 21/3 89/4 Linda [3] 76/23 82/15 106/10	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12 79/25 80/21 80/22 83/9 84/3 85/24 86/1 94/5 97/11 112/2 113/2 148/3 little [19] 18/22 54/1 63/13 64/22 64/23 65/1 66/9 70/12 81/23 107/18 113/21 119/21 120/1 128/4 141/16 142/12 143/13 149/10 151/1 live [1] 69/25 lives [1] 21/25 LLC [9] 1/9 1/12 77/1 82/16 82/25 89/2 107/24 114/6 114/8 lo [1] 56/1 loan [76] 18/25 19/2 19/7 19/15 19/19 20/3 20/10	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11 51/15 68/25 83/22 91/8 91/17 longer [1] 72/16 look [36] 27/20 39/16 44/5 53/17 55/22 57/16 62/1 62/14 88/22 95/22 99/25 100/8 101/15 102/1 102/13 120/15 120/17 121/22 128/12 129/14 129/15 135/15 137/23 142/18 144/22 145/24 147/24 148/23 149/23 150/11 150/12 150/16 151/5 151/8 151/12 155/15 looked [8] 48/8 59/3 63/3 63/12 95/21 96/13 148/5
ladies [1] 121/25 laid [3] 18/21 19/19 127/24 language [8] 45/7 45/15 48/8 48/10 49/25 53/20 115/5 115/11 large [2] 120/18 132/14 LAS [22] 1/12 3/9 3/17 19/2 19/17 19/22 25/11 25/18 31/8 31/21 32/16 32/18 39/18 76/1 76/25 81/8 82/17 93/9 106/14 107/24 110/13 112/22 laser [2] 123/1 123/22 laser-like [1] 123/22 last [15] 7/17 24/16 77/11 82/20 99/3 108/17 111/10 118/20 125/15 126/2 132/15 134/5	left [10] 41/8 42/7 42/12 42/20 42/21 43/22 44/23 44/24 46/3 73/25 Legacy [4] 76/1 76/23 81/4 82/14 legal [3] 33/10 48/22 50/11 legitimate [2] 143/25 144/3 lend [4] 21/4 21/15 54/21 54/22 lender [10] 4/22 19/16 47/22 106/22 121/3 121/4 130/19 130/20 130/25 131/1 lender's [1] 143/22 lenders [3] 20/4 131/1 147/5 lending [1] 22/12 lengthy [1] 38/10 lent [1] 86/18 less [1] 143/3 let [12] 14/2 56/11 59/25 62/1 80/2 85/9 94/22 97/4	63/12 66/10 66/12 79/22 93/16 100/14 105/12 108/5 109/6 109/7 112/5 114/6 114/10 114/22 115/7 117/14 120/5 121/7 123/1 123/22 129/18 130/24 134/23 136/10 136/24 138/10 142/8 142/14 145/2 147/25 151/17 likely [1] 66/16 limit [4] 69/23 81/24 93/4 149/12 limitation [3] 93/2 141/4 143/18 limitations [2] 93/6 144/9 limited [8] 81/25 85/23 115/15 141/8 141/9 141/10 147/3 147/3 limits [2] 21/3 89/4 Linda [3] 76/23 82/15 106/10	litigating [1] 122/16 litigation [15] 11/24 20/8 79/12 79/25 80/21 80/22 83/9 84/3 85/24 86/1 94/5 97/11 112/2 113/2 148/3 little [19] 18/22 54/1 63/13 64/22 64/23 65/1 66/9 70/12 81/23 107/18 113/21 119/21 120/1 128/4 141/16 142/12 143/13 149/10 151/1 live [1] 69/25 lives [1] 21/25 LLC [9] 1/9 1/12 77/1 82/16 82/25 89/2 107/24 114/6 114/8 lo [1] 56/1 loan [76] 18/25 19/2 19/7 19/15 19/19 20/3 20/10 20/13 20/14 22/2	48/23 long [12] 10/19 17/22 25/22 29/21 38/23 40/9 43/11 51/15 68/25 83/22 91/8 91/17 longer [1] 72/16 look [36] 27/20 39/16 44/5 53/17 55/22 57/16 62/1 62/14 88/22 95/22 99/25 100/8 101/15 102/1 102/13 120/15 120/17 121/22 128/12 129/14 129/15 135/15 137/23 142/18 144/22 145/24 147/24 148/23 149/23 150/11 150/12 150/16 151/5 151/8 151/12 155/15 looked [8] 48/8 59/3 63/3 63/12 95/21 96/13 148/5

LAS VEGAS DEVELOPINE	INT TOND LLC			October 9, 2013
L	15/16 15/16 19/25	96/16	59/25 61/23 62/1	members [3]
looking [17] 14/6	20/22 20/25 24/7	marketing [13]	62/16 62/23 65/20	34/14 89/1 95/17
22/19 26/11 42/5	28/6 29/17 31/25	25/19 25/22 25/24	71/9 79/5 79/13	memory [1] 39/15
43/19 53/25 80/19	32/1 34/16 34/22	26/1 31/10 31/22	80/2 83/23 83/24	mentioned [4]
88/24 88/25 90/1	35/3 35/6 36/20	32/7 32/22 39/19	84/1 85/9 85/18	80/3 109/2 134/9
100/18 122/21	37/20 42/23 42/25	46/11 49/8 89/16	90/1 94/13 94/13	139/10
128/21 135/4	44/18 47/7 47/15	110/17	95/23 95/24 96/4	merits [1] 63/18
143/11 147/12	48/7 48/11 48/17	marketings [1]	96/4 100/7 112/17	message [1]
151/12	49/2 52/18 53/18	89/15	112/20 114/11	117/20
looks [4] 46/24	56/12 56/20 58/7	Masonry [1]	120/17 120/21	met [1] 21/6
66/10 66/12 129/8	66/13 66/19 67/4	145/11	125/11 129/7	method [1] 133/19
Los [1] 14/16	67/5 69/3 69/12	master [2] 116/4	134/20 139/10	might [20] 42/8
Los Angeles [1]	70/17 70/17 71/11	116/5	139/25 142/11	42/8 52/11 54/14
14/16	84/20 86/5 94/4	material [1] 77/5	143/8 144/13	58/11 70/8 73/23
lose [1] 64/25	98/21 100/8 102/22	matter [15] 7/5	145/22 145/24	73/24 79/2 92/8
lost [1] 117/20	103/7 109/23	7/6 20/6 22/18	146/23 148/23	101/8 112/4 113/20
lot [15] 11/4 11/20	117/22 120/13	23/17 41/3 48/15	149/22 150/16	122/12 124/12
12/7 13/7 17/16	123/8 123/18	53/19 57/1 77/10	152/20 152/21	124/18 124/20
24/23 34/12 50/20	129/14 129/14	92/20 93/21 99/18	152/23 153/1 156/6	136/21 145/3
62/20 64/1 73/3	132/22 135/16	127/3 157/6	156/8	155/22
105/11 133/16	136/22 140/15	matters [1] 62/9	mean [70] 7/16	million [12] 20/23
137/11 146/9	141/14 142/1	may [29] 8/17 9/22		20/24 37/12 37/13
love [3] 7/16 73/24	149/13 150/12	17/23 20/20 21/13	12/16 15/25 16/4	37/13 37/20 55/9
94/22	150/16 153/2	26/7 26/16 31/10	25/5 26/4 29/8 34/1	55/14 117/19
low [1] 26/5	153/17 153/20	31/12 31/18 32/6	34/5 34/8 40/2 42/7	132/17 137/1 138/5
low-hanging [1]	154/16 154/20	37/11 37/22 40/18	42/9 49/3 49/12	millions [2] 37/14
26/5	154/22	46/14 49/9 63/17	49/13 50/12 51/4	93/22
LVD [23] 15/16	makes [14] 7/25	65/1 66/6 71/11	51/11 51/23 54/14	mind [7] 35/13
21/15 21/18 21/19	8/2 20/16 30/13	77/17 78/23 80/8	59/1 59/10 61/20	58/10 62/5 62/12
32/10 32/22 32/23	37/5 44/11 44/12	92/4 108/14 111/12	62/10 68/23 69/4	70/11 150/20
46/20 67/17 77/23	47/5 67/22 94/2	134/20 149/12	69/5 69/17 69/19	151/21
77/25 78/4 78/5	119/24 129/1 136/3	153/5	70/2 72/8 72/10	minimum [2]
78/9 86/14 86/19	154/15	May 12 [6] 20/20 21/13 26/7 26/16	72/15 72/16 86/1 88/19 89/14 91/18	26/13 111/14
86/19 97/13 106/19	making [8] 40/11 44/17 45/22 92/8	108/14 111/12	92/6 92/12 95/24	minute [3] 10/22 152/24 154/5
106/22 121/18	108/10 116/1		96/2 98/9 101/4	minutes [6] 40/23
130/4 132/3	125/12 140/14	May 2012 [1] 31/18	102/11 106/8	65/17 65/17 127/25
LVDF [2] 13/23	MANAGEMENT [1]		107/11 106/8	147/23 152/1
39/18	1/9	May 2016 [1] 32/6 maybe [29] 5/22	115/25 117/14	misallocation [1]
LVDF's [1] 4/21	manager [3] 75/24		120/15 124/2	19/14
M	76/21 90/24	12/10 14/1 14/7	127/23 128/7 129/6	misappropriated
	managers [1] 89/1	15/19 16/2 16/19	130/10 137/5 140/6	[1] 106/13
ma'am [4] 64/11	manner [1] 99/21	39/5 46/18 48/18	140/10 140/13	mislead [1] 124/15
64/17 74/15 100/20	many [11] 29/22	56/2 57/23 58/11	141/17 142/18	misread [2] 24/5
made [21] 23/24	52/12 69/22 71/21	65/17 72/16 73/11	143/9 144/6 145/22	24/5
23/25 24/3 24/6	72/5 81/14 82/4	73/12 79/5 99/8	151/25	misrepresentation
24/18 29/24 37/8	108/11 111/7 142/3	101/4 110/3 114/4	meaningful [1]	[3] 19/13 26/22
45/3 57/7 64/1	153/17	125/21 144/22	122/4	27/1
66/13 79/13 83/13	March [5] 64/21	151/25	means [2] 5/10	misrepresentation
86/6 91/20 92/21	77/1 81/25 82/18	me [75] 7/10 7/10	52/14	s [1] 21/10
106/15 108/16	108/1	8/20 9/8 11/9 11/12	meant [1] 12/14	missed [2] 131/17
111/6 120/22 122/8	March 2012 [4]	13/2 13/25 14/7	medical [1] 115/6	139/24
mail [1] 101/23	77/1 81/25 82/18	16/3 24/19 28/10	meet [4] 70/5	missing [4] 42/18
main [3] 60/9	108/1	30/24 34/16 38/15	98/17 102/3 102/20	68/18 87/6 141/15
81/19 128/6	March 5 [1] 64/21	40/19 43/1 45/6	meeting [4] 26/10	misspending [1]
majority [2]	mark [2] 45/13	46/2 48/5 48/14	60/17 96/11 111/11	19/13
120/18 148/15	45/24	50/10 54/25 55/2	member [3] 75/24	misuse [1] 114/5
make [72] 5/25	marketed [1]	56/10 56/11 58/15	76/20 90/24	misused [1] 97/25
11/7 13/13 15/6		2, 2 22, == 00, 20	.,	
	<u> </u>	 eaav Isom CCR 541 RM	 ID	(17) lookina - misusea

LAS VEGAS DEVELOPME	INT FUND LLC			October 9, 2019
М	most [7] 68/20	57/18 58/1 67/9	120/22	5/21 13/9 13/14
model [1] 90/10	76/8 98/11 112/15	68/1 70/22 72/5	Mr. Carter [1]	20/19 23/20 23/23
modifying [1]	131/17 134/11	72/25 75/6 75/9	96/10	24/1 24/2 27/5 34/4
104/11	151/2	76/9 77/25 78/11	Mr. Dziubla [34]	35/11 39/11 40/14
Monday [5] 8/2	mostly [2] 111/20	79/5 79/9 80/8	23/13 25/17 25/23	40/24 41/5 41/18
8/5 8/7 152/21	119/20	80/11 80/19 81/1	26/11 39/14 75/6	42/10 43/23 44/25
152/25	motion [62] 4/19	81/5 82/14 82/15	75/9 80/8 80/11	45/22 48/21 49/4
monetary [3]	4/20 4/25 5/10 6/3	85/6 85/14 85/21	87/13 90/14 90/17	49/10 49/23 50/5
19/20 19/24 134/14	6/15 6/24 7/9 7/21	86/21 87/13 88/5	91/18 92/18 92/19	50/7 50/15 51/14
money [51] 19/17	8/21 9/3 9/12 9/13	88/13 89/24 90/1	93/9 94/6 94/11	51/22 54/20 54/24
20/23 21/1 21/4	9/14 12/15 13/22	90/8 90/14 90/17	95/9 96/15 106/10	54/24 57/6 60/8
21/12 21/16 21/20	15/12 16/1 16/3	91/13 91/18 92/18	108/10 108/15	62/13 63/25 64/19
21/21 25/21 26/12	16/9 16/16 17/7	92/19 93/9 93/9	110/6 110/14	65/8 65/16 66/21
31/9 31/20 32/1	17/25 18/11 25/1	94/6 94/11 95/9	110/15 110/17	68/1 68/7 68/24
32/4 32/6 32/14	30/11 40/12 48/9	95/12 95/25 96/10	111/6 111/12	73/23 80/24 81/4
32/16 32/18 32/25	52/16 53/17 55/16	96/10 96/15 97/3	112/15 113/8 130/4	81/15 83/12 84/1
32/25 33/13 39/22	67/1 71/25 74/5	98/16 98/19 102/5	134/8 135/24	84/4 92/4 95/24
46/6 46/7 46/9	74/22 81/17 84/14	103/8 106/10	Mr. Dziubla's [7]	99/20 100/11
46/10 46/12 47/10	87/18 88/23 99/8	108/10 108/15	76/9 81/1 82/14	101/14 102/20
47/11 49/7 54/20	104/7 104/13 109/2	108/19 110/6	88/5 88/13 89/24	108/11 109/15
55/4 55/23 78/7	111/1 115/20	110/14 110/15	90/8	111/23 112/14
80/23 80/24 84/24	116/15 119/13	110/17 110/20	Mr. Evans [2]	113/14 113/25
86/18 86/19 106/21	119/17 123/14	111/6 111/12	22/22 23/8	115/5 115/13 116/1
106/24 108/12	126/4 127/14 127/17 127/24	112/15 113/8 114/15 120/3	Mr. Fleming [3] 26/11 93/9 110/20	116/14 117/1 121/8 122/5 124/15
113/13 113/14	128/14 128/15	120/22 121/19	Mr. Fleming's [2]	125/21 127/25
120/23 121/2 121/4	138/25 139/16	123/18 126/15	81/5 82/15	128/14 128/16
121/15 121/18	139/18 139/21	126/20 130/4	Mr. Greer [21]	133/22 134/25
122/13 130/3	140/1 140/22 141/3	133/25 134/8 134/9	23/22 23/24 24/19	135/18 138/9
monies [9] 21/17	motion's [1] 80/4	135/4 135/24	25/8 31/5 39/2	138/11 138/21
23/5 31/12 32/11	motions [13] 1/16	137/10 138/15	41/20 49/4 54/10	139/11 141/19
106/13 106/14	11/9 12/11 13/5	139/25 140/17	72/25 79/9 80/19	149/2 149/3 152/23
114/9 124/13	17/8 17/22 18/3	141/13 142/4 145/2	85/6 85/14 91/13	155/18 157/9
131/10	70/15 70/15 73/25	145/21 147/24	98/19 103/8 133/25	157/11 157/14
month [4] 12/11 20/1 65/5 73/9	74/3 74/19 105/14	148/21 149/25	134/9 149/25	157/14
months [6] 11/14	move [21] 5/13	150/19 151/6	151/11	myself [2] 63/3
64/22 72/13 93/25	6/2 6/11 6/14 7/1	151/11 154/22	Mr. Greer's [1]	81/18
97/14 138/25	10/4 10/5 10/11	Mr. Aldrich [47]	10/14	N
Morales [9] 127/15	11/12 13/24 16/17	4/19 10/6 11/16	Mr. Keller [1]	
127/21 128/8	21/4 3//6 4//22	15/24 22/14 30/1	96/10	Nam [1] 80/14
128/17 131/20	60/14 64/23 66/2	31/7 32/7 38/13	Mr. Piazza [4] 32/6	
134/7 135/21	66/15 73/1 105/2	46/17 48/25 53/15	77/25 95/12 145/2	95/11 99/3 157/14
145/10 146/4	117/2	57/18 58/1 67/9	Mr. Piazza's [1]	named [2] 107/7
more [28] 26/12	moved [4] 10/9	68/1 70/22 72/5	22/8	121/12 names [24] 77/22
30/24 40/17 43/1	10/10 11/11 11/11	78/11 79/5 85/21	Mrs [1] 121/17	86/9 86/10 87/7
46/12 52/11 58/11	moving [1] 6/5 Mr [2] 25/9 79/4	86/21 90/1 95/25 97/3 98/16 102/5	Ms. [6] 59/22 73/18 100/20 103/7	87/7 87/8 88/15
60/15 62/5 62/17	Mr. [125] 4/19	108/19 114/15	125/10 151/11	89/3 90/12 90/18
63/4 66/25 72/4	10/6 10/14 11/16	120/3 121/19	Ms. Holbert [6]	92/14 93/3 97/19
72/5 73/8 76/16	15/24 22/8 22/14	123/18 126/15	59/22 73/18 100/20	97/19 97/24 98/8
87/24 87/25 113/21	22/22 23/8 23/13	126/20 135/4	103/7 125/10	98/15 98/17 98/20
122/25 123/17	23/22 23/24 24/19	137/10 138/15	151/11	98/21 99/17 100/3
125/4 125/5 125/6	25/8 25/17 25/23	139/25 140/17	much [8] 26/17	126/15 126/16
143/3 145/24	26/11 26/11 30/1	141/13 142/4	72/4 81/1 91/19	narrow [2] 88/3
147/23 153/3	31/5 31/7 32/6 32/7	145/21 147/24	107/14 109/16	151/24
morning [1]	38/13 39/2 39/14	148/21 150/19	130/6 138/2	narrowed [1]
134/13	41/20 46/17 48/25	151/6 154/22	must [1] 44/2	88/20
mortgagee [1] 121/7	49/4 53/15 54/10	Mr. Aldrich's [1]	my [92] 5/1 5/5	narrowly [10]
161/				80/17 81/11 81/22
	P _f	eggy Isom, CCR 541, RM	IR	(18) model - narrowly

(18) model - narrowly

N.	120/16 127/16	150/15 150/10	47/21 E0/14 E2/0	140/2 152/9 152/24
N	120/16 137/16 155/7 156/8	150/15 150/19 No. 24 [1] 150/19	47/21 50/14 52/9 52/15 59/8 59/17	149/2 152/8 152/24 obligation [4]
narrowly [7]	next [16] 8/2 8/9	No. 27 [1] 146/7	61/16 64/20 68/23	32/17 33/8 55/4
85/4 85/22 85/25	8/16 41/5 61/8 73/8	No. 3 [2] 126/10	70/15 71/1 71/21	107/11
87/24 87/25 88/12	73/9 73/15 74/18	143/9	72/9 72/24 73/3	obtain [3] 134/2
92/2	81/17 82/10 105/2	No. 4 [4] 78/24	73/25 74/10 77/17	136/6 136/25
nation [1] 34/19	105/4 129/2 149/22	126/10 143/9	81/23 83/1 83/20	obtained [2]
nature [3] 83/7	150/9	150/15	88/17 90/12 95/2	135/20 137/3
124/16 137/19 necessarily [4]	nexus [1] 48/12	No. 5 [1] 81/8	95/7 95/8 99/9	obtaining [1]
16/18 55/6 87/11	nice [1] 154/1	noise [1] 100/8	105/21 108/19	106/16
141/25	nicely [1] 139/1	non [2] 50/3 95/12	111/2 111/16	obvious [1] 46/2
necessary [2]	nine [1] 51/8	non-identifying [1]		obviously [2]
93/12 142/1	Ninety [1] 118/1	95/12	127/12 127/14	59/11 131/9
need [67] 7/11	no [107] 1/1 6/16	non-jury [1] 50/3	131/17 131/19	occasions [1]
7/20 8/3 15/18	7/1 10/12 12/17	None [2] 106/7	138/2 143/11	142/4
15/23 16/2 17/5	16/25 17/3 19/10	138/21	145/20	occurred [1]
22/11 24/2 25/15	21/10 21/14 23/6	nonetheless [2]	NRCP [1] 58/22	111/11
26/13 33/14 40/21	23/7 23/15 24/20	40/4 81/19 nonissue [1] 12/1	nullification [1]	OCTOBER [9] 1/21
54/1 54/21 59/14	30/25 31/20 31/24		34/24	4/1 10/25 11/3
64/7 66/19 68/17	32/14 32/15 32/17 37/16 42/19 43/7	nonjudicial [1] 20/12	number [15] 62/1 64/20 69/21 75/22	18/24 22/6 24/1 24/3 25/22
69/3 71/5 71/15	43/8 43/17 46/15	nonrelevant [1]	83/2 83/9 89/8	October 2016 [1]
72/5 74/11 84/25	46/16 46/16 49/17	129/1	91/12 94/18 107/20	18/24
86/4 86/9 86/10	49/17 50/22 53/5	normally [2] 51/23		October 4 [1] 22/6
87/7 87/7 87/8 88/8	53/5 53/5 57/3	114/3	111/15 111/16	off [15] 8/10 9/18
90/18 90/18 92/14	60/21 74/14 77/9	not [165]	112/11	16/20 17/6 39/15
95/5 95/7 95/9	80/19 81/22 81/23	note [4] 10/18	numbering [3]	42/10 45/12 57/15
96/24 97/18 97/18	83/11 85/19 86/8	22/14 24/16 85/8	128/3 149/9 153/23	79/25 80/5 84/16
97/19 97/21 98/14	86/10 88/24 89/22	noted [1] 147/9	Numbers [1]	97/13 99/9 103/23
98/17 98/20 98/20 113/14 118/7	91/9 91/13 91/14	notes [3] 120/22	129/17	149/6
118/16 119/8 119/9	92/22 94/2 94/19	149/3 157/8	NV [3] 1/24 2/7 3/9	offer [2] 91/20
122/3 129/10 130/6	98/25 100/15	nothing [13] 36/6	Nye [2] 146/6	153/12
130/21 131/23	100/21 101/5 106/4	63/7 99/14 116/22	146/13	offering [1] 154/18
132/25 136/12	106/20 106/23	120/12 128/7	0	office [6] 101/14
137/11 139/20	108/23 109/4	132/10 134/14	-	102/3 102/21
140/9 141/16 150/2	109/21 116/20	138/24 140/11	o'clock [1] 14/19	146/20 149/21
155/8 155/13 156/9	116/21 116/21	140/17 143/2 143/3	o0o [4] 31/3 31/4	157/14
needed [2] 145/22	119/19 121/6	notice [15] 17/11	74/16 74/17 obfuscate [1] 94/7	officer [3] 75/24
148/13	121/22 123/10	18/1 19/21 19/22	object [7] 78/25	76/20 90/24
needs [5] 40/19	124/8 127/10 135/7 135/13 136/20	58/22 59/24 60/2 60/15 61/11 67/20	81/16 102/8 102/9	officers [1] 89/1 offices [3] 100/13
50/6 76/13 84/23	138/14 139/6	67/21 85/9 107/20	149/23 151/21	144/20 145/2
156/15	139/10 139/21	134/14 148/10	153/20	often [2] 62/14
negative [1] 12/14	140/18 140/19	notices [2] 127/21	objected [2] 84/21	153/11
negligent [1] 27/1	141/4 141/9 142/20	155/3	109/8	oftentimes [1]
neither [1] 44/9	143/4 143/15	notwithstanding	objection [24]	78/12
NES [2] 107/23	143/15 144/4 144/5	[1] 62/11	12/17 16/5 60/16	Oh [1] 13/21
112/2	144/6 144/12	November [3] 5/4	79/23 81/20 83/17	okay [85] 7/3 7/14
nets [1] 119/10	144/13 145/5 145/7	5/15 65/5	85/8 93/7 113/5	10/1 12/19 12/25
network [1] 93/24	145/15 146/1 148/2	November 5 [1]	113/7 115/25	14/12 16/10 18/15
NEVADA [11] 1/7 4/1 8/13 51/25	149/2 150/22	5/4	115/25 116/21	24/8 38/12 40/16
62/10 63/8 115/8	151/13 152/4	now [61] 5/22 7/20	116/21 117/6	43/9 45/19 45/25
126/23 127/1 157/2	152/10 152/12	7/25 14/7 15/10	127/23 129/11	48/5 48/25 49/3
157/15	154/7 154/9 154/20	18/12 20/25 22/6	129/20 133/21	49/22 53/13 57/5
never [5] 6/6	155/22	22/18 24/4 25/1	134/24 150/14	58/4 58/18 58/23
29/25 70/10 80/11	No. [9] 78/24 81/8	26/18 26/20 27/5	150/18 150/21	58/25 60/22 70/24
103/24	126/10 126/10	32/3 39/15 40/12	150/23	73/17 73/20 74/8
	143/9 143/9 146/7	40/20 47/20 47/20	objections [6]	74/18 75/4 79/7
new [5] 31/19			1 44/4 1 6/12 1 6/1/	
			94/9 116/13 116/14	
11ew [5] 31/19		eggy Isom, CCR 541, RM		(19) narrowly okay

LAS VEGAS DEVELOPINE	I I I OND LLC	T	T	October 9, 2013
0	118/16 118/17	or [141] 4/21 5/7	78/3 78/12 78/17	99/15 101/13
okay [53] 83/18	123/17 124/23	5/15 7/22 10/9	79/10 79/19 79/24	102/12 103/8
93/16 95/6 96/3	125/5 125/6 125/15	10/21 10/23 10/25	84/1 84/5 94/4	108/21 111/14
96/15 101/19	126/2 128/15	20/12 21/2 28/13	102/14 103/13	114/9 115/21
101/22 102/6	128/18 128/21	28/21 29/4 29/6	103/17 103/18	115/24 119/17
102/23 102/24	129/2 129/7 130/2	29/11 34/7 42/21	103/23 104/1 104/4	125/18 125/22
103/4 103/16	131/24 135/16	42/21 42/24 43/21	104/14 104/15	127/24 129/24
103/20 104/12	136/23 139/8	44/6 49/23 50/2	104/19 104/21	133/3 133/23 135/3
104/22 104/23	139/10 139/20	52/5 52/5 52/6 54/7		138/4 140/2 142/2
105/9 109/18	141/10 143/9	56/3 56/11 57/15	152/24 154/5 155/9	
110/12 111/5	144/18 146/23	57/16 58/20 59/20 60/25 62/20 63/15	ordered [5] 40/15	149/19 152/19
115/22 116/2	146/23 147/13		79/16 79/17 105/22	outlined [1] 27/11
116/12 116/20	148/2 150/13 150/17 150/17	65/5 68/5 68/7 70/7 70/15 71/10 72/12	109/14 orders [2] 79/10	outside [5] 79/12 81/6 84/3 94/5
116/22 118/12	150/17 150/17	72/12 73/9 74/13	79/16	145/20
119/1 119/23	151/9 152/2 152/25	75/23 75/25 76/9	organization [1]	over [20] 31/21
123/11 125/25	154/16	76/21 77/12 79/12	114/9	32/15 39/19 40/9
129/21 131/19	ones [11] 33/14	80/18 82/5 82/8	other [49] 12/9	40/15 40/24 45/16
133/12 136/2 137/1	80/14 147/6 147/6	82/12 82/21 84/17	20/25 24/23 25/15	46/5 46/12 46/16
138/13 138/16	148/5 148/21	85/8 88/9 88/9	30/17 47/8 48/3	46/17 46/19 47/8
138/24 140/21	148/22 149/9	88/18 88/18 90/24	52/9 53/10 53/11	72/9 102/9 108/10
141/12 141/20	149/13 149/23	92/18 93/19 93/19	54/24 55/16 62/9	116/9 122/13
143/15 148/6	151/20	93/25 94/14 98/8	62/15 64/15 67/12	144/22 149/21
149/14 152/5	ongoing [2] 31/7	99/14 99/18 100/13	80/16 80/23 84/6	overbroad [8] 76/6
152/11 152/16	40/9	100/14 101/16	84/15 85/6 86/6	77/2 87/15 93/5
152/17 154/7 154/11 155/5 156/2	only [28] 4/24 6/7	102/1 102/17	89/23 90/17 92/18	122/5 129/9 141/20
156/18	22/23 30/14 43/3	102/21 103/7	106/7 106/11	146/5
omnibus [1] 74/4	47/15 48/4 54/21	103/14 104/13	106/12 106/25	overlooked [1]
on [203]	54/21 55/1 55/2	105/25 108/5 109/3	107/6 107/7 107/14	62/14
once [10] 6/2 6/4	56/4 56/9 67/4	109/20 110/8 112/2	107/23 108/20	overly [4] 81/14
6/22 25/17 26/13	80/13 83/2 87/13	112/5 112/25 113/1	111/21 111/25	81/20 93/8 129/18
28/11 37/7 39/20	95/11 96/19 97/5	113/7 113/13 114/4		overrule [2]
70/9 152/24	97/6 97/19 100/4	114/5 114/6 114/7	113/12 120/1 120/2	150/21 153/9
one [109] 4/17 5/7	104/1 133/1 133/2	116/17 117/14	123/7 145/17	overruled [1]
5/24 8/3 8/4 30/20	143/21 148/2	119/17 123/5	147/15 148/2 148/5	51/20
34/4 34/11 34/16	open [11] 8/24	123/14 126/5	148/21 148/22	overwhelming [1]
36/2 36/3 39/12	13/4 13/5 79/21 91/8 99/24 105/5	126/16 127/20 128/4 128/23 129/3	153/2 our [22] 4/8 7/21	76/7
39/18 41/13 41/22	107/11 112/9	129/10 129/14	16/12 18/20 18/21	own [3] 21/2 87/1 137/25
43/4 43/17 48/3	112/11 123/15	129/10 129/14	27/6 29/8 41/16	owner [2] 25/9
48/4 49/7 49/11	opening [1]	130/16 130/22	49/13 51/7 55/21	110/16
51/23 52/5 52/10	124/10	132/7 132/19	63/4 70/4 94/8	owns [1] 25/9
62/1 62/15 63/6	operating [1]	132/21 134/11	119/5 127/15	-
64/20 68/4 69/21	149/6	135/8 136/13	127/23 129/11	P
71/10 71/23 76/15	operations [1]	136/23 138/5	129/19 133/9	PM [1] 4/2
76/16 77/7 77/11	31/17	138/21 142/16	135/16 140/19	page [2] 135/5
80/9 81/1 82/8	opinion [1] 66/21	143/6 143/16 144/7	out [58] 5/16	139/12
82/20 83/1 83/2	opinions [1] 70/7	144/14 145/1 145/2		page 13 [1] 135/5
83/9 85/6 86/5 89/8 91/1 91/12 91/13	opportunity [2]	145/9 145/18	19/19 20/6 20/21	pages [5] 91/23
93/1 94/19 96/24	100/8 126/21	146/12 147/17	24/4 27/14 31/22	99/14 118/10
96/25 99/12 105/1	opposed [1] 64/2	148/17 148/18	32/3 32/19 33/9	118/11 134/17
105/2 105/6 105/12	opposing [1]	149/22 150/8	39/16 39/16 46/20	paid [13] 21/18
107/21 112/1	139/13	151/14 153/10	48/24 49/7 52/10	21/23 32/20 33/2
112/15 112/20	opposite [1] 41/24	153/17 155/9	52/25 54/20 55/16	40/24 86/19 106/19
112/22 113/4 113/8	opposition [8] 7/1	order [37] 4/20 5/1		106/23 117/1 121/9
113/11 114/24	7/18 16/13 16/16	5/13 6/10 6/14 6/20		121/10 131/22 131/24
116/18 116/19	16/19 74/4 116/17 140/3	7/8 31/13 50/24 63/17 67/13 70/15	80/23 84/25 88/25 90/8 95/17 97/7	paid-in-place [1]
116/19 118/7 118/8	170/3	03/17 07/13 70/13	וול זווכל טוטל	21/23
				,
			 D	0) -1
	P	eggy Isom, CCR 541, RM	ır. (2	0) okay paid-in-place

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR (20) okay... - paid-in-place (702)671-4402 - CROERT48@GMAIL.COM Pursuant to NRS 239.053, illegal to copy without payment.

LAS VEGAS DEVELOPME	INT FUND LLC			October 9, 2019
Р	107/10 112/1 113/2	pertaining [3]	54/24	pre-history [1]
paired [1] 118/21	116/24 122/4	76/2 81/10 89/12	point [34] 10/13	90/2
	145/13 145/13	pertains [1]	20/17 21/9 21/14	preclude [1] 122/4
Pandora's [1]	past [5] 21/5 21/11		21/17 21/24 26/8	prefer [1] 67/6
124/10	77/20 86/2 95/15	pertinence [1]	31/20 31/24 32/5	prejudice [4]
panel [2] 34/14	patient [1] 125/20	146/12	32/23 35/11 37/25	52/17 58/6 124/4
34/15	pause [5] 18/16	pet [1] 63/7	43/23 45/22 49/13	126/3
papers [2] 18/21	99/19 125/17	philosophical [1]	56/20 60/8 62/13	prejudicing [1]
22/18	125/24 148/1	13/3	66/12 67/15 70/3	140/13
paperwork [1]	pay [9] 21/22 32/3	phone [1] 24/18	80/3 84/11 87/22	preliminary [9]
23/15	33/8 33/11 55/1	photographs [1]	95/24 100/11	9/4 15/13 17/14
paragraph [2]	55/4 55/14 56/15	132/7	115/13 119/8	20/11 63/16 66/17
117/12 117/13	84/16	phrased [2] 77/19	119/18 131/9	67/5 67/13 72/8
paragraph 12 [1]	paying [3] 49/7	87/18	131/11 133/8	premature [2]
117/12	97/14 97/15	Piazza [18] 26/6	133/22	73/24 135/3
paragraph 13 [1]		26/9 32/6 77/25	pointed [2] 119/17	
117/13	payment [5] 19/25			premium [1]
paragraphs [1]	24/1 24/3 32/12	78/10 78/15 79/13	148/22	106/19
120/20	126/12	79/15 95/12 98/13	points [6] 80/2	prepare [3] 70/20
pardon [1] 54/15	payments [6]	108/16 108/16	83/8 106/18 121/9	103/13 104/1
PARKWAY [1] 2/5	21/19 33/2 33/3	111/10 121/23	143/14 145/22	prepared [3] 15/21
part [15] 31/8 38/3	46/21 106/15 121/5	134/4 136/16 137/6	political [1] 62/9	22/9 134/24
41/21 44/8 57/16	peeiea [1] 5//15	145/2	portion [2] 132/16	prepayment [1]
76/8 90/5 100/4	PEGGY [3] 1/24	Piazza's [3] 22/8	132/19	84/17
104/7 104/8 104/18	157/4 157/17	121/17 121/17	position [28] 4/23	present [3] 82/1
104/19 115/24	pending [6] 5/2	picture [1] 87/6	23/20 27/6 29/8	82/18 108/2
143/22 146/9	9/3 15/12 35/12	piece [5] 25/12	41/16 41/23 42/23	presentation [2]
parte [1] 4/19	72/9 73/25	49/4 134/25 138/11	49/13 50/7 50/15	41/21 120/22
particular [4]	penny [1] 69/7	141/19	54/5 55/8 55/10	presented [1]
50/24 78/10 78/22	people [11] 26/12	place [9] 4/8 21/8	57/14 67/3 76/9	15/14
106/6	36/9 56/10 89/20	21/23 50/8 62/18	81/15 88/5 109/12	president [1]
particularity [2]	90/19 92/19 93/24	93/19 98/4 136/4	124/13 135/4	146/19
142/12 151/5	97/10 97/20 109/3	157/7	136/25 137/12	pretrial [1] 12/11
particularly [3]	111/15	placing [1] 89/21	140/20 141/14	pretty [7] 30/13
67/17 108/13	percent [3] 47/19	plaintiff [6] 1/10	144/2 149/25	45/15 62/7 107/14
108/14	94/18 96/22	3/2 4/11 26/21 55/7	155/14	142/24 152/4
parties [28] 17/9	perfect [2] 21/8	115/6	positions [1]	152/14
19/1 19/6 19/8	154/10	plaintiff's [7] 4/20	149/19	previously [2]
20/15 21/13 25/8	perfectly [1]	13/22 70/19 126/4	possess [5] 75/23	21/3 148/8
33/15 33/18 36/9	123/18	127/17 140/22	76/19 77/12 80/18	primary [2] 25/19
36/25 38/5 75/21	performance [4]	143/25	82/21	38/10
77/4 81/7 85/23	32/8 32/12 33/2	plaintiffs [1] 95/20	possession [3]	principal [4] 19/4
86/3 100/1 112/13	46/15	plan [3] 71/6 73/7	120/8 143/22	75/25 76/21 90/25
113/6 116/10	performed [1]	73/14	144/19	principals [2]
119/25 127/4	126/9	planning [2] 15/11	possibility [1]	20/21 89/2
127/18 129/23	perhaps [4] 20/13	146/6	78/12	prior [8] 23/4
140/23 147/21	20/15 113/8 153/6	plans [2] 22/9	possible [2] 12/24	31/11 75/6 75/10
149/19	period [4] 40/9	132/2	28/15	95/13 107/3 131/16
partners [2] 80/12	108/1 108/10	players [1] 77/8	posture [2] 11/22	142/8
122/12	124/25	plays [1] 67/2	56/25	privacy [4] 86/8
	person [2] 80/23	pleadings [2]	potential [4] 62/18	
partnership [1]	110/17	23/20 81/15	77/4 86/25 87/17	private [1] 107/2
114/6	personal [1]	please [3] 40/12	potentially [8] 5/7	privilege [5] 77/4
party [25] 80/21 80/22 81/9 82/13	121/11	73/4 107/22	53/12 73/12 77/3	89/16 116/20 127/7
82/13 82/15 82/16	persons [1] 33/13	pleases [2] 17/24	100/14 123/19	127/8
82/17 86/1 86/4	perspective [8]	153/6	124/18 144/5	privileged [6] 77/3
88/3 88/11 88/21	13/3 42/6 43/20	plus [1] 61/11	powerful [1] 66/25	83/10 83/11 87/16
98/10 99/9 101/21	57/22 62/17 100/19	PMK [1] 85/13	practical [1] 66/3	87/17 132/10
105/17 105/18	110/25 114/23	pocket [2] 54/20	pre [1] 90/2	privileges [1] 77/3
103/17 103/10				
	l D	l Paav Isom CCR 541 RM	I.	(21) paired - privilege

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR (21) paired - privileges (702)671-4402 - CROERT48@GMAIL.COM Pursuant to NRS 239.053, illegal to copy without payment.

LAS VEGAS DEVELOPME	Г	Г	Т	October 9, 2019
P	productions [1]	96/18	qualifies [1] 58/20	
pro [2] 2/12 147/22	131/16	protections [1]	qualify [1] 141/7	90/8
probably [19] 6/17	program [1] 84/13	105/16	quash [16] 17/9	read [6] 30/12
14/15 28/18 29/20	progress [5] 21/19	protective [8]	17/22 18/3 74/4	51/15 65/25 101/1
39/8 42/13 42/23	33/2 121/5 125/12	70/15 78/12 78/17	74/6 74/19 74/22	149/12 151/9
50/6 51/8 52/25	144/25	79/10 104/14	87/18 88/23 104/13	reading [1] 65/16
72/18 82/4 95/4	project [44] 22/5	104/15 104/19	123/14 127/14	ready [6] 18/17
103/18 112/14	22/6 25/24 40/25	113/23	127/18 139/19	26/14 75/3 111/16
118/24 123/16	75/8 76/3 77/13	protocol [4] 35/5	140/22 141/3	116/8 123/8
139/24 142/3	77/15 80/10 81/11	58/12 112/5 113/15	quashed [2] 76/13	
problem [11] 8/18	81/25 82/22 82/24 83/3 83/4 88/10	protocols [1] 52/13	87/23 quashing [2] 104/8	43/11 66/22 71/23 83/8 130/2 136/7
10/12 22/21 25/20	89/5 89/12 90/15	prove [1] 143/24	123/21	137/5
67/25 75/16 76/15	91/15 92/12 93/23	provide [12] 65/3	question [24] 5/5	realize [3] 72/8
95/1 100/6 100/21	96/4 96/17 96/19	75/22 77/12 107/22	5/21 15/9 28/8	115/3 142/9
115/17	130/7 131/12	109/3 118/6 118/18	28/21 36/3 41/5	really [46] 9/3
problems [2]	131/22 131/23	127/2 130/25	41/18 43/9 43/16	11/18 12/1 12/6
77/25 139/13	132/7 143/12 145/1	132/18 152/7 153/7	44/3 44/25 45/13	16/6 22/11 30/20
procedural [3]	145/12 145/19	provided [11]	45/23 46/2 47/19	30/21 35/2 41/12
11/21 51/17 56/25	146/12 146/14	83/14 83/16 83/19	49/23 50/4 60/13	42/7 44/2 47/15
procedurally [5]	146/24 147/1 147/2	94/16 112/16 117/3	75/22 92/4 100/15	59/15 60/9 61/18
6/23 38/21 50/2	147/3 147/6 147/10	118/9 127/2 130/9	127/11 138/9	64/12 65/18 69/6
52/12 80/4	147/17 147/19	134/16 134/17	questions [7]	87/9 88/8 90/5 96/2
proceed [3] 35/6	projects [3] 63/7	provides [1] 63/14	30/24 34/20 50/11	96/7 102/16 107/9
50/2 132/25	88/7 146/10	providing [5]	79/5 85/18 131/25	107/13 111/20
proceedings [9]	prolonged [1]	108/25 109/7 109/7	132/15	113/3 113/5 115/2
18/16 99/19 105/20 125/17 125/24	12/15	134/15 148/13	quick [4] 37/5 38/3	115/15 117/23
148/1 156/20 157/6	promises [2] 72/13	provision [6]	83/9 153/2	119/10 120/12
157/12	94/1	19/10 19/19 60/11	quicker [1] 70/18	122/3 123/3 124/11
proceeds [2] 38/21	promote [1]	62/15 63/3 84/17	quickly [7] 9/6	129/6 129/13
90/21	105/25	provisions [2] 19/6		136/13 137/12
process [17] 12/4	proof [4] 24/1	33/24	37/6 47/23 152/14	145/23 148/18
20/4 34/21 38/10	91/20 114/15	publicly [1] 87/3	quid [1] 147/22	154/20 154/20
47/17 47/23 57/24	114/18	publish [1] 97/7	quite [1] 41/22	Realty [4] 76/1
65/14 66/17 69/5	proper [4] 85/4	pull [3] 39/16	quo [1] 147/22	76/23 81/4 82/14
70/11 92/22 100/5	94/16 123/3 142/2	54/20 96/23	quotes [1] 30/12	reason [22] 4/24
104/22 140/15	properly [2] 84/4 95/2	purpose [2] 121/15 129/10	R	6/7 7/4 11/17 25/2 25/3 32/13 43/3
143/25 144/3		purposes [4] 59/10		56/21 61/25 67/24
processes [1]	130/4 133/3	59/19 124/19	raise [4] 26/13	76/13 86/24 95/7
140/8	proposed [2]	124/21	55/22 56/17 111/14	98/21 106/4 109/11
procuring [1]	20/13 121/21	pursuant [2] 33/24		115/24 126/19
106/20	proposition [1]	48/10	30/3 56/11 76/3	127/4 144/17
produce [6] 98/15	51/25	push [1] 65/4	89/5 89/13 113/7	155/18
115/16 115/17	proprietary [16]	pushing [1] 47/20	126/5	reasonable [1]
119/4 124/1 126/14	77/22 83/6 83/10	put [24] 7/1 10/3	raising [4] 21/18	65/2
produced [10]	87/16 90/11 92/24	10/8 15/2 15/2	75/11 80/23 93/22	reasons [2] 52/10
68/16 87/11 98/6	93/3 93/12 95/1	15/19 15/22 21/8	Rank [14] 127/22	124/23
99/24 105/24 106/3	96/14 96/19 97/2	21/20 29/10 33/19	128/15 128/19	recall [5] 80/8
109/16 119/16 119/20 126/19	97/25 99/6 108/5	45/13 45/23 66/24	128/21 128/22	111/10 113/4
producing [4] 99/9	116/21	67/10 76/6 81/15	135/6 145/9 145/17	-11
101/21 118/4 127/5	prospective [1]	93/7 101/14 101/21	146/3 147/15 149/7	receipt [1] 126/11
production [13]	26/25	101/23 117/22	150/15 150/18	received [4] 23/5
99/22 107/3 116/1	protect [3] 33/20	124/24 136/14	150/24	24/18 113/17
116/6 117/5 123/23	84/9 93/8	putting [3] 12/18	rare [1] 51/24	133/21
124/9 125/1 131/17	protected [3]	32/25 33/13	rate [1] 134/18 rather [4] 78/4	receiver [5] 9/4
133/10 133/13	33/14 86/14 105/19	Q	117/24 119/10	15/12 15/18 15/22
133/22 138/17	protecting [1]	qualified [1] 56/21	151/24 119/10	16/1
		 	131,22	
	=		<u> </u>	(22)
	D _i	eggy Isom, CCR 541, RM	IIV	(22) pro - receive

LAS VEGAS DEVELOPME	INT TOIND LLC	T	T	October 9, 2019
R	150/23	27/3 86/16	reminded [1]	155/22
	regard [15] 25/1	relatively [1] 9/6	62/23	requested [5]
receivership [1]	36/3 37/2 46/4	released [2] 21/21	remove [1] 26/13	36/11 120/6 120/7
114/4	EE/20 0E/2 06/17	32/11	repay [1] 55/8	126/15 148/16
receiving [1] 113/9	87/19 112/9 114/2	releasing [1]	repeat [1] 90/6	requesting [1]
recent [2] 131/17	114/14 121/1	106/16	repeatedly [1]	151/3
134/11	124/22 130/1	relevance [5]	139/14	requests [20]
recently [1] 22/16	146/16	75/13 76/11 87/13	repercussions [2]	87/24 111/20
Recess [2] 31/3	regarding [26]	89/23 100/16	86/25 87/5	111/25 117/15
74/16	17/14 34/18 34/21	relevant [42] 9/3	repetitive [3]	120/16 120/19
recognize [2]	57/7 59/25 60/1	76/7 82/1 82/19	116/13 116/14	128/1 128/1 128/2
50/12 112/3	64/6 68/21 73/21	90/14 90/16 92/5	141/20	128/5 128/12
recollection [3]	75/8 77/13 82/22	94/19 94/24 100/15	report [14] 23/8	129/24 130/11
51/15 115/5 120/5	102/25 106/5 106/9	105/20 106/7 107/5	31/23 40/18 40/19	141/5 142/9 149/2
recommended [1]	106/10 121/3	108/13 108/14	59/2 59/19 61/1	151/22 153/8 156/7
61/19				
reconsider [1]	123/13 126/8 131/5	111/19 112/8	61/4 61/13 61/21	156/8
155/11	141/3 145/11	113/22 116/24	68/15 68/16 69/24	require [1] 128/10
record [16] 4/9	146/25 147/1 149/3	116/25 116/25	71/3	required [6]
8/10 9/18 10/2	151/18	121/20 123/5	reported [2] 1/24	130/18 131/17
16/20 24/5 63/25	regardless [3]	124/18 124/19	133/6	133/25 134/1 134/2
69/12 138/16	29/11 40/5 52/4	124/20 128/7 129/5	REPORTER [1]	135/15
140/21 147/13	regional [11]	129/9 129/19	157/4	requirements [4]
149/1 149/13	25/11 31/14 49/6	130/13 131/3 131/6		60/17 70/5 130/5
152/18 155/2	76/4 76/25 82/17	131/13 132/23	1/15 156/23	150/5
157/11	82/25 93/11 106/11	136/3 136/7 146/5	reporting [4]	rescinded [1]
recording [1]	110/15 126/10	146/15 148/3 148/4	130/4 131/14	27/14
132/7	regular [1] 24/6	148/20	134/11 150/3	rescission [3]
records [16] 40/14	regulated [1]	relied [7] 22/22	reports [3] 68/14	28/13 28/15 42/11
40/22 108/22	86/20	37/9 128/23 135/8	69/21 148/14	research [3] 65/17
110/19 110/22	relate [7] 53/10	142/21 143/1	represent [1]	66/9 146/12
112/16 122/9	84/19 111/20 129/3	151/14	67/24	resolution [2]
123/12 132/4	131/4 143/6 144/14	relief [5] 9/4 15/12		20/15 108/6
138/18 143/19	related [28] 17/12	20/11 122/24	120/14	resolve [2] 20/6
143/19 144/10	25/7 30/17 36/25	123/25	representations	84/25
144/16 144/23	40/6 44/14 53/24	rely [6] 58/15	[6] 83/2 93/21	resolved [3] 9/6
144/24	58/21 68/4 74/6	99/22 130/14 131/2	108/11 108/15	41/13 127/12
red [2] 153/20	80/15 91/14 109/8	155/15 156/9	111/6 117/3	resorts [1] 62/8
153/21	111/25 113/1 113/6	remain [1] 47/10	represented [3]	resource [1] 21/2
redact [2] 94/15	113/9 113/23	remainder [1]	80/8 80/12 80/13	resources [2]
100/3	120/19 132/11	148/16	reputable [1]	31/14 31/15
	139/22 139/23	remaining [1] 28/7	42/20	respect [2] 58/25
redacted [7] 87/11	144/7 146/21 147/2	remains [2] 55/12	request [42] 7/12	94/11
95/2 95/5 95/11	147/10 147/18	101/24	29/6 42/24 78/24	respective [2]
99/17 100/2 126/17	148/3	remedy [1] 28/15	81/22 82/10 83/22	57/13 149/18
redacting [2] 98/8	relates [12] 17/17	remember [23]	88/12 93/5 107/18	respects [1]
98/15	38/4 42/15 44/19	5/14 19/11 22/5	107/21 109/8	109/19
redactions [1]	48/9 50/2 53/22	28/14 28/16 29/21	111/18 112/9	respond [2] 7/20
99/23	60/17 111/5 112/1	36/5 39/14 40/12	115/16 116/1 116/6	117/24
refer [3] 129/3	120/8 123/25	43/4 57/7 62/13	117/4 117/9 118/12	
143/6 144/14	relating [10] 19/7	82/6 87/1 110/13	118/20 123/23	138/17
referring [1] 144/7	45/16 88/15 126/10	111/16 114/16	124/8 124/25	response [8] 72/12
reflect [2] 144/5	131/8 143/16	116/9 120/3 120/6	128/20 128/22	116/19 117/16
154/23	144/19 145/18	120/14 131/15	133/9 133/13	118/3 119/5 134/24
reflected [2] 63/13	147/16 150/25	139/7	133/22 135/7	135/13 139/23
122/8	relationship [5]	remind [8] 13/25	138/16 142/2 142/8	responses [6]
reflecting [8]	33/5 76/9 146/3	14/7 40/11 64/24	142/20 143/4 145/5	124/25 133/22
131/12 143/16	146/17 147/21	139/11 152/21	145/7 150/15	138/21 139/11
144/8 145/8 145/16	relationships [2]	152/23 156/6	151/13 154/7 154/9	139/14 139/15
146/2 147/14	. Ciudonanipa [2]	132/23 130/0	131/13 137// 137/3	137/11 137/13
	D _i	eggy Isom, CCR 541, RM	IR (23)	receivership - responses

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR (23) receivership - responses (702)671-4402 - CROERT48@GMAIL.COM Pursuant to NRS 239.053, illegal to copy without payment.

LAS VEGAS DEVELOPME	INT FUND LLC			October 9, 2019
R	65/16	sanction [1] 9/13	147/3	118/12 129/24
	ruled [1] 67/13	sanctions [1]	sealed [5] 99/24	155/3
responsibility [2]	rules [2] 31/18	119/13	100/12 101/17	separate [8] 18/23
23/13 23/14	144/11	sat [3] 42/22 96/15	101/21 101/24	25/8 30/17 33/4
responsible [2]	ruling [6] 15/11	122/7	Sean [3] 125/16	33/5 40/3 91/1
76/10 132/17	16/9 16/24 67/4	satisfied [1] 60/12	126/2 126/5	114/21
rest [5] 27/15	67/6 98/22	satisfy [1] 119/16	second [7] 28/9	separately [2]
27/16 71/14 111/20	rulings [1] 44/20	saved [1] 13/7	28/15 76/15 76/16	35/15 48/18
147/9	run [4] 6/17 78/2	saves [2] 13/6	105/6 115/8 152/2	serial [1] 12/15
restricted [1] 97/5 result [1] 113/9	104/2 154/25	103/21	secret [3] 83/12	series [1] 34/20
retained [1] 68/2	rush [10] 29/25	say [33] 5/15	83/13 92/25	serious [1] 116/10
return [1] 33/2	35/1 35/10 57/7	11/23 14/1 15/21	secured [1] 20/5	seriously [1] 86/22
returns [3] 79/21	57/22 70/9 142/10	23/13 28/19 32/21	security [1] 130/25	serve [2] 129/10
143/19 144/10	149/20 150/13	36/21 37/8 37/19	see [26] 6/22 13/1	155/4
retype [1] 153/11	152/19	39/4 39/13 39/17	14/1 35/19 53/14	served [5] 85/9
reveal [1] 112/4	rushed [1] 142/2	45/13 46/12 48/2	54/13 54/14 55/13	85/11 91/22 155/4
reversed [1] 70/10	rushing [2] 70/10	53/16 55/20 57/25	57/4 59/25 65/18	155/8
review [1] 144/13	140/16	59/7 79/19 91/23	65/18 66/20 93/16	service [2] 132/14
reviewed [8] 23/21	S	94/12 94/13 95/6	97/9 99/3 99/20	133/6
132/5 144/16		98/15 98/19 114/18	113/11 114/3 123/5	services [1]
144/21 144/25	safe [1] 14/19	117/7 117/24	124/2 132/8 133/11	148/14
145/1 145/4 147/8	safer [1] 139/4	138/23 142/19	141/22 145/6	servicing [1]
reviewing [1]	said [51] 6/25	144/24	151/12	132/19
150/20	23/22 25/17 30/19	saying [35] 6/13	seeing [1] 55/3	set [35] 5/4 5/14
revisit [3] 58/11	31/24 39/11 39/14	7/10 20/22 26/12	seek [3] 92/2	6/2 6/4 6/21 6/22
58/12 71/4	39/18 39/18 39/23	27/19 27/20 32/7	123/20 126/21	6/22 9/9 11/1 13/15
rid [1] 21/3	43/9 46/3 46/17	39/3 40/20 45/14	seem [5] 18/4 43/1	
ridiculous [1]	49/4 51/17 54/25	45/23 46/11 53/2	60/5 61/15 125/11	20/4 21/3 23/20
23/10	55/22 56/13 56/24	53/5 53/14 55/6	seems [4] 13/2	31/14 31/15 48/16
right [192]	57/12 57/24 63/2 63/3 77/24 96/16	58/10 62/5 62/12	61/16 62/16 143/8	52/22 55/23 64/8
rights [2] 33/20	98/20 109/6 111/13	66/1 70/11 85/22	seen [4] 55/12	64/21 71/5 71/10
98/10	115/8 116/5 117/21	86/22 110/22	77/20 84/9 95/16	72/20 73/14 73/16
ripe [1] 28/18	125/21 126/25	110/22 117/8 117/18 121/8	sees [3] 54/24 98/16 103/8	73/24 74/5 74/5 100/24 102/11
RMR [2] 1/24	133/25 134/23	123/19 123/21	selection [1] 15/1	119/12 155/6
157/17	134/25 135/14	135/2 137/10	sell [1] 21/1	sets [2] 9/20 89/3
road [1] 73/2	135/15 136/6	138/18 142/5	seminal [1] 51/4	setting [4] 17/14
Robert [6] 4/15	136/12 136/19	155/20	send [8] 7/10	51/13 72/20 73/7
20/20 75/25 76/22	138/10 138/11	says [17] 25/8	101/13 120/16	seven [2] 51/8
80/20 82/12	139/1 139/6 139/8	29/5 44/13 45/16	153/16 153/18	128/1
role [1] 25/19	139/25 141/9	47/4 50/19 54/25	153/19 153/22	several [2] 25/16
rolling [2] 22/11	141/15 141/19	56/9 78/16 88/12	153/24	110/12
151/23	157/7	97/3 98/16 120/24	sending [1] 156/8	sham [11] 130/2
Romspen [1] 4/22	sales [1] 30/17	134/14 138/24	sends [1] 95/17	130/16 130/20
room [1] 102/13	same [26] 10/15	144/6 144/13	senior [15] 4/22	130/22 132/20
roughly [1] 130/11	35/15 39/6 41/6	scenario [7] 43/10	128/9 128/9 128/11	136/8 136/14
rule [22] 17/10	43/21 49/11 65/10	55/13 55/21 114/4	130/18 130/19	136/16 136/19
17/11 18/1 18/2	75/18 75/20 76/15	122/11 122/20	130/20 134/1 134/1	147/22 148/19
18/2 44/21 44/22	77/8 77/9 77/19	138/3	134/2 136/6 136/6	share [1] 79/11
52/24 58/20 58/23	79/13 83/5 85/15	schedule [2] 10/14		shareholder [1]
60/11 61/8 61/11	112/24 113/15	73/22	sense [5] 20/16	62/7
62/14 62/15 63/13 65/16 66/23 67/16	115/25 115/25	schedules [1]	94/2 119/24 120/6	shareholders [1]
81/10 87/19 123/9	117/6 117/7 119/8	132/1	154/16	122/10
Rule 16 [4] 17/11	146/19 146/20	scheme [1] 39/12	sensitive [1]	short [5] 18/21
18/2 58/20 58/23	151/18	Schlatter [1]	126/16	38/3 38/9 41/21
Rule 26 [1] 87/19	SAN [11] 2/17 75/8	114/25	sent [11] 5/12 7/8	71/23
Rule 65 [5] 18/1	76/2 80/10 81/10	scintilla [1] 11/24	7/10 19/23 24/18	shortened [1]
61/11 62/15 63/13	81/24 83/4 89/4	scope [2] 98/7	74/6 78/19 88/17	124/24
01,11 02,13 03,13	91/14 93/23 96/3			
L	D.	eaav Isom CCR 541 RM	ID (24) *	ı responsihility - shortened

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR (24) responsibility - shortened (702)671-4402 - CROERT48@GMAIL.COM Pursuant to NRS 239.053, illegal to copy without payment.

LAS VEGAS DEVELOPME	INT FUND LLC			October 9, 2019
S	93/11 93/18 98/12	six-ish [1] 118/10	somewhat [2]	stand [10] 22/8
	105/24 106/17	slightly [4] 55/21	52/11 54/12	24/9 24/9 28/13
shortening [7]	106/19 106/20	114/19 114/20	son [1] 113/10	60/14 66/22 69/15
4/20 5/1 5/13 6/10	106/23 121/18	115/3	soon [3] 71/11	75/9 83/20 136/17
6/14 6/20 7/9	129/12 129/14	smoking [1] 26/8	111/17 150/10	standard [1] 70/6
SHORTHAND [1]	129/15 130/9	so [235]	sooner [5] 5/19	standing [3] 41/11
157/4	130/18 130/23	social [1] 89/18	10/25 11/3 11/5	81/16 113/4
shortly [2] 111/11	131/5 131/8 131/15	soft [1] 16/5	67/7	stands [2] 51/25
148/15	132/5 133/25	solely [1] 19/3	sorry [11] 13/20	53/21
should [42] 4/25	134/10 134/16	solicitations [1]	38/19 49/10 79/12	Stanwood [3]
6/8 6/14 8/20 8/22	143/6 144/15	89/16	83/16 85/9 108/8	76/23 82/15 106/10
10/1 14/25 20/18	144/23 145/17	soliciting [1] 90/20		starred [1] 155/3
22/18 29/10 30/20	146/9 147/1 147/15	some [63] 7/7 12/5		start [11] 6/5 9/23
30/21 30/22 36/18				
37/25 41/17 49/14	148/12 150/24	12/9 17/20 17/21	sort [4] 38/18	17/6 17/24 55/24
50/12 50/18 56/3	Sight's [8] 22/22	22/15 23/23 25/16	52/20 110/24	59/12 74/7 79/9
59/2 59/22 69/13	23/16 132/12	28/12 32/9 32/10	149/22	114/8 122/6 122/21
69/15 70/12 72/17	143/17 144/8	33/6 38/18 40/16	sought [2] 77/14	started [2] 4/17
72/19 73/7 73/14	144/15 144/20	42/8 43/14 48/1	82/23	63/6
74/9 79/24 87/18	146/14	49/2 49/9 50/6	sound [1] 104/5	starters [1] 80/13
88/20 94/3 94/24	sign [2] 6/21 115/6		source [5] 86/14	starting [2] 8/18
96/9 97/23 99/24	Signature [8]	55/24 58/10 59/12	99/23 139/3 139/4	14/11
100/2 120/1 122/25	105/5 107/20	61/19 62/7 62/22	139/6	starts [1] 41/11
142/3	107/21 111/3	62/23 64/14 65/17	SOUTH [1] 3/7	state [5] 8/11
shouldn't [4]	111/18 120/9 123/2	68/2 70/3 72/6 74/6	space [1] 139/12	62/10 153/11 157/2
22/20 41/17 70/2	123/16	75/13 76/11 78/1	special [2] 116/4	157/14
97/20	signed [3] 25/18	79/5 79/21 84/11	116/5	stated [2] 31/7
show [12] 26/18	39/20 103/23	85/13 95/11 101/11	specific [18] 31/14	
50/23 67/14 92/21	significant [9]	108/3 108/5 109/24	48/9 63/11 67/25	statement [4]
94/6 94/8 96/4 96/4	40/23 41/2 67/25	110/24 112/20	70/18 89/3 112/23	23/25 45/23 57/7
109/25 130/22	08/20 80/9 80/15	119/16 119/20	120/12 121/15	79/13
132/18 143/23	91/21 93/2 108/9	128/3 128/3 128/8	122/24 123/8	statements [13]
showing [6] 75/23	similar [4] 85/14	129/16 134/10	123/22 123/24	21/11 56/21 105/23
76/19 77/7 86/5	105/11 106/18	142/8 147/13	126/5 130/12	107/12 107/22
89/23 121/2	112/10	149/10 149/11	130/12 142/24	121/3 121/17
shows [2] 32/21	similarly [1] 36/23	149/22 151/22	153/7	121/18 131/16
44/1	simple [6] 19/15	somebody [1]	specifically [14]	142/20 143/18
shrift [1] 38/9	96/7 103/18 154/4	107/10	43/5 51/9 52/20	144/10 145/1
shut [1] 39/23	154/14 154/21	somehow [4]	63/4 68/4 76/8 89/7	States [2] 51/7
side [5] 22/12	simplify [1] 55/20	47/12 49/24 84/20	111/5 115/15	51/16
25/15 65/13 120/2	since [3] 6/25	140/13	117/10 120/5	status [11] 13/25
140/8	81/19 96/17	someone [3] 48/5	122/24 133/14	14/13 17/14 60/1
sides [2] 17/8 22/1	single [5] 19/18	94/14 136/22	135/11	64/6 72/20 73/21
SIGHT [77] 1/9	69/3 94/9 131/24	something [25]	speed [2] 117/21	83/23 102/12
15/16 19/18 19/18	139/12	6/2 16/2 28/13	153/10	143/17 144/8
19/23 20/14 20/21	sir [16] 16/11	42/18 44/21 65/5	spend [3] 31/22	stay [1] 155/9
	16/22 23/18 30/25	70/12 72/12 98/14	121/8 121/9	stays [2] 101/17
21/7 21/16 21/22	53/17 57/3 75/3	100/2 100/14	spending [1] 32/18	
21/22 22/15 22/24	85/19 103/5 107/16	101/13 108/5 112/5	spent [12] 12/7	stem [1] 42/14
23/25 25/21 26/1	123/25 126/1	117/9 122/23 124/4	32/15 32/16 34/12	STENOTYPE [2]
31/12 31/23 31/24	138/14 145/25	125/8 132/2 132/5	46/6 46/7 46/11	157/5 157/8
32/11 32/15 32/17	153/4 154/23	132/8 134/11 136/9	46/17 47/10 62/5	step [3] 65/13
32/20 32/22 33/1	sit [5] 11/23 35/3	141/15 155/19	124/14 131/11	140/8 152/1
33/1 33/7 46/8	53/16 69/2 154/23	Sometime [1]	sponte [1] 6/5	still [22] 11/4
46/10 46/15 46/19	sitting [1] 94/11	10/23	squash [2] 9/12	24/20 25/14 33/8
47/11 47/13 69/7	situation [3] 21/23		99/8	33/21 35/12 35/13
75/1 75/7 77/13	23/11 33/17	10/16 14/17	squeeze [1] 97/13	40/13 46/4 47/9
77/15 77/20 78/1	six [3] 51/8 116/10		stack [1] 111/13	57/16 57/17 57/18
82/22 82/24 84/16	118/10	31/23	stamped [1] 7/10	64/13 64/24 69/4
90/10 90/16 91/5	,	- 1		, , == = , = . 00, 1
	<u> </u>	eggy Isom CCD 5/11 DM		(25) chartening - stil

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR (25) shortening - still (702)671-4402 - CROERT48@GMAIL.COM Pursuant to NRS 239.053, illegal to copy without payment.

LAS VEGAS DEVELOPME	INT FUND LLC			October 9, 2019
S	127/21 140/22	150/16 153/17	tell [7] 32/17 48/5	132/13 136/13
still [6] 70/14	SUBSCRIBED [1]	154/22	65/16 83/20 113/18	136/15 137/12
73/2 97/14 102/10	157/13	surviving [1]	138/8 154/4	139/13 142/15
	substance [1] 95/3	35/24	telling [4] 41/11	144/19 144/24
129/12 138/19	substantive [1]	suspect [2] 82/2	94/6 112/15 150/20	146/17
stip [2] 151/22	51/18	82/3	ten [3] 7/21 7/23	theirs [1] 74/7
151/24	such [5] 19/10	suspicion [1]	7/24	them [70] 7/22
stipulate [1]	21/19 22/17 37/5	137/5	tend [2] 143/24	20/4 31/21 36/20
121/20	99/21		144/1	40/4 47/8 54/14
stipulation [1]	sudden [2] 36/20	T	tens [3] 25/25	65/2 69/2 69/24
121/21	86/3	tabulating [1]	93/22 113/17	71/23 74/24 78/2
stopped [2] 25/24	suffers [1] 76/15	69/7	terms [3] 48/15	78/3 78/18 79/6
32/22	sufficiently [1]	tailored [15] 76/8	52/21 56/15	80/12 80/13 81/21
straight [2] 7/24	92/1	80/17 81/12 81/22	test [2] 142/15	85/9 85/12 87/21
115/13	suggest [1] 79/4	85/5 85/22 85/25	142/16	92/13 93/25 94/16
strictly [1] 90/11	suggestion [2]	87/24 88/1 88/12	testified [7] 81/1	97/10 97/20 97/23
strip [1] 62/8		92/1 92/2 93/1		98/14 98/14 98/18
strong [1] 92/24	101/12 153/5	122/24 132/23	96/15 108/16	
structures [1]	SUITE [3] 2/6 2/16		111/10 111/12	98/22 99/6 99/24
22/10	3/8	take [24] 11/14	134/4 136/17	99/25 100/12
struggles [1]	sum [1] 138/4	17/23 25/20 39/8	testify [2] 26/7	100/12 100/19
99/12	summary [1] 67/1	39/10 39/11 41/25	70/4	101/16 102/8
study [2] 126/9	sun [1] 76/12	56/14 56/18 56/18	testimony [12]	102/12 102/13
126/12	SUPERVISION [1]	64/13 69/23 74/9	22/8 25/16 39/15	105/3 106/19
stuff [13] 6/5	157/9	74/11 74/15 78/18	62/20 62/22 69/25	108/25 109/1 109/4
10/11 40/23 64/15	supplement [3]	85/16 87/12 97/17	71/23 72/21 73/8	112/1 112/17
65/7 65/7 66/22	118/9 118/18	99/25 100/23 101/7	75/9 85/12 137/14	112/21 115/16
69/4 84/25 112/8	156/17	111/14 147/24	testing [1] 137/13	116/1 118/25 119/7
113/19 115/14	supplemental [12]	takes [2] 14/17	than [27] 5/19	121/2 126/20 127/5
123/2	17/11 18/2 19/21	76/12	10/25 11/3 12/9	128/10 129/1
sua [1] 6/5	58/20 59/19 60/10	taking [7] 10/19	46/13 46/13 59/16	129/13 132/13
subdivisions [1]	61/1 61/2 61/13	55/7 55/10 62/13	62/6 62/17 74/14	139/1 139/2 139/3
62/10	72/11 72/12 139/15	94/17 124/13	78/4 82/8 89/23	139/15 140/2
subject [6] 77/10	supplied [1] 33/16	136/25	90/17 106/12	152/25 153/24
88/3 109/1 127/3	support [7] 67/11	talk [10] 10/21	106/25 107/8	154/16 156/10
141/11 147/4	105/25 117/11	24/24 40/22 59/14	107/14 117/24	theme [1] 148/11
submit [1] 137/22	117/13 137/2	64/8 73/13 79/10	119/10 123/1	themes [1] 148/19
submitted [3]	137/12 144/2	97/10 137/10 152/1	145/17 147/16	themselves [2]
	supports [2] 15/18	talked [15] 24/19	148/21 152/10	98/10 144/21
68/11 68/14 154/18	23/16	27/6 40/13 85/3	152/13 153/2	then [84] 5/12 8/8
subpoena [12]	supposed [3]	104/19 108/7	Thank [15] 15/8	9/22 13/13 15/10
17/22 85/12 88/23	04/12 04/12 110/24	111/10 116/14	17/1 18/10 23/18	17/25 18/1 25/23
101/13 103/5 104/5	supposedly [1]	134/5 136/18	31/1 60/23 73/19	28/2 28/3 31/22
104/9 104/11 109/9	80/23	136/24 137/6 137/7	79/8 85/20 107/16	31/23 32/11 33/1
120/11 135/5	Supreme [5] 51/8	138/12 142/14	129/21 133/8	36/19 42/25 44/3
138/18	51/17 51/21 63/4	talking [9] 66/20	133/20 156/3 156/5	44/5 44/14 46/3
subpoenaed [3]	115/8	91/25 92/1 94/18	Thanksgiving [1]	46/5 46/14 47/4
78/23 116/23	sure [35] 5/9 5/25	95/17 111/2 137/19	94/1	48/18 49/1 49/25
128/20	10/21 11/7 13/13	139/22 140/22	that [771]	52/23 52/25 53/8
subpoenaing [5]	14/24 15/7 23/21	talks [1] 84/15	that's [161]	53/10 54/23 56/14
108/21 112/17	28/6 32/1 34/10	targeted [1]	their [31] 22/18	56/18 58/21 59/13
114/8 121/8 122/6	34/16 34/22 35/3	121/15	23/12 30/15 32/25	60/11 65/1 65/20
subpoenas [19]	49/19 55/25 58/7	tax [4] 79/21 115/7	46/6 69/24 78/7	65/25 66/4 66/25
17/9 17/22 40/13	58/8 63/23 69/3	143/19 144/10	87/1 87/3 87/3 87/4	
74/6 75/1 75/16	73/13 85/7 96/6	team [1] 31/15	90/12 94/17 107/4	72/13 73/5 74/5
75/19 85/4 85/16	96/8 103/7 123/18	tecum [1] 135/6	107/5 107/11	77/11 79/20 79/23
105/11 105/15		telephonic [1]		81/20 86/20 89/4
113/8 123/14	132/22 140/15	14/13	107/12 126/12	90/25 91/24 93/6
123/21 127/15	141/14 142/1	telephonically [1]	130/24 131/15	
127/18 127/20	149/13 150/12	14/1	131/16 131/17	95/5 96/12 97/12
		1 ¹ ,1		
	Pe	eggy Isom, CCR 541, RM	1R	(26) still ther

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR (26) stil (702)671-4402 - CROERT48@GMAIL.COM Pursuant to NRS 239.053, illegal to copy without payment.

				,
Т	137/22 138/4	98/7 98/13 98/17	64/20 69/7 77/3	142/13 144/2 147/9
ļ -	138/16 138/20	105/15 105/16	78/18 79/22 80/9	148/10 149/8
then [25] 98/16	139/8 140/9 140/17	106/8 111/15	82/6 94/2 94/12	149/19 150/15
98/21 100/22 101/4	141/15 145/24	111/25 113/8	95/18 112/10	150/17 151/1
101/12 102/20	146/11 147/2	113/25 114/20	117/19 117/22	151/13 152/17
104/3 108/15	147/13 147/21	122/8 124/14 128/2	117/24 122/13	153/1 155/8
111/17 112/12	148/13 148/22	128/5 128/12 129/8	123/13 124/14	thinking [1] 99/20
112/18 112/24	149/2 149/11	129/12 129/16	133/24 137/11	third [13] 17/9
115/14 127/4 129/2	149/15 149/16	129/12 129/10	143/24 145/3	33/15 33/18 77/4
131/10 132/18				
136/2 136/6 137/1	150/6 153/8 153/17	131/24 132/16	think [149] 5/24	77/7 86/3 86/4
139/14 143/11	153/17 153/24	132/25 133/2 133/9	6/4 6/4 6/9 6/10	98/10 116/24
151/8 153/20	155/13 155/19	133/16 143/11	6/23 8/11 9/2 9/13	127/18 140/23
153/21	there's [75] 4/17	145/21 145/21	11/16 11/16 12/8	145/13 145/13
theory [1] 44/11	7/1 11/8 11/20	146/8 146/9 146/17	12/13 13/7 15/14	third-party [1]
there [146] 5/16	17/16 19/10 21/24	146/22 146/23	20/18 23/10 28/9	98/10
7/18 13/21 16/2	22/21 23/7 23/15	146/23 155/3 156/9	28/18 33/9 37/3	this [273]
16/18 17/13 17/20	25/3 27/20 27/25	they [194]	37/5 37/25 38/7	those [56] 9/11
	28/2 29/5 31/19	they're [55] 25/6	38/12 38/13 39/2	17/22 23/21 26/18
17/21 21/4 21/10 22/16 22/21 23/1	31/20 33/25 34/15	25/6 25/8 26/14	39/7 40/3 41/9	27/9 28/1 28/4 29/9
	34/15 34/25 43/7	28/18 33/14 33/15	42/10 42/13 43/15	35/4 39/25 40/6
23/6 24/11 25/4	46/4 46/9 48/12	34/17 40/20 48/18	45/15 47/17 47/25	40/8 41/3 42/12
25/4 25/5 26/9	50/13 52/6 54/2	48/18 50/11 53/9	48/4 48/23 49/22	42/24 43/1 46/22
26/20 27/1 27/21	56/21 61/25 61/25	53/10 53/24 62/11	50/17 50/19 50/21	48/21 51/23 52/3
28/7 28/19 29/10	62/19 63/7 67/23	71/20 73/5 85/4	51/6 51/16 51/19	52/25 53/1 54/12
29/17 32/8 32/14	68/6 74/4 74/5 75/9	85/14 85/22 87/1	52/6 52/14 53/3	54/12 55/24 60/4
34/17 35/13 35/23	79/15 84/15 85/8	88/2 88/19 90/22	53/16 53/24 54/1	60/13 61/15 61/23
35/24 36/5 36/5	86/8 86/10 86/25	93/24 96/19 99/7	54/7 55/7 55/7	63/25 64/25 69/13
36/13 36/18 36/24				
36/25 37/16 37/22	89/22 91/8 92/22	99/10 102/8 108/25	55/11 55/19 55/20	69/20 73/16 77/8
40/2 42/19 44/4	95/5 97/2 101/5	109/7 113/22 116/1	56/14 56/16 56/20	80/14 85/4 85/13
46/6 46/8 46/21	102/16 103/23	117/6 117/8 118/14	56/23 57/20 57/20	93/6 97/20 105/19
47/9 50/10 50/20	109/4 110/11	120/11 124/13	58/9 58/19 59/1	105/19 106/17
50/22 55/14 55/16	111/24 112/16	125/21 128/7 128/9	60/3 60/13 63/5	111/22 112/7
57/17 57/18 59/1	113/17 114/5	129/18 134/1 134/2	63/6 63/21 64/2	112/16 116/12
59/16 66/24 70/3	122/17 122/18	134/18 137/13	66/15 66/15 66/25	116/18 119/10
70/13 73/2 75/13	123/3 123/4 123/16	137/13 138/7	67/1 67/3 67/9	141/4 143/24 144/1
77/17 78/7 80/16	128/3 128/4 132/10	141/20 143/9	67/14 67/15 67/24	144/17 145/7
81/13 82/3 83/1	142/7 142/11	146/18 146/20	69/14 70/13 70/25	145/13 148/9
	142/16 149/10	146/21 155/6	72/19 73/3 78/15	though [7] 36/11
83/4 84/10 84/11	150/14 150/18	they've [3] 29/10	84/7 85/15 85/15	38/7 53/4 56/8 83/3
84/13 84/13 84/17	150/22 153/23	83/13 109/8	86/21 87/15 88/16	100/22 102/7
86/22 86/24 89/24	155/19	thing [26] 7/20	89/25 91/2 91/2	thought [7] 32/1
92/17 92/17 92/24	thereabouts [1]	39/18 41/10 46/8	92/6 93/17 93/20	34/4 45/4 48/3 63/2
93/20 94/23 94/23	10/21	55/6 60/9 69/3 77/9		117/15 147/11
96/15 99/13 99/13	thereafter [2]	80/16 82/8 82/10	102/4 102/9 105/11	thoughts [7] 45/3
99/14 99/16 100/2	108/16 157/7	84/6 85/6 87/13	110/21 114/1	45/10 48/21 51/23
101/10 105/10	therefore [1] 47/2	87/23 93/15 94/9	114/19 114/24	52/9 63/25 113/25
106/4 106/12 107/3	these [72] 11/8	108/9 112/25 117/7	117/17 117/18	thousand [2]
108/20 108/20		131/1 134/13 137/9	117/17 117/16	117/1 118/10
112/3 112/10	21/9 22/12 28/5			
112/13 113/3 113/3	40/2 45/2 45/3	151/18 151/23	119/9 120/10	thousands [4]
113/5 113/7 113/13	45/10 58/13 74/24	155/10	120/24 122/3 122/7	25/25 113/17
114/18 115/21	78/6 78/18 79/3	things [44] 5/24	122/20 122/20	134/17 134/17
120/1 122/1 123/4	79/6 80/2 80/16	6/11 6/17 7/7 17/18		three [18] 74/25
125/4 126/18	81/16 82/6 82/7	20/7 22/11 23/23	124/18 124/21	75/19 79/6 82/11
127/16 132/3	82/11 85/2 85/16	24/23 25/17 27/9	128/6 128/18	85/2 104/1 105/3
133/13 134/9	85/22 87/10 87/15	28/5 31/14 34/4	129/13 132/24	127/20 127/21
134/10 135/11	87/19 89/11 89/20	34/11 35/4 36/3	134/25 135/5	129/22 129/25
135/19 136/16	91/1 93/17 94/1	36/10 39/22 40/2	136/19 136/23	131/5 138/25
137/11 137/18	94/12 97/10 97/14	41/3 42/20 55/25	138/6 140/6 142/2	146/17 146/18
13//11 13//10	·			
	ם.	l eggy Isom, CCR 541, RM	L IR	(27) then three
(702)671-440		COM Pursuant to NRS 239		
(102)011- 11 02	- CIOCINI IOMONIAILIC	Or i i di sudific to INNO 25	, inegai to copy with	nout payment.

_	110/7 110/0 110/16	tue els [4] 111/22	77/20 70/2 04/24	,
<u>T </u>	118/7 118/8 118/16	track [1] 111/22	77/20 78/2 84/24	unclean [1] 33/17 unconscionability
three [3] 146/19	118/17 124/25 134/5 134/8 136/18	trade [2] 83/12 83/13	87/1 111/22 131/19 135/3 141/6 146/21	[1] 51/18
146/20 146/25	139/9 139/20	traditional [2]	Tuesday [3] 8/6	uncontrollably [1]
threw [2] 94/15	141/24 142/1 147/3	20/8 114/23	8/8 8/9	76/14
94/16	147/24 155/25	transactional [2]	turn [1] 152/14	under [15] 51/12
through [35]	157/7	119/21 119/25	turnaround [1]	52/3 52/21 62/15
21/13 25/21 27/5	timely [1] 87/20	TRANSCRIBED [1]	153/2	64/22 70/5 76/12
27/18 28/5 30/12	times [3] 52/12	157/8	turns [2] 27/14	78/24 84/12 84/18
34/18 39/13 39/13	69/22 117/14	transcript [3] 1/15	39/16	87/19 132/3 137/16
40/6 42/22 45/21	timing [2] 7/21	103/16 157/10	tweaked [1] 144/5	150/15 157/9
47/23 57/24 66/16	87/19	transferring [1]	twice [1] 66/24	underfunded [1]
74/23 76/4 77/15	TIMOTHY [1] 1/18	113/1	two [39] 5/6 5/6	109/20
80/20 82/24 86/13	today [27] 6/8	transfers [1]	5/10 9/9 11/13	underlying [1]
86/21 112/25	13/8 13/25 15/11	112/13	14/25 18/23 20/9	25/12
128/13 128/13 129/7 129/18	15/21 16/24 17/7	trial [49] 8/18 9/20	21/9 21/24 24/18	undermine [1]
135/21 140/15	19/21 23/25 24/2	9/23 10/10 12/10	25/4 25/5 27/8	97/12
143/12 150/16	24/20 28/14 34/2	14/9 27/10 28/25	34/15 36/2 36/10	understand [40]
151/9 152/25	40/6 59/11 60/12	29/6 29/7 29/11	39/13 40/24 46/9	10/14 10/15 11/10
153/23 156/10	64/5 93/8 116/2	29/23 34/1 34/5	46/21 46/21 46/22	12/4 12/16 24/12
throughout [2]	117/8 118/25 122/1	34/7 34/7 35/2 35/5	66/8 71/10 71/11	27/24 29/1 34/1
148/11 148/19	124/4 125/13	37/6 37/17 38/3	74/2 74/2 86/8 93/2	38/16 39/9 53/1
throw [2] 41/19	144/24 152/12	41/13 42/22 45/6	96/17 117/7 123/12	54/9 55/17 56/20
52/10	155/25	48/10 50/2 50/3	130/3 144/17	56/23 57/13 58/7
throwing [1]	together [16] 12/8		144/19 148/19	63/21 64/17 65/10
119/10	15/17 25/24 30/21	52/2 52/5 52/13	149/22 150/8	66/7 69/1 69/25
thrown [1] 57/1	43/2 53/1 53/7 60/4		type [13] 10/11	70/8 108/19 109/12
thus [3] 69/14 87/2	60/5 61/15 65/7 80/10 100/13 102/1	60/14 62/20 63/17 64/9 64/15 65/21	20/7 70/7 76/20 89/15 122/11	109/14 116/11 124/3 135/14
106/4	136/14 146/18	66/6 66/13 72/24	122/11 130/25	138/10 139/17
tie [2] 46/8 138/24	told [3] 63/4	72/25 119/8 124/20	131/1 141/11	148/8 149/18
ties [1] 15/17	125/21 139/14	152/22	146/12 147/22	149/25 151/3
time [96] 4/20 5/1	tomorrow [1]	trials [2] 27/8	153/9	151/10 152/17
5/13 6/10 6/14 6/21	34/12	46/22	types [4] 35/4 46/9	
7/9 7/20 8/3 8/4	too [18] 12/2 12/4	tried [12] 30/20	46/21 55/24	understanding
10/20 12/7 13/6 13/7 14/13 14/18	15/10 26/17 28/12	30/21 36/11 38/1	TYPEWRITING [1]	[13] 5/1 11/8
15/1 20/3 20/13	29/13 53/25 62/22	39/6 41/6 41/7	157/8	13/14 24/3 68/1
20/17 21/7 21/14	75/17 77/5 84/12	43/18 48/18 53/1	typical [3] 20/7	68/7 73/23 81/4
21/24 22/4 22/7	99/7 114/18 119/2	53/10 58/13	51/17 114/2	101/12 128/16
23/4 24/4 24/4	124/23 129/16	tries [1] 41/9	typically [7] 6/17	128/18 135/18
25/22 29/21 31/2	146/15 151/2	trouble [1] 57/21	38/17 51/19 59/18	149/2
31/20 31/24 32/5	took [5] 39/19	true [6] 96/21	122/11 137/25	understands [3]
32/23 34/12 35/15	39/22 118/20	96/22 107/6 119/6	138/3	34/17 52/14 62/4
39/6 39/8 41/6 43/4	136/17 157/5	140/5 157/10	typo [1] 128/3	understood [4]
43/21 47/6 48/1	top [16] 23/13	truly [4] 12/6 35/2	typos [3] 149/10	30/2 58/17 141/14 152/6
49/14 51/15 61/16	42/10 127/22 128/15 128/19	96/3 124/11 trust [4] 4/21	153/18 154/17	unfair [1] 117/18
62/5 65/3 65/6	128/21 128/22	13/23 94/14 139/3	U	unique [5] 11/20
65/11 66/3 66/5	135/6 145/9 145/17	truth [1] 94/6	ultimate [4] 28/22	11/21 11/21 51/11
66/12 66/16 67/15	146/3 147/15 149/6	try [18] 10/20	43/15 70/21 138/9	51/13
68/25 72/4 73/1	150/15 150/18	27/16 36/12 39/9	ultimately [10]	United [2] 51/7
73/16 79/3 81/25	150/24	41/4 41/17 41/25	34/6 42/10 57/23	51/16
82/1 82/5 82/19	topic [1] 89/19	43/10 43/22 53/5	58/13 70/3 73/6	universe [1] 133/4
83/5 83/22 87/22 91/9 93/1 96/24	topics [1] 85/13	56/20 59/15 96/1	80/11 110/23	unknown [1]
96/25 100/3 100/25	tort [2] 115/4	97/4 117/2 129/14	136/21 155/21	113/18
108/1 108/10	150/18	139/5 152/13	Um [2] 43/13	unless [6] 15/21
108/17 111/7	toughest [1]	trying [13] 11/12	154/24	29/17 32/3 52/19
111/10 115/15	112/20	12/5 42/10 46/8	Um-hum [2] 43/13	79/4 105/20
			154/24	
-	D _i	eggy Isom, CCR 541, RM	IR	(28) three unless

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR (28) three... - unless (702)671-4402 - CROERT48@GMAIL.COM Pursuant to NRS 239.053, illegal to copy without payment.

LAS VEGAS DEVELOPME	INT TOND LLC	T		October 9, 2019
U	130/14 135/8	voidable [1] 54/7	wasn't [7] 7/3	80/17 81/14 82/5
unlike [1] 142/19	135/19 151/14	voir [1] 34/15	37/23 44/14 46/11	83/9 84/2 84/10
unmanageable [1]	using [1] 136/13	W	124/19 136/16	84/21 84/24 85/5
77/6	utilize [1] 84/2		138/17	91/25 92/1 93/8
unnecessary [1]	V	Wait [1] 115/8	waste [2] 27/4	94/5 94/17 96/18
124/24		waiting [2] 40/17	141/23	98/11 104/1 104/8
unopposed [1]	vacation [1] 88/19	72/11	water [1] 17/2	104/11 105/4
13/4	valid [2] 136/10	waive [1] 33/22	way [41] 6/23 7/4	111/22 112/10
unrelated [2] 25/6	142/17	waived [5] 19/9	12/14 13/1 13/8	113/15 121/16
48/18	value [3] 78/5	29/11 29/12 38/5	14/3 14/3 20/16	121/24 121/25
until [9] 9/19 9/24	87/12 92/22	50/15	22/23 39/22 40/25	125/7 125/12
13/5 16/9 34/10	various [1] 75/10	waiver [12] 29/5	45/21 47/15 48/4	125/13 125/18
35/7 39/24 57/15	vast [2] 93/23	29/11 33/25 42/9	48/23 57/17 66/4	126/6 126/14
102/1	148/15	45/7 48/9 50/14	67/2 75/16 76/6	127/16 131/19
up [47] 4/24 6/25	VEGAS [22] 1/12	50/21 51/3 51/11	77/5 77/5 84/14	133/5 135/15
9/21 14/17 16/6	3/9 4/1 19/2 19/17	52/6 53/21	84/20 86/6 86/13	138/23 140/21
16/7 20/4 20/11	19/22 25/11 25/18	waiving [1] 155/20	87/15 95/4 102/4	145/20 150/5
22/15 26/14 30/2	31/8 31/21 32/16	walk [4] 20/25	102/21 104/6	152/21 153/25
31/14 31/15 32/3	32/18 39/18 76/2	128/13 128/13	106/15 109/4	we've [26] 12/10
33/6 33/13 33/19	76/25 81/8 82/17	129/7	125/11 129/16	17/10 18/21 19/19
34/6 43/4 43/14	93/9 106/14 107/24	walked [4] 27/5	134/4 136/23 139/4	24/24 25/16 33/16
43/17 44/17 52/21	110/13 112/23 vehicle [1] 98/4	27/18 28/5 30/11	152/13 154/15	36/11 52/12 64/24
54/18 56/12 56/13		want [68] 5/7 5/7	154/19	71/22 77/20 79/19
60/14 61/8 64/23	vendors [1] 113/18 verify [1] 112/18	6/3 10/3 10/13	ways [2] 102/16	84/22 84/24 85/2
78/8 85/10 93/16	versus [4] 30/17	10/18 11/7 13/13	108/20	104/19 105/14
96/23 107/11	47/20 48/17 154/25	14/3 16/11 28/6	we [335]	105/14 109/1
111/15 111/16	vertical [1] 22/9	34/16 34/21 45/12	we'd [3] 9/5 12/23 94/22	110/16 110/20 113/19 126/3
115/14 117/22	very [54] 11/20	52/23 56/10 58/6	we'll [41] 8/18	127/23 132/11
118/21 124/10	11/21 11/25 14/5	59/7 59/11 59/13	10/8 10/9 10/21	WEDNESDAY [3]
130/5 138/24	18/21 19/15 19/15	61/18 69/12 69/23	12/25 13/12 13/22	1/21 4/1 152/12
145/22 148/14	21/24 21/25 33/4	73/23 85/6 85/21	13/23 13/12 13/22	week [3] 8/16
153/10 153/24	33/4 34/14 34/24	90/13 93/18 95/19	14/7 14/23 15/2	11/14 150/8
154/17	35/7 38/2 38/10	100/8 101/1 102/11	15/2 15/3 15/6 15/6	
upon [14] 22/22	40/23 41/21 62/11	103/17 112/12	16/16 18/7 24/24	65/1 71/10 71/11
37/9 45/6 56/24	77/17 77/21 78/9	113/12 113/13	34/13 72/10 72/25	72/10 117/7
92/7 115/5 131/2	78/9 85/14 86/14	115/15 121/19	73/13 74/13 74/13	well [47] 5/21 6/16
135/8 138/1 142/21	86/14 88/12 88/16	122/13 123/2 123/7	74/15 84/4 99/8	7/5 7/11 8/9 9/17
143/1 151/14 155/15 156/9	88/16 90/6 90/6	123/18 123/22	100/24 101/25	22/19 25/23 26/1
us [18] 10/20 14/2	90/10 90/10 92/24	124/24 140/8	104/22 113/22	26/15 29/24 30/6
29/24 32/4 37/6	97/8 97/16 106/18	140/15 141/23	119/7 127/2 152/1	37/10 38/14 39/11
40/18 47/20 65/4	107/13 109/16	145/24 148/23	152/19 154/1	39/21 39/25 46/3
66/3 74/23 102/22	119/21 120/1	149/6 149/12	154/15 154/17	46/18 54/21 55/5
103/13 105/6 109/1	120/11 124/16	149/21 150/12	154/20	55/5 68/9 72/6 74/2
112/15 113/9	125/20 130/11	150/13 151/4 151/6	we're [82] 7/19	77/17 80/25 85/9
116/24 146/10	130/11 131/12	151/7 151/9 151/24	8/13 11/12 11/21	88/2 88/18 89/25
USCIS [7] 83/14	131/13 131/13	152/19 153/20	14/9 16/4 18/11	91/6 95/14 96/11
83/20 83/21 83/24	132/22 132/22	154/3 154/22	20/22 22/6 22/7	99/7 101/1 101/8
83/25 86/12 86/21	137/19 144/12	155/19	26/14 31/25 32/1	109/10 109/19
use [13] 15/6 75/7	153/11	wanted [9] 4/17	32/3 34/6 34/12	110/2 110/5 112/7
78/18 79/25 94/4	vet [1] 52/19	60/10 60/12 63/8	37/15 40/13 40/22	136/21 139/18
97/5 97/6 97/17	vetted [1] 34/9	94/3 115/6 120/23	41/24 43/17 47/20	140/21 141/25
117/23 128/10	VIA [1] 2/15	141/18 154/19	49/1 55/19 57/25	144/4
134/2 136/15 137/4	viable [1] 38/23	wanting [1]	58/10 58/12 59/14	Wells [9] 105/12
used [11] 23/3	VICE [1] 2/12 video [1] 132/7	141/14 wants [6] 27/10	60/3 60/4 61/12	105/21 106/2 107/7
106/24 107/19	Viet [1] 80/14	54/19 59/15 84/1	64/2 64/8 64/13	112/14 112/17
112/12 112/22	visit [1] 70/12	96/2 129/7	66/2 66/20 69/4 70/8 71/9 71/13	113/16 113/21 123/17
115/12 128/23	void [2] 27/14 54/7	was [166]	10/0 /1/5 /1/13	143/1/
	2//11/34//			
				(26)
	Pe	eggy Isom, CCR 541, RM	IK	(29) unlike - Wells

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR (29) unlike - Wells (702)671-4402 - CROERT48@GMAIL.COM Pursuant to NRS 239.053, illegal to copy without payment.

LAS VEGAS DEVELOFINE	I TOND LLC	Т	Т	October 9, 2013
W	9/19 9/20 13/4	15/22 22/23 22/25	34/9 34/22 35/5	71/8 78/14 84/21
went [16] 5/16	18/17 21/21 26/6	36/4 36/18 38/5	36/22 38/2 38/3	92/13 95/14 102/22
21/13 28/3 46/16	29/7 35/4 35/7 35/9	39/18 41/16 45/17	38/8 38/8 38/10	119/7 130/6 131/22
80/11 80/20 106/21	36/4 36/4 40/15	46/15 47/9 47/13	40/11 41/14 41/14	131/22 131/23
106/24 111/23	43/6 46/17 47/8	64/22 65/25 76/3	41/21 44/3 44/4	133/3 133/4 138/4
113/19 115/24	52/11 55/2 56/23	80/10 82/1 89/5	47/10 47/17 49/4	140/2 147/7 154/15
120/23 121/2	57/21 57/22 59/14	89/13 93/3 93/7	53/5 60/25 65/15	worked [2] 88/7
121/19 122/14	63/12 64/8 64/9	106/12 108/6	65/15 70/4 70/20	96/3
144/20	64/9 72/10 75/3	110/15 110/15	71/8 73/15 84/4	working [5] 83/3
were [49] 21/3	77/24 81/17 91/22	110/16 119/11	97/17 97/17 97/25	96/20 125/18
21/17 21/18 23/11	96/1 100/12 100/22	119/24 126/18	98/13 99/4 101/14	125/22 147/6
31/12 32/2 32/7	108/17 108/17	127/10 128/3	101/15 104/3 104/4	works [4] 10/15
32/8 32/10 32/10	111/10 114/16	128/25 130/5	108/3 110/5 111/9	48/24 129/13
32/11 32/24 32/24	117/7 117/10 122/7	143/23 146/14	112/5 112/19	137/16
37/8 37/20 39/22	128/12 134/5 136/7	148/19 151/13	115/23 116/2	world [1] 97/7
42/19 42/20 50/7	137/7 139/25	151/20	120/14 126/19	worried [1] 70/1
72/13 83/1 83/3	149/21 153/25	whichever [1]	126/20 129/7	worry [3] 9/24
87/10 91/22 93/21	155/21	58/20	134/20 149/23	69/17 69/20
95/2 105/10 106/13	whenever [1]	while [1] 25/13	152/13 153/1	worthless [1] 23/9
106/14 106/15	21/19	who [11] 33/13	154/17 155/7	would [120] 5/18
106/15 108/17	where [50] 12/10	43/10 78/6 80/23	WILLIAMS [1]	6/16 6/24 8/8 9/16
109/20 112/13	12/13 12/14 14/1	86/15 88/11 95/12	1/18	11/4 11/17 14/12
117/3 118/14	14/16 17/5 17/5	110/20 137/17	willing [3] 97/8	14/19 14/20 15/20
119/19 119/20	22/4 22/20 23/11	148/12 155/21	113/15 142/9	16/3 16/5 21/22
120/19 122/8	33/18 33/25 34/5	who's [4] 28/4	win [3] 65/2 110/3	23/12 27/13 29/8
131/24 133/9	35/19 37/11 46/16	73/15 121/12	110/5	33/18 36/21 37/3
142/25 143/22	54/1 55/13 55/21	150/17	wind [1] 14/17	37/25 39/5 39/8
146/11 147/5 149/2	57/4 58/5 59/22	whoever [1] 153/9		41/23 41/23 41/24
156/20 157/8	63/24 65/8 66/1	whole [13] 7/20	winds [1] 44/17	42/12 42/14 42/14
weren't [5] 32/8	67/4 77/20 84/25	34/18 41/9 46/8	wish [1] 103/13	42/22 42/22 43/1
77/18 80/10 85/11	87/4 95/3 99/21	49/14 56/17 63/5	wishes [1] 88/18	44/23 44/24 45/5
139/2	106/21 106/24	87/6 87/23 97/1	withdraw [2]	45/17 48/14 48/20
west [18] 63/9	111/23 113/13	113/17 116/13	33/22 83/17	49/22 50/1 50/16
75/2 75/5 75/25	113/19 114/4 114/9	116/18	within [5] 62/10	51/6 52/1 52/25
76/3 76/4 76/21	120/23 121/2 121/8 121/9 121/19	whose [1] 110/14 why [51] 4/24 6/7	73/8 73/9 79/12 150/9	54/2 54/5 54/6 54/6 61/8 66/25 67/6
80/8 80/20 82/12	122/12 122/13	8/15 8/23 11/17	without [14] 6/12	67/8 67/18 67/24
85/4 89/2 89/5	129/24 131/19	13/1 23/7 28/20	52/16 53/19 53/22	68/21 69/15 75/13
89/11 89/13 91/22	139/16 145/6 154/7	34/17 37/5 37/21	58/6 68/22 88/10	76/6 76/7 76/11
102/25 104/2	whereas [2] 19/14	40/14 41/16 43/3	99/25 108/21 124/4	78/8 78/25 83/24
what [168]	38/9	43/17 44/2 48/6	126/3 140/14	86/13 87/11 87/12
what's [16] 33/23	WHEREOF [1]	52/10 52/13 52/18	143/17 144/9	87/22 87/25 88/16
39/9 41/8 42/7	157/13	53/17 57/12 62/1	WITNESS [1]	88/18 89/14 90/6
42/12 46/3 51/13	whether [33] 29/3	63/21 65/10 67/24	157/13	90/7 90/9 90/10
59/16 59/23 69/24	34/7 42/21 44/5	81/21 83/11 86/9	witnesses [2]	90/16 91/2 91/2
87/6 89/7 89/22	44/12 52/4 52/5	86/10 87/7 87/7	73/15 73/16	91/22 92/21 93/2
95/22 119/12 138/8	52/20 55/12 56/2	87/8 92/4 92/4	won't [8] 9/19	93/4 93/4 94/3 95/4
whatever [20]	62/19 68/6 68/10	93/19 93/20 99/15	15/23 26/17 30/12	96/1 98/25 100/7
10/25 27/14 34/8	82/7 84/16 84/16	108/24 109/11	51/3 98/1 125/1	103/1 103/9 103/18
42/13 42/21 57/16	88/9 99/18 109/2	113/11 115/24	136/23	104/7 106/2 106/4
70/7 98/7 99/23	111/21 112/4 123/4	116/24 122/7	wondering [2]	106/4 106/7 107/1
101/16 109/16	128/9 130/16	124/24 128/19	99/23 114/23	108/3 108/4 109/3
109/20 113/1	130/22 132/20	137/4 141/13	word [6] 94/17	109/10 113/9 114/3
113/23 117/14	136/13 136/13	141/18 151/3	138/14 138/15	114/3 124/10 127/6
142/1 144/25 145/1	138/4 138/5 142/16	153/22	153/7 153/14	127/8 130/24 131/2
153/10 155/18	148/17 148/18	WIGWAM [1] 2/5	153/16	134/20 135/7
wheel [1] 14/16	which [42] 7/25	will [57] 10/11	work [21] 9/8	143/21 143/23
when [54] 5/14 5/16 7/8 7/11 7/12	8/2 9/23 10/21	22/14 24/16 28/19	15/20 40/1 47/15	143/24 144/1
3/10 //0 //11 //12				
	<u> </u>	l Paav Isom CCR 541 RM	I	(30) went - would

(30) went - would

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR (30) wer (702)671-4402 - CROERT48@GMAIL.COM Pursuant to NRS 239.053, illegal to copy without payment.

LAS VEGAS DEVELOPME	NT FUND LLC			October 9, 2
W	119/4 119/14	106/8 107/9 109/12		
-	124/12 125/3 125/9	114/15 117/17		
would [5] 144/24	126/1 127/8 127/13	119/7 119/17		
146/14 149/11	127/19 133/19	120/21 123/10		
153/2 154/4	141/1 152/9 156/1	123/25 125/3		
wouldn't [5] 65/10				
98/20 113/12	yet [10] 5/2 7/9	125/18 125/25		
144/23 153/10	25/25 33/8 58/15	127/14 127/16		
writing [1] 119/5	68/16 81/7 84/7	129/20 129/22		
wrong [8] 57/25	94/4 155/4	132/24 134/12		
63/7 89/7 90/1	you [330]	135/4 135/19		
135/11 137/10	you'll [2] 148/10	135/19 135/25		
138/9 139/11	156/13	136/24 137/25		
	you're [29] 6/25	138/6 138/22		
wrote [2] 96/4	14/2 14/17 17/2	139/24 140/11		
139/12	27/19 27/20 43/7	140/14 140/18		
X	55/10 56/17 57/25	140/19 141/14		
	71/18 72/23 72/24	142/5 142/14 146/8		
XVI [1] 1/3	72/25 97/6 97/19			
Υ		147/8 147/24		
-	110/21 110/22	148/11 148/25		
yeah [42] 7/13	110/23 135/2	149/5 149/21		
9/17 10/7 12/9	137/10 138/4	149/25 152/7 155/2		
12/17 12/22 13/21	138/17 141/9 151/2	155/14 155/20		
16/14 17/13 18/6	151/10 151/12	155/24 155/25		
30/4 55/25 57/12	155/20 156/8	156/3 156/4		
60/1 60/7 61/7	you've [2] 35/8	-		
64/19 68/4 68/23	68/1	Z		
	your [143] 4/7	zero [1] 99/18		
69/19 89/9 100/10	4/10 4/12 4/19 6/20			
100/24 101/3 101/9	7/19 8/18 8/22			
104/13 104/17				
105/3 109/13 124/6	11/13 13/16 15/9			
133/9 135/17	16/3 16/9 16/21			
135/23 144/17	18/14 18/18 18/20			
147/5 149/15 150/2	19/8 19/21 21/2			
150/18 152/3	23/19 24/5 28/14			
153/15 154/2	29/20 31/1 31/6			
156/16	35/6 35/18 36/3			
•	2014 0 2014 2010			
year [5] 10/24 59/8	40/20 41/23 42/21			
72/9 83/9 133/7	44/1 44/4 44/10			
years [4] 29/22				
40/10 51/9 96/18	44/10 44/11 44/11			
yes [60] 10/17	44/13 44/16 44/18			
11/2 11/6 15/22	45/18 46/23 47/4			
16/21 17/19 18/5	47/5 47/25 47/25			
18/13 18/14 18/18	53/21 54/5 54/18			
18/19 30/9 31/6	55/1 55/11 55/21			
35/22 38/22 38/24	59/23 66/17 66/23			
	67/3 68/20 69/12			
39/1 45/9 45/11	70/25 73/19 74/21			
53/12 54/8 56/5	74/23 75/5 79/4			
57/9 57/19 58/3				
59/6 60/3 60/20	79/4 79/8 87/15			
61/5 62/25 70/23	89/14 90/4 90/5			
73/4 73/19 74/21	90/23 91/10 92/15			
91/11 92/3 92/12	93/14 93/15 94/4			
103/6 103/11	94/14 94/20 95/6			
	97/5 97/9 98/19			
103/12 103/15	100/13 102/17			
104/20 104/23	102/21 105/7			
104/23 111/1				
115/18 115/18	105/10 105/14			
	D.	aggy Isom CCD 5/1 DM	ID.	(31) would - 3

(31) would... - zero

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR (31) would (702)671-4402 - CROERT48@GMAIL.COM Pursuant to NRS 239.053, illegal to copy without payment.

Electronically Filed 10/18/2019 6:04 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

		CLERK OF THE COUR
1	RPLY	Atumb. L
	John P. Aldrich, Esq.	W
2	Nevada Bar No. 6877	
_	Catherine Hernandez, Esq.	
3	Nevada Bar No. 8410	
4	Matthew B. Beckstead, Esq.	
4	Nevada Bar No. 14168 ALDRICH LAW FIRM, LTD.	
5	7866 West Sahara Avenue	
	Las Vegas, NV 89117	
6	Telephone: (702) 853-5490	
	Facsimile: (702) 227-1975	
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
		DICEDICE COURT
8	EIGHTH JUDICIAL	
9	CLARK COUN	II, NEVADA
9	FRONT SIGHT MANAGEMENT LLC, a	
10	Nevada Limited Liability Company,	CASE NO.: A-18-781084-B
		DEPT NO.: 16
11	Plaintiff,	
12	VS.	REPLY TO OPPOSITION TO
13	LAS VECAS DEVELODMENT ELIND LLC	<u>PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR</u> SANCTIONS
13	LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT FUND LLC, a Nevada Limited Liability Company; et al.,	SANCTIONS
14	ivevada Elilined Elaointy Company, et al.,	
•	Defendants.	
15		
1.0	AND ALL DELATED COLDITED CLADIC	
16	AND ALL RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.	
17		
1 /	COMES NOW Plaintiff FRONT SIGHT	MANAGEMENT, LLC ('Plaintiff' or 'Front
18		
	Sight'), by and through its attorneys, John P.	Aldrich, Esq., Catherine Hernandez, Esq., and
19	Mad D D 1 a 1 E Cal All' 1 L	P' I'd 11 1 1 1 2 2 P 1
20	Matthew B. Beckstead, Esq., of the Aldrich La	w Firm, Ltd., and hereby submit its Reply to
20	Opposition to Motion for Sanctions.	
21	opposition to treaten for summerical	
	///	
22		
22	///	
23	///	
24		
- '		
ı	1 1	

This Reply is made and based on the attached memorandum of points and authorities and 1 2 supporting documentation, the papers and pleadings on file in this action, and any oral argument 3 this Court may allow. DATED this 18th day of October, 2019. 4 5 ALDRICH LAW FIRM, LTD. 6 /s/ John P. Aldrich John P. Aldrich, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 6877 7 Catherine Hernandez, Esq. 8 Nevada Bar No. 8410 Matthew B. Beckstead, Esq. 9 Nevada Bar No. 14168 7866 West Sahara Avenue 10 Las Vegas, Nevada 89117 Telephone: (702) 853-5490 Facsimile: (702) 227-1975 11 Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counterdefendants 12 13 14 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES** 15 Defendant EB5IA feigns confusion about what sanctions Plaintiff seeks. However, simply reviewing the opening paragraphs of the Motion makes it clear what Plaintiff is seeking. 16 17 In the Motion, Plaintiff: 18 ...moves the Court for an order of sanctions against Defendant EB5 Impact Advisors LLC and its officers and members (collectively 'EB5IA') for Defendant 19 EB5IA's violation of the Court's Order to produce a full accounting and failure to produce a full accounting pursuant to this Court's Order, and for Defendants' EB5IA and Dziubla's intentional spoliation of key evidence in this case.' 20 21 Plaintiff then requests the following relief: 22 [1] [T]he Court should strike EB5IA's Answer or, [2] in the alternative, give an adverse inference instruction that the records EB5IA should have retained and 23 produced would support Front Sight's claims of fraud, misrepresentation, concealment, conversion, breach of contract, and civil conspiracy. 24

The Motion then continues:

In addition, the Court should sanction EB5IA in an amount equal to the amount of money Defendant EB5IA took from Plaintiff that Defendant EB5IA cannot prove was used properly to market the Front Sight project.

(Motion, at pp. 1-2.) While additional briefing may be pertinent to a specific request for monetary sanctions, Mr. Winters' report provides a rational number: **at least \$144,574.27**. That is the amount by which Front Sight's payments to EB5IA between February 2013 and October 6, 2016 exceeded the documented expenses – by Dziubla's own documentation. Plaintiff also intends to ask for attorneys' fees for having to bring the Motion for Accounting and related motions, including the Motion to Compel and the present Motion for Sanctions. Once Plaintiff prevails on this Motion, it will submit a separate Motion for Attorneys' Fees. This is the proper procedure because Plaintiff continues to incur attorneys' fees related to the scant accounting Defendant EB5IA and Dziubla provided and Plaintiff's attempts to enforce the Court's Order.

Defendants assert:

Plaintiff's motion should be denied for the very simply reasons that: (1) Defendant EB5IA has provided an accounting which details how every single dollar received by EB5IA was spent; and (2) any backup documents which were allegedly discarded were discarded contemporaneously in the ordinary course of business, which was before litigation was contemplated[; and]...[3] Defendant was not obligated to retain 'every scrap of paper.' (Opposition ("Opp."), p. 3 (citations omitted).)

Sadly, Defendants simply continue to ignore the true state of the facts and expect this Court to ignore them as well.

A. DEFENDANT EB5IA'S ACCOUNTING IS NOT A PROPER ACCOUNTING

Defendant EB5IA claims "production of the general ledger is production of the complete accounting records." (Opp., p. 3, 1. 27.) Defendant EB5IA further claims "Defendant has produced the complete and unredacted general ledger for EB5IA. This is, virtually by definition, a full and complete accounting. Thus, Defendant has fully complied with the order to produce an

accounting." (Opp., p. 4, ls. 18-20.) Finally, in Dziubla's Declaration that was filed contemporaneously with the Opposition, Dziubla claims that "individual invoices were discarded consistent with the EB5IA document retention policy and practice[.]" (Dziubla Declaration, p. 2, ls. 23-24.) Of course, no copy of the "document retention policy" – more aptly named a "document destruction policy" – was provided.

Defendant EB5IA and Dziubla's claims are blatantly false. The documentation provided is <u>not</u> a proper accounting. Plaintiff has hired Douglas S. Winters, CPA, as an expert witness and forensic accountant. However, Mr. Winters is not able to complete his analysis of how Defendants, including EB5IA, Fleming, and Dziubla, spent Front Sight's money. Mr. Winters notes that EB5IA has not produced the following:

- An electronic copy of its Quick Books accounting records;
- Balance sheets;

- General ledger reports;
- Cash receipts or disbursement journals;
- All cancelled checks;
- Deposit slips;
- Expense reports or expense reimbursement requests with supporting documentation;
- Invoices, receipts, statements, or other documents customarily maintained as support for cash receipts and disbursements.

(Expert Report of Douglas S. Winters, CPA, dated October 18, 2019, at pp. 2-3, attached hereto as **Exhibit 4**.) Mr. Winters goes on to provide an analysis of Dziubla's April 3, 2019 Declaration and the accompanying Quickbooks. He noted the following (using the same paragraph numbers as Defendant Dziubla used in his April 3, 2019 Declaration about the alleged QuickBooks records):

4. Budget: Mr. Dziubla declares "The Budget contemplated that Plaintiff Front Sight would pay EB5IA a total of \$277,230 to develop, structure and implement an EB5 financing platform." The \$277,230 Budget includes both the fee that Front Sight agreed to pay and the estimated expenses. The Budget was not a set amount that Front Sight owed EB5IA.

- 6. Exhibit B is list of funds that EB5IA received from Plaintiff totaling \$336,730. Mr. Dziubla references the Wells Fargo ("WF") bank statements that were produced. I compared Exhibit B with the WF statements and found that the second item on Exhibit B, a deposit dated December 2, 2013 in the amount of \$24,500 is not on the WF statements. The EB5IA production of Wells Fargo ("WF") statements begins with WF(2013)00001 which covers December 1 to December 31, 2013. It is possible that it was deposited into the account in November 2013 and entered into Quick Books in December 2013.
- 7. Exhibit C is, according the Declaration, purportedly "a transaction ledger from Quickbooks." I note that the pages lack headings or footings customarily found on Quick Books reports.

Mr. Dziubla declared that the payments totaling \$359,826.95 are "the expenses that were payable by the Plaintiff."

Following Exhibit D of Mr. Dziubla's Declaration are copies of bills and invoices as support of some of the amounts listed on Exhibit C. Attached hereto as Schedule 1 is a list of 37 payments totaling \$113,650.73 from Exhibit C for which I found supporting invoices. I have been unable to find invoices or other documents as support for the other entries on Exhibit C.

As mentioned above, according to the February 14, 2013 agreement between EB5IA and Front Sight, Front Sight was to pay of fee of \$36,000 plus reimburse EB5IA for expenses. Schedule A to the agreement states "Borrower shall be responsible for payment of lender's reasonable expenses."

To support reimbursement of expenses, it is a well-established business practice and custom to maintain and provide support for all reimbursable expenses. Mr. Dziubla claims he has substantial business experience and should be well familiar with customary expense documentation requirements.

(**Exhibit 4**, pp. 3-4.) With regard to Defendants EB5IA and Dziubla's duty to retain financial records for Defendant EB5IA, Mr. Winters also references IRS Publication 463, which provides:

"Documentary evidence ordinarily will be considered adequate if it shows the amount, date, place, and essential character of the expense.

For example, $\underline{a \text{ hotel receipt}}$ is enough to support expenses for business travel if it has all of the following information.

The name and location of the hotel.

The dates you stayed there. 1 Separate amounts for charges such as lodging, meals, and telephone calls. 2 A restaurant receipt is enough to prove an expense for a business meal if it has all 3 of the following information. 4 The name and location of the restaurant. 5 The number of people served. 6 The date and amount of the expense. 7 If a charge is made for items other than food and beverages, the receipt must show that this is the case. 8 Canceled check. 9 A canceled check, together with a bill from the payee, ordinarily establishes the cost. However, a canceled check by itself doesn't prove a business expense 10 without other evidence to show that it was for a business purpose." (Emphasis in original.) 11 (Exhibit 4, pp. 4-5.) 12 After a brief reference to Mr. Dziubla's evidentiary hearing testimony, Mr. Winters 13 provides the following analysis: 14 In my opinion, EB5IA has produced documents to support \$113,650.73 of 15 expenses. 16 I compared the entries on Exhibit C with the WF statements. Attached hereto as Schedule 2 is a list of over 700 entries totaling \$86,406.71 of withdrawals on the 17 WF bank statements that were not listed on Exhibit C. 18 8. Exhibit D is a list of \$44,300 capital infusion. That bank deposits on Exhibit D also included on the last page of Exhibit C which shows that 19 \$44,500 was deposited into WF and that \$76,850 was paid out, for a net decrease of \$32,550. 20 The \$76,850 was paid to Kenworth Capital \$56,975; Legacy Realty 21 Capital Inc. \$17,875; and Robert Dziubla \$2,000. 22 (Exhibit 4, p. 6.) 23 Finally, Mr. Winters provided the following opinion: 24

EB5IA produced documentation for expenses totaling \$113,650.73. \$105,142.73 of that amount was paid out before October 6, 2016. Through that date Front Sight had paid EB5IA \$249,730. The Front Sight payments to EB5IA exceed the documented expenses by \$144,587.27 through October 6, 2016.

The accounting prepared by and produced by does not reconcile with the WF bank accounts. The EB5IA accounting of its disbursements on Exhibit C of Mr. Dziubla's accounting totals \$359,826.95. The total deposits and disbursements from the WF accounts total \$482,932.25. The EB5IA accounting of its disbursements differs from the WF bank activity by \$86,408.71 (see Statement 1). The EB5IA accounting of deposits differs from the WF bank deposits by \$130,934.30.

It is my opinion that the EB5IA has failed 1) to provide a complete or accurate accounting, 2) to provide documentation for the expenses that it charged Front Sight, and 3) to maintain adequate receipts and other records to support its expenses.

(Exhibit 4, pp. 6-7.)

As Mr. Winters pointed out, there is a significant question as to the authenticity of the QuickBooks records, as they do not actually appear to be normal QuickBooks records. Additionally, conspicuously absent from the allegedly 'complete accounting' is a Balance Sheet. Finally, at the behest of Mr. Winters, Plaintiff requested the electronic backup to the QuickBooks records so that Plaintiff could verify the records. The following is the request and the response received from Defendant EB5IA:

REQUEST NO. 97:

Please provide an <u>electronic backup</u> copy of the QuickBooks attached to "Updated Declaration of Robert W. Dziubla Re – Accounting" signed on April 3, 2019 (Exhibit 46 to the Evidentiary Hearing).

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 97:

Responding Party objects to this Document Request on grounds that it is <u>vague and ambiguous as to "backup;"</u> it is <u>burdensome</u>, <u>oppressive</u> and only meant to harass Responding Party because it seeks documents that are already in possession of Requesting Party; and it purports to require Responding Party to disclose information that is a <u>trade secret</u>, <u>confidential</u>, <u>proprietary</u>, <u>commercially sensitive</u>, <u>or information that is protected by rights of privacy</u>.

(Defendant EB5IA's Responses to Plaintiff's Third Set of Requests for Production of Documents, attached hereto as **Exhibit 5** (emphasis added).) The Court will note that these are essentially the same frivolous objections Defendants asserted as to each and every other Request for Production of Documents that has been sent to Defendants. These contradictory objections – *i.e.*, has the information already been provided or will it not be provided because it is proprietary and confidential? – are absurd. And the request is certainly <u>not</u> burdensome or oppressive. Defendant Dziubla should be able to provide that information immediately with the push of a button – unless of course he destroyed that evidence too! The electronic backup to the QuickBooks should be on his computer. But this begs the question: what would the electronic backup show that Defendants do not want the Court or Plaintiff to know? Thus, Defendant EB5IA and Dziubla continue to refuse to provide even the most basic information regarding an accounting. Sanctions are appropriate.

B. DEFENDANT EB5IA'S DISCARDING OF THE DOCUMENTS – ALLEGEDLY "IN THE ORDINARY COURSE OF BUSINESS" – WAS NOT ONLY INTENTIONAL, BUT IS AGAINST DEFENDANT EB5IA'S CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE ENGAGEMENT LETTER, CONTRARY TO STATUTE, AND IN VIOLATION OF IRS REGULATIONS AND DEFENDANTS EB5IA AND DZIUBLA ARE AT FAULT FOR THE DESTRUCTION OF THE EVIDENCE

1. <u>Defendant Dziubla's Claim That Defendant EB5IA Had a Company Document Destruction Policy Is Bogus</u>

Defendant Dziubla states in his Declaration that he discarded relevant and significant financial records pursuant to company policy. Again, conspicuously absent is a copy of the alleged company "document retention policy." Plaintiff is hopeful that the Court can understand that Plaintiff and the Court cannot take Defendant Dziubla's word that there was indeed such a policy. Nor can Plaintiff or the Court accept the assertion that any such policy even existed. In response to direct questioning about the document destruction policy of Defendants LVDF and

EB5IC (the regional center), Defendant Dziubla denied that he tossed those entities' records pursuant to a similar policy. (*See* June 3, 2019 Evid. Hrg. Tr. at p. 50, ls. 23-25; p. 51, l. 1; p. 56, ls. 4-7.) This alleged "policy" was nothing more than Defendant Dziubla's blatant and nefarious decision to destroy the evidence of fraud.

2. <u>Defendants EB5IA and Dziubla Had Multiple Duties – Contractual, Common law, Statutory, and Regulatory – to Keep the Records Defendant Dziubla Tossed</u>

Defendants EB5IA and Dziubla had a **contractual** duty to keep records of all expenses. The February 14, 2013 engagement letter, which has been admitted as Exhibit 6 during the evidentiary hearing, specifically provides:

The Company will pay for or <u>reimburse</u> EB5IA, as billed periodically, for its expenses, which are detailed to the extent possible as this time on the attached budget, regardless of whether or not the contemplated Financing is completed. If any of such expenses have not previously been <u>reimbursed</u> at the time this Agreement terminates, the Company shall promptly <u>reimburse</u> EB5IA for any such expenses incurred or accrued prior to termination.

(Exhibit 6 to the Evidentiary Hearing, p. 3 (Bates #0022) (emphases added).) Defendants Dziubla and EB5IA had a <u>clear contractual duty</u> to keep those records. Defendants Dziubla and EB5IA repeatedly refused to do so, and repeatedly refused to provide documentation to Plaintiff, despite repeated requests for them to do so. For example:

- On **July 28, 2015**, Plaintiff, through Mike Meacher, requested information for reimbursement of expenses. (*See* email correspondence from Mike Meacher to Robert Dziubla, attached hereto as **Exhibit 6**, FS 03698-03700.)
- On **February 15, 2017**, Plaintiff again requested reports of what Defendants were actually doing to raise money in China, India, and around the world. Dziubla's response was "We don't get paid for writing reports, we get paid for sourcing investors." (Exhibit 19 to the Evidentiary Hearing, 0076.)

Plaintiff made multiple verbal requests for documentation as well. Each time Plaintiff requested documentation of how the money was being spent and Defendants refused to comply, Defendants were aware of the possibility of litigation. Further, each time Defendant Dziubla paid himself or Defendant Fleming (or their entities) money, he knew the possibility of litigation existed.

Defendants Dziubla and EB5IA had a **common law** duty to keep the financial records. Defendant EB5IA and Defendant Dziubla assert that "the absolute latest that any documents were disposed of was August 5, 2018[.] This date is prior to the 'trigger date' which would impose any obligation to maintain the records." (Opp., p. 7, ls. 22-24.) This statement is ridiculous, and ignores the contract and the law – something Plaintiff has seen throughout this litigation. But the true, undisputed facts that came from the writings and testimony of Dziubla himself are set forth above and outline all of the duties that required Dziubla and EB5IA to keep the records, and the dates Dziubla, an attorney, knew they could be relevant to litigation in the future.

Even though they ignore the contractual duties under the engagement letter, Defendants EB5IA and Dziubla agree that, once they are on notice of a potential claim, they are obligated to keep the records. (Opp., p. 5, ls. 24-27.) Defendant EB5IA and Defendant Dziubla's argument that the destruction of this key evidence was prior to the "trigger date" is a non-starter. But even if the Court did not find the repeated refusals by Dziubla and EB5IA to provide documentation of expenses under the engagement letter convincing, Defendant Dziubla's own testimony and documents show he was on notice of the potential for litigation – thereby triggering Defendants' duty to maintain complete and accurate records – long before August 5, 2018. For example:

 Dzuibla sent the first Notice of Default letter on July 30, 2018. (Exhibit 20 to the Evidentiary Hearing.)

- Dziubla breached the CLA and held back loan proceeds because he wanted more documentation from Plaintiff. This was in early 2018. (See June 3, 2019 Evid. Hrg. Tr. at p. 157.)
- In a June 20, 2016 e-mail, Dziubla makes this statement to Mr. Meacher: "Threats of imminent lawsuits do not help the situation." (See email correspondence from Robert Dziubla to Mike Meacher, attached hereto as Exhibit 7, FS 04629.)
- Before that, on June 17, 2016, Dziubla himself mentions he and Front Sight could be subjected to lawsuits. (See email correspondence from Robert Dziubla to Mike Meacher, attached hereto as Exhibit 8, FS 04630.)
- On May 12, 2016, Dziubla sent an e-mail to Plaintiff setting forth three "choices" –
 one of which was to "part as friends." That is, Dziubla was looking for a release.
 (Exhibit 53 to the Evidentiary Hearing.)
- On March 1, 2016, Mike Meacher sent Dziubla and Fleming an e-mail in which he listed all the misrepresentations up to that time. The second paragraph of that e-mail starts: "You are in a dangerous situation." (Exhibit 16 to the Evidentiary Hearing.)
- Dziubla should have known all along that litigation was possible, given his repeated lies. (See Chart of Fraudulent Misrepresentations by Dziubla, attached as Exhibit 1 to Plaintiff's Motion to Extinguish LVDF's Deed of Trust, or Alternatively to Grant Senior Debt Lender Romspen a First Lien Position, and Motion to Deposit Funds Pursuant to NRCP 67, filed on October 4, 2019.)

Defendants Dziubla and EB5IA also had a <u>statutory</u> duty to keep accurate records. NRS 86.241 relates to requirements of an LLC to keep "[t]rue and . . . complete records regarding the activities and the status of the business and financial condition of the company." While this provision relates to the right of members to obtain this information, it underscores the duty to

keep prudent records. Moreover, NRS 86.343 requires sufficient records to permit the determination of the prudence of distributions upon dissolution of an LLC. NRS 86.505 permits a dissolved LLC to be sued for up to three (3) years after dissolution, thus making it clear that retention of records is necessary. Likewise, NRS 86.521 permits distribution of assets, but the appropriateness of distribution cannot be determined without proper records. Finally, NRS 86.541 provides that "The manager or managers. . . in office at the time of dissolution. . . are thereafter trustees of the dissolved company. . . ," with powers to wind up the entity.

Finally, Defendants Dziubla and EB5IA had a <u>regulatory</u> duty to keep accurate and complete financial records. As explained by Mr. Winters, IRS guidelines required Defendants Dziubla and EB5IA to keep the records they destroyed.

As Plaintiff will shown below, Defendants Dziubla and EB5IA intentionally destroyed evidence that goes directly to Plaintiff's claims of fraud, etc., asserted in the Second Amended Complaint. Defendant EB5IA's Answer should be stricken, and Plaintiff is also entitled to a presumption under NRS 47.250(3) that "evidence willfully suppressed would be adverse if produced."

C. DEFENDANTS' DESTRUCTION OF EVIDENCE WAS KNOWING AND WILLFUL, AND DEFENDANTS ARE AT FAULT FOR ITS DESTRUCTION

1. The Court Should Strike Defendant EB5IA's Answer Because Defendants Dziubla and EB5IA's Spoliation Was Willful and Knowing

In its Motion, Plaintiff painstakingly walks the Court through the considerations set forth in *Young v. Johnny Ribiero*, 106 Nev. 88, 787 P.2d 777 (1990). (Motion, pp. 9-12.) Defendants make no effort whatsoever to address those elements, nor do they try to refute any of the analysis. This, in and of itself, is concession to the granting of the sanction requested. EDCR 2.20. But even the cases Defendants cite in their cursory Opposition support precisely the relief Plaintiff seeks.

Defendants cite *Marrocco v. General Motors Corp.*, 966 F.2d 220, 224 (7th Cir. 1992) in support of Defendants' concession that "a party is required to keep relevant evidence over which it had control of and reasonably knew or could foresee that it was material to the litigation." (Opp., p. 6, ls. 9-12.) But *Marrocco* goes much further. The court in *Marrocco* upheld a lower court's dismissal of the plaintiff's complaint because of that plaintiff's "contumacious conduct." *Id.* The plaintiff in *Marrocco* had willfully violated a protective order that had been entered in the case; similarly, here, Defendants EB5IA and Dziubla willfully and without excuse violated the various duties set forth above. Defendants EB5IA and Dziubla *willfully and knowingly* violated these duties to the prejudice of Plaintiff.

Likewise, a second case cited by Defendants supports Plaintiff's position. Defendants cited *Danis v. USN Communications*, 2000 WL 1694325, at *30, *32 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 20, 2000) for the proposition that Defendants EB5IA and Dziubla were not required to keep "every scrap of paper." (Opp., p. 6, ls. 5-7.) Citing other cases, including *Marrocco*, *supra*, the court in *Danis* discussed the distinctions between willfulness, bad faith, and fault as follows:

Because a default judgment deprives a party of a hearing on the merits, the harsh nature of this sanction should usually be employed only in extreme situations where there is evidence of willfulness, bad faith or fault by the noncomplying party. *Societe Internationale*, 357 U.S. at 212. *See also Marrocco*, 966 F.2d at 223 (quoting other cases); *Long v. Steepro*, 213 F.3d 983, 985 (7th Cir. 2000) (citing cases):

Although wilfulness and bad faith are associated with conduct that is intentional or reckless, the same is not true for fault. Fault does not speak to the noncomplying party's disposition at all, but rather only describes the reasonableness of the conduct -- or lack thereof -- which eventually culminated in the violation. Fault, however, is not a catch-all for any minor blunder that a litigant or his counsel might make. Fault, in this context, suggests objectively unreasonable behavior; it does not include conduct that we would classify as a mere mistake or slight error in judgment.

(internal quotations omitted). To justify a dismissal or default judgment, the level of "fault" must reflect "extraordinarily poor judgment," "gross negligence," or "a flagrant disregard" of the duty to "preserve and monitor the condition of evidence which could be pivotal in a lawsuit." *Marrocco*, 966 F.2d at 224.

Danis at *101-102. And even if destruction not "intentional" as it was in this case, the Danis court explained why the destroying party was still at fault:

Thus, the Court does not believe there was intentional destruction. But we also believe that more than good intentions were required; those intentions had to be followed up with concrete actions reasonably calculated to ensure that relevant materials would be preserved. We believe that the failure to put into place clear procedures and standards concerning document preservation, and the failure to do any follow-up to see that the general oral directive was broadly disseminated and followed, constitutes fault -- that is, "extraordinarily poor judgment" or "gross negligence." *Marrocco*, 966 F.2d at 224.

Danis at *115-16. Finally – and significantly – the Danis court noted the personal liability of corporate officers and managers:

[C]orporate officers and managers can be held personally responsible for a corporation's failure to preserve relevant evidence. *See, e.g., In re Prudential Ins. Co. of America Sales Practices Litigation,* 169 F.R.D. 598 (1997); *Turner v. Hudson Transit Lines, Inc.,* 142 F.R.D. 68, 72 (S.D.N.Y. 1991). *See also National Ass'n of Radiation Survivors v. Turnage,* 115 F.R.D. 543, 556 (N.D. Cal. 1987) (same); *Kansas-Nebraska Natural Gas Co. v. Marathon Oil Co.,* 109 F.R.D. 12, 18 & n* (D.Neb. 1983) (same).

Danis at *116-17.

One last case that Defendants cite in passing is *GNLV Corp. v. Service Control Corp.*, 111 Nev. 866, 900 P.2d 323 (1995). That case focused on the at-fault party suffering the sanction, not the innocent party. In *GNLV Corp.*, one defendant, a hotel, lost a bath mat. A second defendant, a cleaning service, sought and obtained a dismissal of both the plaintiff's claim against it and the contribution claim by the hotel. *Id.* at 867-68. The district court granted the sanction, dismissing both the plaintiff's claim against the cleaning service and the hotel's contribution cross-claim against the cleaning service. *Id.* at 869. The Nevada Supreme Court overturned the dismissal of the plaintiff's case against the cleaning service. *Id.* at 871.

Analyzing the eight factors set forth in *Young v. Johnny Ribiero* (as Plaintiff did in its Motion), the Court repeatedly noted that the plaintiff was not at fault, was "entirely uninvolved" in the loss of the bath mat, and had "not engaged in abusive conduct." *Id.* at 871. The Nevada Supreme Court noted the importance that the party against whom sanctions are awarded must be the party actually responsible for the loss or destruction of the evidence. *Id.*

Plaintiff is seeking sanctions against Defendant EB5IA – the party who willfully destroyed the crucial financial evidence. As the Court can see, even the cases cited by Defendants support the requested relief.

2. Alternatively, the Court Should Apply a Negative Inference

Plaintiff believes that striking Defendant EB5IA's Answer is appropriate. However, if the Court declines to do so, it should apply an adverse inference instruction that the records EB5IA should have retained and produced would support Front Sight's claims of fraud, misrepresentation, concealment, conversion, breach of contract, and civil conspiracy.

Bass-Davis v. Davis, 122 Nev. 442, 134 P.3d 103 (2006), applies to this case if the Court disagrees that the destruction of evidence was intentional, and rather was mere negligence. The Nevada Supreme Court made it clear that where evidence is negligently destroyed, an adverse inference instruction is proper. See id. at 452.

3. Additionally, if the Court Is Not Inclined to Strike Defendant EB5IA's Answer No Defendant Should Be Able to Present Evidence or Testimony in Rebuttal to Mr. Winters' Report and Conclusions

Plaintiff believes that striking Defendant EB5IA's Answer is appropriate. However, if the Court declines to do so, in addition to application of a negative inference, the Court should prohibit the presentation of any evidence or testimony by any Defendant to rebut Mr. Winters' report and conclusions. *See, e.g., Banc One Shareholders Sec. Litig.*, NO. 00 C 2100, 2005 WL 3372783, at *14 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 8, 2005) (cited in Opp. at p. 6).

4. The Court Should Impose a Monetary Sanction Against Defendant EB5IA

In addition, the Court should sanction EB5IA in an amount equal to the amount of money Defendant EB5IA took from Plaintiff that Defendant EB5IA cannot prove was used properly to market the Front Sight project. Mr. Winters' report provides a rational number, and that number is **at least \$144,574.27**. That is the amount by which Front Sight's payments to EB5IA between February 2013 and October 6, 2016 exceeded the documented expenses – by Dziubla's own documentation.

Defendants EB5IA and Dziubla only address this issue in cursory fashion. The only case they cite is *Nevada Power Co. v. Fluor Illinois*, 108 Nev. 638, 837 P.2d 1354 (1992), and it is for the proposition that awarding all attorneys' fees and costs from the commencement of litigation was improper. (Opp., p. 9.) But – again – this case actually supports Plaintiff's position. The *Nevada Power* case relates to violation of a protective order, which is somewhat different than what is at issue here. However, that case clearly set forth that under NRCP 37(b)(2), a sanction for fees and costs is appropriate, so long as they award relates to "the failure." *Nevada Power* at 646. The reason the Supreme Court overturned a sanction of all attorneys' fees and costs was because not all of the attorneys' fees and costs related to the violation of the protective order.

It is worth noting that Plaintiff is requesting two monetary sanctions: (1) Plaintiff seeks a sanction in the amount of money Defendant EB5IA took from Plaintiff that Defendant EB5IA cannot prove was used properly to market the Front Sight project – \$144,574.27, and (2) an award of attorneys' fees and costs associated with attempts to obtain the destroyed information. Regarding the latter, as explained previously, once Plaintiff prevails on this motion, it will specify the amount being requested.

23 ///

24 || ///

1		III.
---	--	------

$^{\circ}$	
_	

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Defendant EB5IA's Answer should be stricken and Defendant EB5IA should be sanctioned monetarily for intentional and unlawful destruction and spoliation of evidence. Alternatively, Front Sight is entitled to a negative inference instruction that the records EB5IA should have retained and produced in this matter would demonstrate EB5IA used funds received from Front Sight in bad faith, fraudulently, and unlawfully. The Court should also prohibit the presentation of any evidence or testimony by any Defendant to rebut Mr. Winters' report and conclusions, and the Court should impose a monetary sanction against Defendant EB5IA in the amount of \$144,574.27.

Therefore, Front Sight respectfully requests the Court grant Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions and further relief this Court deems just and equitable.

DATED this 18th day of October, 2019.

ALDRICH LAW FIRM, LTD.

/s/ John P. Aldrich
John P. Aldrich, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 6877
Catherine Hernandez, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 8410
Matthew B. Beckstead, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 14168
7866 West Sahara Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89117
Telephone: (702) 853-5490
Facsimile: (702) 227-1975

Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counterdefendants

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

2	I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 18 th day of October, 2019, I caused the foregoing
3	PLAINTIFF'S REPLY TO OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR SANCTIONS to be
4	electronically filed and served with the Clerk of the Court using Wiznet which will send
5	notification of such filing to the email addresses denoted on the Electronic Mail Notice List, or
6	by U.S. mail, postage prepaid, if not included on the Electronic Mail Notice List, to the
7	following parties:
8	Anthony T. Case, Esq. Kathryn Holbert, Esq.
9	FARMER CASE & FEDOR 2190 E. Pebble Rd., Suite #205
10	Las Vegas, NV 89123 Attorneys for Defendants LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT FUND
11	LLC, EB5IMPACT CAPITAL REGIONAL CENTER LLC, EB5 IMPACT ADVISORS LLC, ROBERT W. DZIUBLA,
12	JON FLEMING and LINDA STANWOOD
13	C. Keith Greer, Esq. 16855 West Bernardo Drive, Suite 255
14	San Diego, CA 92127 Attorneys for Defendants LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT FUND
15	LLC, EB5IMPACT CAPITAL REGIONAL CENTER LLC, EB5 IMPACT ADVISORS LLC, ROBERT W. DZIUBLA,
16	JON FLEMING and LINDA STANWOOD
17	
18	/s/ T. Bixenmann
19	An employee of ALDRICH LAW FIRM, LTD.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	