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Notice of Entry of Order (03/02/2020)
Notice of Entry of Order (03/03/2020)
Notice of Entry of Order (03/12/2020)
XVII

Notice of Entry of Order (04/01/2020)

Notice of Entry of Order (04/01/2020)

Notice of Entry of Order (04/28/2020)

Notice of Entry of Order Admitting to Practice (11/15/2018)

Notice of Entry of Order Denying Counter
Defendant Jennifer Piazza's Motion for Summary
Judgment (06/08/2020)

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)

Notice of Entry of Order Denying Front Sight
Management LLC's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment With Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law (06/22/2020)

Notice of Entry of Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions Related to Defendant EB5IA's
Accounting Records (12/19/2019)
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)
Notice of Entry of Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion XII

2847-2853
XIV
3430-3436
XIV
3437-3441
XVI 3892-3896
I 0064-0068

XVIII 4288-4293

XVIII
4282-4287

XVIII 4318-4327

XII
2854-2860

VII
1585-1591 to Quash Subpoenas to Morales Construction, Top Rank Builders and All American Concrete and Masonry (12/19/2019)

| Notice of Entry of Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion <br> to Quash Subpoenas to Plaintiff's Bank and <br> Accountant $(12 / 6 / 2019)$ | XII | $2817-2822$ |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Notice of Entry of Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion <br> to Quash Subpoenas to Summit Financial Group and <br> US Capital Partners, Inc. $(06 / 08 / 2020)$ | XVIII | $4276-4281$ |
| Notice of Entry of Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion <br> to Stay Enforcement of Order Denying Plaintiff's | XII | $2861-2866$ |
| Motion to Quash Subpoenas to Bank of America and <br> Lucas Horsfall (01/02/2020) |  |  |
| Notice of Entry of Order Denying Without Prejudice <br> Plaintiff s Motion for Sanctions for Violation of | XVIII | $4343-4349$ |
| Court Orders Related to Defendants Responses to <br> Plaintiffs Requests for Production of Documents to <br> Defendants $(07 / 06 / 2020)$ |  |  |

Notice of Entry of Order Granting Defendant and Counterclaimant Las Vegas Development Fund, LLC's Notice of Motion and Motion for Leave to Amend the Countercomplaint (06/04/2020)

$$
\text { Notice of Entry of Order Granting Defendant Las } \quad \text { XVIII } \quad 4263-4268
$$

Vegas Development Fund, LLC's Motion for Clarification on Order Shortening Time (06/05/2020)

Notice of Entry of Order Granting Defendant's
Motions to Quash Plaintiff's Subpoenas to NonParty Banks (12/6/2019)

Notice of Entry of Order Granting Defendants’ XVIII 4350-4356
Motion for Protective Order Regarding the Defendants' Private Financial Information (07/10/2020)

Notice of Entry of Order Granting Defendants’
Motion to Advance Hearing regarding Plaintiff's Motion to Quash Subpoenas (11/08/2019)

Notice of Entry of Order Granting in Part and
Denying in Part Counterdefendants' Motions to
Dismiss Counterclaim (09/13/2019)
Notice of Entry of Order Granting in Part and
XII 2786-2793
Denying in Part Defendants' Motions to Quash
Plaintiff's Subpoenas to Non-Parties Empyrean
West, Jay Carter and David Keller (12/6/2019)
Notice of Entry of Order Granting in Part Motion for XVIII 4328-4333
Sanctions and/or to Compel Actual Responses to
Plaintiff's First Sets of Interrogatories to Defendants (06/22/2020)

Notice of Entry of Order Granting Las Vegas XVII 4062-4067
Development Fund, LLC's Motion to Compel
Production of Documents or, in the Alternative,
Motion for Preliminary Injunction to Address Front
Sight's Continuing Violation of Section 5.10 of the Construction Loan Agreement and Request for Limited Relief From the Protective Order (05/18/2020)

Notice of Entry of Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Protective Order (11/27/2018)

Notice of Entry of Order Granting Temporary
Restraining Order and Expunging Notice of Default (11/27/2018)

Notice of Entry of Order on Defendants' Motion to
II
0333-0337 Dismiss Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint (01/17/2019)

| Notice of Entry of Order on Plaintiff's Motion for <br> Preliminary Injunction (01/17/2019) | II | $0323-0327$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Notice of Entry of Order on Plaintiff's Motion to <br> Disqualify C. Keith Greer as Attorney of Record for <br> Defendants $(01 / 25 / 2019)$ | II | $0338-0343$ |

Notice of Entry of Order on Plaintiff's Petition for I 0069-0074 Appointment of Receiver and for an Accounting (11/27/2018)

Notice of Entry of Order on Plaintiff's Renewed
II
0328-0332
Motion for an Accounting Related to Defendants Las
Vegas Development Fund LLC and Robert Dziubla and for Release of Funds (01/17/2019)

Notice of Entry of Order on Status Check Regarding XIII 3092-3095
Discovery Responses/Plaintiff's Motion to Compel
(01/23/2020)
Notice of Entry of Order Regarding February 5, XIV
3381-3385 2020 Status Check (02/19/2020)

Notice of Entry of Order Shortening Time (02/15/2019)

Notice of Entry of Order Shortening Time
XII (11/15/2019)

Notice of Entry of Order Shortening Time (12/11/2019)

Notice of Entry of Order Shortening Time
XIV
0629-0658 (02/11/2020)

Notice of Entry of Order Shortening Time XVIII

4294-4305 (06/12/2020)

Notice of Entry of Order Staying All Subpoenas For Documents and Depositions which were Served on Non-Parties by Plaintiff (09/13/2019)

Notice of Entry of Protective Order (11/27/2018)
Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order (12/18/2019)

Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Regarding Defendants' Judicial Foreclosure Cause of Action (06/25/2019)
Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Regarding $\quad$ XII 2801-2816
Exhibit $(12 / 6 / 2019)$

Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order Resetting
XIV
3386-3391 Hearings and Briefing Schedule (02/25/2020)

Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order to Extend XVIII 4390-4403 Discovery Deadlines (09/02/2020)

Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order to Extend XVII 4046-4056 Discovery Deadlines and Continue Trial (Second Request) (05/13/2020)

Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order to Replace XV / XVI 3693-3891 Exhibit "A" to Defendant's Motion for Leave to
Amend the Countercomplaint [redacted in district court filing] (04/20/2020)

Notice of Intent to Issue Subpoena to Bank of X
2379-2459
America, N.A. (10/22/2019)
Notice of Intent to Issue Subpoena to Lucas Horsfall, X 2298-2378

| Opposition Memorandum of Defendant Las Vegas <br> Development Fund, LLC to Plaintiff's Motion to <br> Seal and/or Redact Pleadings and Exhibits <br> $(02 / 19 / 2019)$ | III | $0659-0669$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Opposition to Defendant Las Vegas Development <br> Fund LLC's Motion for Appointment of Receiver <br> (02/22/2019) | III | $0670-0730$ |
| Opposition to Defendant Las Vegas Development <br> Fund LLC's Motion for Clarification on Order <br> Shortening Time (05/11/2020) | XVII | $4017-4045$ |
| Order Re Rule 16 Conference, Setting Civil Jury <br> Trial, Pre-Trial/Calendar Call and Deadlines for <br> Motions; Discovery Scheduling Order (08/20/2019) | VII | $1573-1577$ |
| Order Scheduling Hearing (09/27/2019) | VIII | $1931-1932$ |
| Order Setting Settlement Conference (12/06/2018) | I | $0105-0106$ |
| Order Setting Settlement Conference (06/04/2019) | VI | $1314-1315$ |
| Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions (09/17/2019) | VII | $1600-1643$ |
| Plaintiff's Motion to Quash Subpoenas (10/29/2019) |  |  |$\quad$ X | $2460-2478$ |
| :--- |
| Plaintiff's Second Motion for Temporary Restraining <br> Order and Preliminary Injunction, Motion for Order <br> Shortening Time, and Order Shortening Time <br> (03/01/19) |
| IV |

Reply in Support of Defendant and Counterclaimant XVI / XVII 3897-4006 Las Vegas Development Fund, LLC's Motion for Leave to Amend the Counterclaim [redacted in district court filing] (04/29/2020)

Reply to Opposition to Motion to Quash Subpoenas XI / XII 2661-2776 (11/15/2019)
Reply to Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for
Sanctions (10/18/2019)

Reporter's Transcript of Hearing (Preliminary
VII / VIII 1644-1930 Injunction Hearing) (09/20/2019)

Reporter's Transcript of Motion (Preliminary
Injunction Hearing) (06/03/2019)
Reporter's Transcript of Motions (Defendants'
IX
2045-2232
Motions to Quash Subpoena to Wells Fargo Bank, Signature Bank, Open Bank and Bank of Hope) (10/09/2019)

| Reporter's Transcript of Preliminary Injunction | VI / VII | 1331-1513 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hearing (07/22/2019) |  |  |

Reporter's Transcript of Preliminary Injunction (07/23/2019)

Response to Defendant LVDF's Objections to XIV
3392-3411
Statement of Undisputed Facts and Countermotion to Strike (02/28/2020)

Second Amended Complaint (01/04/2019)
I / II
0107-0322
Statement of Undisputed Facts (01/17/2020)
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)

Supplemental Declaration of Robert W. Dziubla in
IV
0756-0761

Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Appointment of Receiver (02/26/2019)

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.

## 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
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 $30^{\text {th }}$ 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

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the $30^{\text {th }}$ day of September, 2019, I caused the foregoing COUNTERDEFENDANT FRONT SIGHT MANAGEMENT LLC'S ANSWER TO COUNTERCLAIM to be electronically filed and served with the Clerk of the Court using Wiznet which will send notification of such filing to the email addresses denoted on the Electronic Mail Notice List, or by U.S. mail, postage prepaid, if not included on the Electronic Mail Notice List, to the following parties:

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
LLC, EB5IMPACT CAPITAL REGIONAL CENTER LLC,
EB5 IMPACT ADVISORS LLC, ROBERT W. DZIUBLA,
JON FLEMING and LINDA STANWOOD
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
/s/ T. Bixenmann
An employee of ALDRICH LAW FIRM, LTD.

## ANS

John P. Aldrich, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 6877
Catherine Hernandez, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 8410
Matthew B. Beckstead, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 14168
ALDRICH LAW FIRM, LTD.
7866 West Sahara Avenue
Las Vegas, NV 89117
Telephone: (702) 853-5490
Facsimile: (702) 227-1975
Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counterdefendants

# EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 

FRONT SIGHT MANAGEMENT LLC, a Nevada Limited Liability Company,

Plaintiff,
vs.

LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT FUND LLC, a Nevada Limited Liability Company; et al.,

Defendants.

## AND ALL RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.

CASE NO.: A-18-781084-B
DEPT NO.: 16

## COUNTERDEFENDANT

 JENNIFER PIAZZA'S ANSWER TO COUNTERCLAIMCOMES NOW Counterdefendant JENNIFER PIAZZA (hereinafter "answering Counterdefendant"), by and through her attorneys of record, John P. Aldrich, Esq., Catherine Hernandez, Esq., and Matthew B. Beckstead, Esq., of the Aldrich Law Firm, Ltd., and for her Answer to Counterclaim on file herein, denies, admits, and alleges as follows:

## 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.
II.

## 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.

## 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
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.

## I. 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.

## J. Breach Number 10: Failure to Provide EB-5 Information - CLA § 1.7(f)

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

## L. 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.

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.

## 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.

## 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.

## 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.

## 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
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 $30^{\text {th }}$ 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
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Kathryn Holbert, Esq.
FARMER CASE \& FEDOR
2190 E. Pebble Rd., Suite \#205
Las Vegas, NV 89123
Attorneys for Defendants LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT FUND
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EB5 IMPACT ADVISORS LLC, ROBERT W. DZIUBLA,
JON FLEMING and LINDA STANWOOD
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
/s/ T. Bixenmann
An employee of ALDRICH LAW FIRM, LTD.

OPP/MTN
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Nevada Bar No. 6589
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Facsimile: (702) 739-3001
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LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT FUND LLC, EB5
IMPACT CAPITAL REGIONAL CENTER LLC,
EB5 IMPACT ADVISORS LC, ROBERT W. DZIUBLA, JON FLEMING and LINDA STANWOOD
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Time: 9:00 a.m. ) LLC'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS MOTION FOR SANCTIONS

Defendants.

AND ALL RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS )

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; ${ }^{1}$ 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
${ }^{1}$ 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).
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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
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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
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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).
" $[I] \mathrm{n}$ 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?"
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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. Ill. 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 plaintiff's 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) [] (one prerequisite of the imposition of sanctions for destruction of evidence is the occurrence of the act either after suit
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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
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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. ब5). 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. 96) 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. ब7) 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. 18 ).
"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
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that sanctions relate to the specific conduct at issue." GNLV Corp. v. Serv. Control Corp., 111 Nev. 866, 870 (1995).

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;
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instead, under NRCP 37(b)(2), a district court should, if it properly finds that a party has violated a discovery order, determine only those fees and costs associated with the violation of the 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 allegations have any merit, which they don't, the sanctions sought are ridiculously disproportionate to the handful of Starbucks and gas receipts that are no longer available, yet are described in detail and appear to the penny in the ledgers that were produced. Thus the request for sanctions should be denied.

## III. CONCLUSION

As set forth above, Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions should be denied because: (1)
Defendant has provided a proper accounting; and (2) Plaintiff has not established a spoilation of evidence required for imposition of sanctions.
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Affiant, hereby states and declares as follows:

1. 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 EBS 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. Al 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.
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LAS VEGAS, NEVADA; WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2019
1:27 P..M.
$P \quad R \quad O \quad C \quad E \quad E \quad D \quad N G S$

*     *         *             *                 *                     *                         * 

THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon. IN UNISON: Good afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: And let's go ahead and place our appearances on the record.

MR. ALDRICH: Good afternoon, your Honor.
John Aldrich on behalf of plaintiff.
MS. HOLBERT: Good afternoon, your Honor.
Kathryn Holbert on behalf of defendants.
MR. GREER: Keith Greer on behalf of defendants. Also here with Robert Dziubla.

THE COURT: All right. And before we get started, there's one issue $I$ just wanted to kind of address and decide what to do with it.

Mr. Aldrich, $I$ have your ex parte motion for an order shortening time on plaintiff's motion to extinguish the LVDF's deed of trust or in the alternative grant senior debt lender Romspen a first lien position.

And the reason why $I$ 'm only bringing it up, what should we do with this? Because this is a motion
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for order shortening time. It's my understanding don't we have it pending also? Has it been filed yet?

MS. HOLBERT: It has been filed and, I believe, it was set for hearing on November 5 .

THE COURT: That's my question. And so it's like having two -- you can't have two filings. Do you want -- do you want to potentially advance one or what do you want to do?

MR. ALDRICH: I'm not sure what the Court means by $I$ have two files. We filed the motion. THE COURT: Right.

MR. ALDRICH: And then $I$ sent it down with an order shortening time asking to move the hearing date from when it is set. I don't remember if it was November 5 th or the $15 t h$, but it was - I want to say it was five weeks from when it went out there.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. ALDRICH: So we would like to have it heard sooner than that. We already have a hearing on the $23 r d$.

THE COURT: Well, that's my question. And we can maybe deal with that administratively now.

And this is kind of -- this is what $I$ do with issues like that. $I$ think - because one of the things you want to do is you want to make sure you have
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consistency.
So once something is set, $I$ don't move it;
right? If you want to file a motion to advance it, you can do that. But $I$ think once it's set, I don't think the Court can sua sponte start moving stuff around. I don't do that. I never have.

So -- so the -- and the only reason why I brought it in today, maybe it should be advanced to the 23rd. $I$ don't know. But $I$ don't think an ex - I think an order shortening time after the fact is kind of having the Court advance the things and move the calendar around, without the input of adverse counsel.

MR. ALDRICH: So is the Court saying that $I$ should move for an order shortening time before $I$ file the motion?

THE COURT: No, it would have - well, probably because that's how things are typically run, right?

MS. HOLBERT: Right.
THE COURT: You get your order shortening time. I sign it. I give you a date, and we set it. But see, once it's set, it's set.

And $I$ think procedurally the best way to handle that would be like a motion to advance, but since you're here, $I$ said I'd bring it up, and maybe
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there's no opposition to just put it -- move it to the $23 r d$.

MR. ALDRICH: Okay. I just wasn't going to -the reason $I$ did it that way is because -

THE COURT: Well, it doesn't matter. It doesn't matter.

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 copy. Well, when $I$ do it, $I$ guess, maybe what $I$ need to do is not request a hearing when $I$ file it.

THE COURT: Right. Yeah.
MR. ALDRICH: Okay. So I'll do that in the future. That's fine.

I mean, certainly I'd love to have it heard on the $23 r d . \quad$ It was filed last Friday.

THE COURT: Is there any opposition to that?
MR. GREER: Your Honor, we do. We're going to need time to respond. This whole thing with now the timing -- like our motion is due ten days after you get them or 14 days?

THE COURT: Ten days.
MS. HOLBERT: Right. And it's ten straight days now, which makes it, you know, like, five

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR
(702)671-4402-CROERT48@GMAIL.COM
pursuant to NRS 239.053 , illegal to copy without payment.
calendar -- five business days.
MR. ALDRICH: Which makes it due next Monday.
THE COURT REPORTER: I need one at a time.
THE COURT: One at a time.
MR. GREER: So Monday is a Court holiday, so due Tuesday; right?

MR. ALDRICH: If Monday is a Court holiday, then it would be Tuesday.

THE COURT: So next Tuesday as well.
(A discussion was held off record.)
MR. ALDRICH: I don't think that's a state court holiday.

MR. GREER: Not here in Nevada. So we're going to be jammed.

THE COURT: So if it's due on the $14 t h$, why couldn't we hear it the next following week?

MR. GREER: Here's -- I may have a conflict, your Honor, is a problem. We'll be starting trial on the 15 th . And so the 23 rd is going to be a challenge for me. The 5 th $I$ should be done by. That's an important motion.

Your Honor, also it's -- that should be --
THE COURT: But, you know what, this is why I do everything in open court. Right?

MR. GREER: Right.
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MS. HOLBERT: Right.
MR. GREER: Here's -- we think that this really is relevant to the pending motion to appoint a receiver, and for relief from the preliminary injunction. And so we'd actually like to have that resolved relatively quickly.

I'm just concerned the $23 r d$ is not going to work for me.

MR. ALDRICH: We have two hearings set on that day already.

MR. GREER: So is that -- those are -- what do we have, motion to squash?

MS. HOLBERT: I think motion for sanction, motion to compel; right?

MR. ALDRICH: That's right.
MR. GREER: So that would be - -
MS. HOLBERT: Yeah, well --
(A discussion was held off record.)
MR. GREER: I won't know until Friday when the Court -- we have trial call. And when the court sets this up.

And then $I$ may be fortunate to get a courtroom to start on that date for trial, in which case Im - I don't have to even worry about, but $I$ don't know until Friday.
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THE COURT: Okay. Should we go back on the record?

MR. GREER: You want to put it on the $23 r d ?$ And -- because if I'm going to have to move, I'm going to have to move everything.

THE COURT: How about that, Mr. Aldrich?
MR. GREER: Yeah.
THE COURT: We'll just put it on the $23 r d$. And if -- we'll know Friday if it has to be moved or not. If it has to be moved because of trial and that that type of stuff, we will just move it.

MR. ALDRICH: So $I$ have no problem with the $23 r d . \quad$ That's great. $\quad$ just want to point out, and I -- I understand Mr. Greer's schedule, so - and I understand how that works because $I$ have the same issues sometimes.

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. ALDRICH: But $I$ just want to note that the Court has expressed concern that this is taking a long time and has expressed a desire to have us try the case in January or thereabouts, which I'm sure welll talk about in a minute.

THE COURT: January or February. Sometime after the first of the year.

MR. ALDRICH: Sooner than October or whatever
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it's set for.

THE COURT: Yes. It could be June maybe, but sooner than October.

MR. ALDRICH: That would still be a lot sooner.

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. ALDRICH: I just want to make sure that there's an understanding here that these are important motions for me and for getting discovery that are going to be heard on the $23 r d . \quad$ So $I$ understand if they have to get moved, they have to get moved. But that cannot count against me as we're trying to move forward.

MR. GREER: Your Honor, he's already got two months against him. I'll take a week.

THE COURT: All right.
Mr. Aldrich, I don't think -- $I$ can't think of any reason why $I$ would count that against you. I mean, really. I mean, because this case -- let's keep it how it is.

This case is very unique. There's a lot of unique issues. We're in a very unique procedural posture. We can all agree; right?

And $I$ can't sit back and say anyone involved in this litigation has even a scintilla of dilatory conduct. In fact, it's been very aggressive, you know.
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So that's a nonissue. It really isn't.
So -- but just as important, too,
historically, $I$ do get that we can't circumvent due process. I understand that aspect too.

All I'm trying to figure out on some level, efficiency; right? That's, really and truly, what it all comes down to. Because we have spent a lot of time together. I can't think of any case I've ever had other than -- I mean, yeah, I have had some complex cases that have gone to trial where we've had maybe a month of pretrial motions. I've had that in a few cases.

But $I$ can't think of any cases where I've had -- and this isn't meant in a negative way - where I've had prolonged serial law and motion like $I$ have in this case. If you understand what $I$ mean.

MR. GREER: Yeah. So we have no objection putting it on the $23 r d$.

MR. ALDRICH: Okay.
MR. GREER: And hopefully we can get here on the $23 r d$.

THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. GREER: We'd like to have this heard as quickly as possible.

THE COURT: Okay. That's what we'll do. You
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can see why $I$ handled it the way $I$ do handle it. And $I$ kind of do that because it just seems to me from a judicial philosophical perspective, I do -- I do everything in open court, even when $I$ have unopposed motions. $I$ don't grant anything until I'm in open court. I find that that saves time. It just does.

And think about it, $I$ just saved a lot of time here today by handling it the way I did.

MR. ALDRICH: And $I$ - my client appreciates it and we appreciate the accommodation to have it heard on the $23 r d$.

THE COURT: Right. Right. So what welll do then, and $I$ just want to make sure we have the - because this has been filed, it's my understanding. And what date is that set for?

MS. HOLBERT: Your Honor, I just
double-checked. It actually was set for 10-13.
MR. ALDRICH: 11-13.
MR. GREER: 11-13.
MS. HOLBERT: 11-13, sorry.
THE COURT: 11-13. Oh, yeah, there you go.
So what we'll do as far as plaintiff's motion to extinguish the LVDF deed of trust, et al, we'll go ahead and we'll move that to the 23 rd. And what welll do today if you remind me, we can have a status check,
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say maybe Friday 1:00 telephonically, just to see where
you're at and you can let us know. And we can hande
it that way. That way we don't have to -- we want
efficiency.
MR. GREER: Very good.
THE COURT: That's all I'm looking for. But
remind me to set - maybe well set that right now
before we forget.
What do we have Friday? We're in trial;
right?
THE COURT CLERK: Starting at 9:30, all day.
THE COURT: Okay. What do you -- what would
be a good time to have a telephonic status check on
that?
MR. GREER: Probably late afternoon. In
Los Angeles, you go on the wheel, you don't know where
you're going to wind up. It takes sometimes the better
time of the day to get a Court.
THE COURT: Would 4:00 o'clock be safe?
MR. GREER: $4: 00$ would be fine.
MR. ALDRICH: I'm around, that's fine.
THE COURT: And you don't have to come down
for it. We'll have you call in on Courtcall.
MR. ALDRICH: Sure.
THE COURT: Because $I$ should be on day two in
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jury selection at the time.
So we'll put that at $4: 00$, and welll put it on calendar. And so what we'll do is -- do we have the CourtCall information?

THE COURT CLERK: We do.
THE COURT: We'll use CourtCall. We'll make sure you get copies of everything.

MS. HOLBERT: Thank You.
MR. GREER: Your Honor, just a question on that, then, too, because right now $I$ don't know if the Court -- is the Court planning on ruling today on the pending motion for receiver and relief from the preliminary injunction? Because if the Court isn't, I think that the issues that are presented here with this alleged any financing and the concessions that front Sight is asking LVD Fund to make and to make this happen, it all -- we believe it ties together and supports the need for a receiver. So what I'd like to ask is that -- we put that on calendar for - maybe for further hearing. Would that work? On the $23 r d ?$

Unless the Court is prepared today to say, Yes, let's put a receiver on board, in which case we won't need it.

THE COURT: Mr. Aldrich?
MR. ALDRICH: I mean, we are - we argued the
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motion for receiver already, but --
THE COURT: Maybe there is something I need to hear in your motion that would help guide me.

MR. ALDRICH: I mean, we're going to be here. So, I guess, I would call it a soft objection, but really what is it? If it's going to come up anyway, it's going to come up, anyway. so I'm here.

THE COURT: I'll delay -- I'll defer the ruling until after $I$ hear your motion.

MR. ALDRICH: Okay.
THE COURT: Is that what you want, sir?
MR. GREER: Actually after you hear our
opposition.
THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. GREER: Because - -
THE COURT: Motion and opposition. And werll
just move it to that day so you don't have to be here.
MR. ALDRICH: There is not necessarily opposition maybe.
(A discussion was held off record.)
MR. GREER: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Sir.
MR. GREER: Just - was the Court going to
issue a ruling today on that?
THE COURT: NO.
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MR. GREER: Good. Thank you.
You're in hot water.
THE COURT: NO. All right.

This is the case that keeps on going.
So where do we need to continue from? Where do we start off at?

MR. ALDRICH: Today we have defendant's motion to bifurcate. We have -- both sides have motions to quash subpoenas to third parties.

We've got a discussion of the Rule 65(a)(2) notice. And a supplemental Rule 16 conference, $I$ guess, related to the counter-defendants.

MS. HOLBERT: Yeah. And there is actually a status check regarding setting continued preliminary injunction hearing.

THE COURT: There's a lot.

MS. HOLBERT: But all of that relates to calendaring things.

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. ALDRICH: So there was some discussion among counsel before. There was some concern about how long those subpoena - motions to quash the subpoenas may take.

So if it pleases the Court, we can start with the motion to bifurcate and then have a discussion
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```
about the Rule 65(a)(2) notice. And then handle the
rule -- supplemental Rule 16 conference before we do
the motions to quash.
    Does that seem fair?
    MR. GREER: Yes.
    MS. HOLBERT: Yeah.
    THE COURT: All right. That's what we'll do.
    And that's for Friday at 4:00. That's the
CourtCall instructions so both of you have that.
    MR. GREER: Thank you.
    THE COURT: So we're dealing with the motion
to bifurcate right now; is that correct?
    MR. ALDRICH: Yes.
    MR. GREER: Yes, your Honor.
    THE COURT: OkaY. I got you.
        (Brief pause in proceedings.)
        THE COURT: I'm ready when you are.
        MR. GREER: Yes, Your Honor.
        THE COURT: Yes.
    MR. GREER: Our argument here, your Honor,
very short, concise. We've laid it out in our papers.
I have little to add.
    This case involves two separate contracts:
The February 2013 engagement letter, the October 2016
construction loan agreements.
```
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```
Different parties involved with each. The loan agreement involving Las Vegas Development Fund solely. EB5 Impact Capital Advisors being the principal defendants in the engagement letter case.
So we have different contracts. Different parties. Because of the contractual provisions of the construction loan agreement, all issues relating to that are to be heard by your Honor as both parties waived jury.
Conversely, there's no such provision in the engagement letter. Remember the engagement letter involves allegations of fraudulent inducements, misrepresentation -- misspending of funds, misallocation of funds, et cetera; whereas, the construction loan agreement very, very simple. Borrower lender arrangement.
Las Vegas Development Fund got the money to Front Sight. Front Sight breached every single provision as we've laid out in the construction loan agreement, including the monetary breaches. We just gave your Honor today supplemental notice of default. Notice of default that was filed by Las Vegas Development Fund to -- sent to Front sight a few days ago confirming that they are, again, in monetary default for failing to make the interest payment for
```
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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?
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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
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interests in both sides. And the compelling interest here is that the construction loan agreement is just that: A construction loan agreement to -- it involves EB5 investors where time is of the essence.

Remember, the completion date for this project was October 4. So we're now done with the project. We're done with -- the time to complete it is done. And according to Mr. Piazza's testimony on the stand, they haven't even prepared plans for the vertical structures.

So we really need to get things rolling on the construction lending side and not with these EB5 investors in jeopardy.

I will note that the case, Mr. Aldrich brings it up, Front Sight has brought forth some hearsay evidence recently alleging that there have been enough jobs created already, such that EB5 investors don't matter. They should be filing their papers now.

Well, looking at the law, this is what we don't allow hearsay where hearsay shouldn't be allowed. The problem there is that there's a fundamental fact that Mr. Evans, Front Sight's economist, relied upon, which doesn't exist here. And that is the only way that Front $S i g h t$ can get credit for jobs created from the date they chose, which was the date of the
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engagement letter back in 2011 , is if there was a bridge loan.

A bridge loan is used to create the jobs and do the construction prior to the time that the EB5 monies is received. The builder, the investors, can get credit for that. There is no bridge loan here. There's no evidence of a bridge loan, and that's why the economy -- the economist report from Mr. Evans is just worthless in this case.

So it's ridiculous to think that if the EB5 investors were in a situation where they could get their cards, they would have done so already. Mr. Dziubla, that his responsibility to say on top of that; the investors' responsibility to file the paperwork. But there's just no evidence before the Court that's admissible that supports Front sight's contention that EB5 doesn't matter anymore.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
MR. ALDRICH: Good afternoon, your Honor.
I also set forth my position in the pleadings, and I'm sure the Court has reviewed those. I've got a couple of comments based on what Mr. Greer said, and I'll highlight some of the things in my brief.

The first is, is that Mr. Greer made the
statement today that Front sight had not made its
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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 understanding is the payment was made for October.

MR. GREER: Hold. Time out. Time -- now, your Honor. I misread - I misread the record. They have - they made the regular interest. They didn't make the default interest.

MR. ALDRICH: Okay.
MR. GREER: I stand corrected. Stand corrected.

MR. ALDRICH: There we go.
THE COURT: And $I$ understand that's in dispute.

MR. ALDRICH: Correct. The default interest amount is in dispute.

And $I$ will note at the last hearing we asked for the calculation of the default interest and hadn't received it. I've sent two emails and made a phone call - actually Mr. Greer called me. We talked about it. And today $I$ still don't have it. $I$ have no calculation of what that default interest is. I asked for June, July, and August, and $I$ don't have it.

So, anyway, it goes to a lot of other things we've been asking for, but we'll talk about that on the 23 rd 。
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Now, with regard to the motion to bifurcate, for good reason the defendants are asking the court to ignore the fraud allegations. There's a good reason for that. Because there isn't -- there aren't two distinct agreements here. I mean, there are two agreements, but they're not unrelated. They're absolutely related.

Mr. Greer says they're separate parties, except that Mr. Dziubla owns - he's the CEO and owner of all the entities involved. EB5 IA, EB5 Impact Capital, the regional center, Las Vegas Development Fund, he's the underlying piece.

Interestingly enough, we have -- while I'm still going to continue to complain that $I$ don't have all the evidence $I$ need from the other side, we do have some testimony because welve been here several days. Among the things that Mr. Dziubla said was that once the construction loan agreement was signed, Las Vegas Development Fund assumed primary role of marketing, but the problem with that is that he continued to take money from Front Sight through EB5 IA, the alleged marketing entity, for a long time after October of 2016. Well, then we also learned that Mr. Dziubla stopped marketing the project all together at the end of 2017 , yet continued to accept tens of thousands of
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dollars from Front $S$ ight allegedly for marketing well into 2018.

How is that not continuing fraud? And that --
I mean, $I$ could go on, but that's -- that's the easy low-hanging fruit.

We also heard from Dr. Piazza when he was here to testify about this May 12 of 2016 email that the defendants point to as being the smoking gun, except that Dr. Piazza explained what happened there.

They had a meeting a few days later. Mr. Dziubla and Mr. Fleming came hat in hand looking like homeless people begging for more money and saying, We need to remove the minimum raise, but once we do they're all lined up. We're ready to go.

That's additional fraudulent inducement well beyond that May 12 of 2016 email.

I could go on. I won't belabor it too much right now, but those facts show that this is a continuing fraud.

Now, there are the causes of action. The plaintiff has causes of action for fraud and intentional misrepresentation, conversion, civil conspiracy, breach of contract, breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, intentional interference with prospective economic advantage, and
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negligent misrepresentation. There are also counterclaims that are for intentional interference with contractual relationships, conversion, civil conspiracy, judicial foreclosure, and waste.

Now, I've walked through in my brief and talked about bifurcating the claim. It's our position 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, I've also outlined exactly how that has to go.

The fraud in the inducement claims have to go first. Because that would -- if the contract is deemed void, rescinded, whatever it turns out to be because of the fraud in the inducement, all the rest of the claims go away and the court doesn't have to try the rest of the case.

I walked through --
THE COURT: So what you're saying is this. You're saying, Look, Judge, if there's fraud in the inducement, there can't be a breach of the construction loan agreement.

MR. ALDRICH: Correct.
THE COURT: I understand.
MR. ALDRICH: And so if there's going to be a
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bifurcation, those have to go first.
Then if the Court finds that there's not
fraud, then we can fight about how the agreement went down and who's in breach and all those different things. And $I$ walked through these cases.

THE COURT: And $I$ want to make sure I'm clear on this. Are there any remaining equitable claims?

MR. ALDRICH: That's a good question.
Because -- I don't think $I$ have a second amended complaint with me.

We certainly have -- could amend once we have all the evidence, too, to assert some equitable claims, rescission, or something like that. As I stand here today, your Honor, $I$ can't remember if we have an asserted rescission as a possible remedy in the second amended complaint. $I$ don't remember.

But certainly the fraud claims are either common law based. I think they're probably ripe for a jury. I will say this, there is --

THE COURT: And you know why I asked that question, because if it's at law, the jury decides, or the ultimate fact finder.

MR. ALDRICH: Correct.
THE COURT: If it's an equitable claim, the trial court decides.
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MR. ALDRICH: The Court does. I understand that.

We do have, $I$ guess, an issue as to whether a jury is appropriate here or not. The construction loan agreement says that there's a waiver of that jury trial. The defendants actually filed a request or demand for jury trial. And when they did, so did we.

And so, $I$ mean, our position, $I$ guess, would be with those claims that are appropriate before a jury, they should be put there because they've been waived, or that that waiver of a jury trial regardless has been waived because the defendants filed a demand. We filed it too.

THE COURT: That's an interesting issue.
MR. ALDRICH: It is interesting.
THE COURT: Before $I$ comment on that, before $I$ make a decision, unless there was an agreement, I'd ask for full briefing on that because that's a fascinating issue.

MR. ALDRICH: And Your Honor probably doesn't remember because this was a long time ago, but $I$ argued this issue in front of the Court many years ago on another trial $I$ had in front of the Court. And that's what the Court made us do in this instance as well.

THE COURT: I never rush to judgment,
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```
Mr. Aldrich.
```

MR. ALDRICH: Understood. I -- it came up, so
I just raised that issue.
THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. ALDRICH: But --
THE COURT: Well, at least I'm consistent;
right?
MR. ALDRICH: That is correct.
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. ALDRICH: But the bottom line, back to the motion to bifurcate, $I$ cited the Awada case. I walked through that. I won't read the court the quotes, but it makes it pretty clear fraud in the inducement comes first. The only case that was cited by defendants in their brief was a federal court case. And they - they did bifurcate in that, but they bifurcated fraud claims related to a separate sales agreement versus the other issue involved.

So in this instance, as $I$ said before, it's really one continuous fraud, and it should be tried -really it should be tried together. But if the court is going to bifurcate, the fraud claims should go first.

Does the Court have more questions for me?
THE COURT: NO, sir.
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MR. ALDRICH: All right. Thank you for your time.
-000-
(Recess)

$$
\text { - ○ } 00 \text { - }
$$

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Greer.
MR. GREER: Yes, Your Honor.
Mr. Aldrich stated that this is an ongoing continuous fraud because -- in part because Las Vegas Development Fund continued to accept money for marketing, even after May 2015 .

But what is disingenuous about that is prior to May of 2016 , monies coming from Front sight were given to EB5 Impact Capital Advisors in order to do specific things like set up a resources -- a regional resources center, set up a team of brokers and agents, establish the infrastructure for EB5 fundraising operations.

After May 2012 the rules changed because there's a new agreement, and the agreement at that point in time is there's no money given, just checks cut over to Las Vegas Development Fund with them having the discretion to then go out and spend it on marketing and then, you know, report to Front sight in someway.

No, at that point in time Front Sight said, In light of the fact that were not going to make all the
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money that we thought we're going to make sure, I guess haven't achieved the goals that we were aspiring to, from now on out, we're not going to pay up unless you give us money.

And so at that point in time, after the May 2016 , every bit of money that Mr. Piazza and Mr. Aldrich are saying were for marketing, that was for performance. Checks weren't given to -- if there were some given to the Capital Advisors and Impact Advisors; some were given to $L V D$ Fund. But they were all after monies were released from escrow to front sight, then the performance payment was given.

So that's -- that's, again, a reason to bifurcate because there is no issue of how that money was to be spent. Front sight had no control over how that money was to be spent. Las Vegas Development Fund had no obligation to tell Front sight how it was spending that money. All that Las Vegas Development Fund had to do was go out, get capital, give it to Front $S i g h t$, and get paid for doing so.

So it also shows how it's disingenuous to say that Front $S i g h t$ - that $L V D$ Fund stopped marketing at that point in time because $L V D$ Fund kept getting capital, knew EB5 investors were coming in. They were putting their money in the escrow, and that money was
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being given to Front Sight. Front Sight, then, in return paid the progress payments, the performance payments.

So, again, very, very separate and distinct contract, separate and distinct relationship.

This argument coming up, again, about some fraud in the inducements, alleviating Front sight from the obligation to pay the loan. I still have yet to figure out how that fits in. $I$ don't think fraud in the inducement is going to be any legal basis to not pay the interest and be -- and comply with the construction loan because it's the EB5 investor's money. They are the persons who are putting up the capital. They're the ones that need to be protected here. They're innocent third parties, and we know that. We've supplied the Court with the law. This unclean hands doctrine does not apply to this situation where to do so would affect innocent third parties.

Lastly, on the issue of the jury, we put up -we did a jury demand just to protect the rights, the ability to do so later. We still have the ability to waive that, $I$ believe, and withdraw it.

THE COURT: What's the impact for the construction loan agreement and the provisions pursuant to the contract where there's a waiver of the right to
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a jury trial? I mean -- and understand, that's not being briefed today. I'm not going to decide that issue.

But here's my thought. And one of the things as a trial judge -- and, $I$ mean, $I$ don't know where we're going to, ultimately, end up with this case, whether it's going to be a bench trial, jury trial, or whatever. I mean, $I$ don't know because it hasn't been fully vetted and briefed, and $I$ will not decide that issue until I'm sure; right? And that's how $I$ do it.

But one of the things $I$ always contemplate and I spent a lot of time on -- for example, tomorrow we're having a jury come in; right? We'll have about 100 panel members. And $I$ actually conduct a very extensive voir dire of the panel. And there's -- there's two focuses for me. And one is $I$ just want to make sure the jury understands why they're there; right? And I go through this whole litany of discussions regarding the history of this nation.

But $I$ have another series of questions regarding the process itself. And the -- and $I$ want to make sure the jury will follow the instructions of the Court, even if they disagree. Right? Because it's very important we don't have jury nullification.

But there's another focus $I$ give, and it's on
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the "you can't rush to judgment," and it's so, so important. It really and truly is. Even as a trial judge, $I$ have to sit back and make sure $I$ hear all the facts and those types of things. Because when $I$ explain to the jury the protocol of how the trial will proceed, and, you know, you can't even make your decision until at the very end when you have the instructions, and you've listened to all the evidence, and that's when you deliberate.

And so in this case $I$ can't rush to any conclusion; right? And here's my point. For example, we still have a pending fraud in the inducement claim; right? still there. And so with that in mind, how can I decide the breach of the construction loan separately? And before but not at the same time that the fraud, the fraud in the inducement claims, are being decided?

MR. GREER: We agree, your Honor.
THE COURT: You see where I'm going on that?
MR. GREER: Absolutely. Absolutely. Because in both case - -

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. GREER: -- after you bifurcate, there is -- if there is a surviving fraud in the inducement claim, it has to be heard first on both cases.
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THE COURT: Right.
MR. GREER: The difference here is one - two things. One with regard to the jury question, your Honor, which applies to this, when we -- when we demand a jury, remember there are cases -- there are claims in the complaint that have nothing to do with the construction loan agreement.

The Impact Advisors allegations, we have people that aren't parties to the construction loan agreement, so that jury demand is two things that can be tried as to a jury. Even though we've requested a jury, we can't try the equitable claims that are in there.

THE COURT: We can all agree on that.
Absolutely.
MR. GREER: Right. And you know what, your Honor, we can't do the contract either. That's - if there are claims in the complaint which should not be heard by a jury, then the jury demand doesn't all of a sudden make them able to be heard by a jury demand - by a jury. So it's - I would say that the contract claims and the equitable claims will be handled similarly. And we have to include it as a demand because there are all kinds of causes of action in there involving claims and parties that aren't related
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to the construction loan agreement.
So with regard to the fraud in the inducement,
I think on the bifurcation case, you would hear the fraud in the inducement claims first.

But $I$ think why this makes this such a quick trial and allows us to move quickly on the loan 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 of this email in May of 2016 where everybody agreed, not going to go bring in 50 million, not going to bring in 75 million, not going to bring in 35 million. We have millions in the bank. That's it. Let's decide what we're going to do.

There is just no fraud in the inducement evidence that goes into the bifurcated trial for the construction loan agreement.

And they can't in good faith say that, I believe that they were going to make this 75 million and that's why $I$ entered into the construction loan agreement, because right there in May of 2012 they all agreed it wasn't going to happen.

So any of the fraud in the inducement claims would end at that point. And $I$ think that issue should
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be tried and the bifurcated case involving the construction loan agreement, it will just be a very quick, short part of the trial. And it will be heard by your Honor because that relates to the construction loan agreement, which all the parties have waived jury to.

So $I$ think that even though fraud in the inducement will be heard first, it will be dealt with in short shrift in the loan agreement case; whereas, it will be the primary focus and a very lengthy process in the engagement letter case.

THE COURT: Okay. What do you think about that, Mr. Aldrich? What do you think? Because - -

MR. ALDRICH: Well--
THE COURT: -- it does appear to me -- and I understand $I$ haven't been fully briefed on it. Typically we do briefing on this issue. But the fraud has to have some sort of an impact; right?

MR. ALDRICH: It has to what? I'm sorry. THE COURT: It has to be an impact on how the case proceeds procedurally.

MR. ALDRICH: Yes.
THE COURT: As long as it's a viable claim. MR. ALDRICH: Yes.

THE COURT: We can all agree with that; right?
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saying -- and, of course, $I$ know you don't agree with this aspect of it because $I$ was going to say. I guess, he's kind of agreeing that maybe the fraud would have to be tried at the same time of the construction loan agreement case. You don't agree with that. $\quad$ think you probably disagree with the time it would take to try that component, $I$ understand that, but what's your take on that?

MR. ALDRICH: Well, my take on it is as I said before. This is one scheme and it has gone on through -- we can say it's through two agreements. But remember what Mr. Dziubla has said about - during the 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 defendants disagree with what $I$ say. But I've already said one thing, which was he said that LVDF, Las Vegas Development Fund, took over the marketing for EBS IA once the agreement was signed.

Well, that's -- that's not consistent with the money that he took and the way things were done. He shut -- he also said that the engagement letter was extended by gentleman's agreement until he decided to do away with it. Well, those are -- how does that
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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
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forward.

And so that is significant because all of those things are going to matter as we go forward to try this case.

THE COURT: And here's my next question. If the fraud in the inducement is tried at the same time the breach to the construction loan agreement is tried, what's left?

MR. ALDRICH: If -- $\quad$ think it tries the whole thing. If we do fraud in the inducement - because as I'm standing here telling the Court, it starts in 2012 , 2013, and it goes really to current. And that is all the issues are going to be resolved, in that one trial. That will include the fraud in the inducement, it will include the contract claims, the counterclaims, all of it, which is why our initial position is the Court shouldn't bifurcate. We should just try the case.

THE COURT: I get that. But my question is this: If $I$ throw in the fraud claim with the construction loan agreement, I know Mr. Greer feels that will be a very short part of the presentation of evidence. I'm quite - $\quad$ and this is a one - I just know this. It would be -- your position would be the exact opposite. It would be, Judge, werre going to -it's going to take days to try the fraud in the
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inducement.
MR. ALDRICH: Of course.
THE COURT: Of course, right. I just know.
MR. ALDRICH: Of course.
THE COURT: And so -- and $I$ was just looking at it from this perspective: If you have a fraud, you 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. I'm just trying to think off the top of my head. But ultimately rescission.

But what's left? Because those would all-- I think, probably whatever affirmative defenses and the like would be available would stem directly from the facts as it relates to the allegations of frad and the allegations of breach of the construction loan agreement.

Am I missing something?
MR. ALDRICH: No. In fact, if there were anything left, especially reputable things that were left or whatever, your Honor, whether it was a jury or bench trial would have sat through it, and would probably be in a position to either just make a decision on those issues or at least request briefing based on what was already done and then make a decision
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on those issues. So that would seem to me to be more efficient just to do it all together.

THE COURT: All right. The only reason why I bring this up, $I$ remember it was -- at one time $I$ had a case, and it was specifically dealing with equitable indemnity issues; right? And so at first blush when you're dealing with equitable indemnity, there's no contract, no contractual indemnity. And $I$ had a question for the lawyers. I said, Okay. In an equitable indemnity scenario, who do you try the case in front of? Right? And we had a real long discussion on that.

MR. ALDRICH: Um-hum.
THE COURT: And it actually ended up with some briefing. $\quad$ think $I$ know the ultimate answer to that question, but it's -- it's a fascinating issue. So that's why $I$ brought it up. And we're clear, no one is disagreeing about equitable claims are tried to the Court, but I'm just looking at it from this perspective. Because if $I$ bifurcate and we have to have the fraud heard at the same time or breach of the construction loan agreement, what is left to try? That's my point.

MR. GREER: I have the answer.
THE COURT: All right.
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MR. GREER: So, your Honor, this shows exactly why the Court really must bifurcate. Because if you bifurcate, then the question in the case first will be was there fraud in the inducement. And your Honor will then look at that evidence and determine whether the evidence applies to the construction loan agreement or not.

And this is the important part. Because if the Court decides that neither that inducement goes to the contract, your Honor hears that, your Honor hears that theory, your Honor makes that decision, your Honor makes the decision first as to whether it was evidence of fraud in the inducement. Anything your Honor says wasn't related to the construction loan agreement then goes to the jury.

If your Honor doesn't bifurcate and hear this
first, the jury winds up getting -- making decisions that the judge - that your Honor later has to make because it relates to the construction loan agreement, we could have disparate rulings. And it's clear that if the judge is going to rule on something, the judge has to rule on it first. And so by bifurcating - -

THE COURT: But what would be left?
MR. GREER: What would be left. Here's - -
THE COURT: Here's my question.
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MR. GREER: Just --
THE COURT: And -- and -- and these are just thoughts. This is not a decision I've made. These are just issues that I've thought about.

For example, would the fraud in the inducement issue be heard by me as a trial judge based upon the waiver language contained in the construction loan agreement?

MR. GREER: Yes.
THE COURT: These are just thoughts.
MR. GREER: Yes, that is --
THE COURT: And $I$ don't want to cut you off, but put a big question mark after $I$ say that. Right? I'm not saying --

MR. GREER: I think the language is pretty clear. It says anything relating to a dispute over this agreement, which would inherently include fraud in the inducement, your Honor decides.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. GREER: It's big capital letters all the way through. And so --

THE COURT: My point is I'm just making a statement. That's all I'm saying. Put a question mark.

MR. GREER: Okay.
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That's a question that's so obvious to me.
MR. GREER: Then you said what's left. Well, there's still -- with regard to the -- you have to go then over to the Impact Capital advisor group, and there is allegations of how they spent their money. How the money was spent is a big contention that Front Sight is trying to tie into this whole thing, but there is actually two different types of money here. There's money given to Capital Advisors that Front Sight is saying wasn't spent efficiently in marketing, and they feel they had more say and control over that money than -- than they got.

And then after May 2016 , you have the - the performance bonuses, which Front sight had no control over, no ability, no right to even know where it went. So when Mr. Aldrich said we spent over $\$ 500,000$ here, well, that's right. It's maybe $\$ 360,000$ to EB5 Impact Advisors, 140 over here to Front Sight. I don't know -- to LVD Fund. I don't know how it balances out, but there is two different types of payments, two different amounts. And those are two different trials.

So if the judge -- your Honor bifurcates the case, looks at the fraud in the inducement argument, determines, you know what, this fraud in the inducement
(702)671-4402-CROERT48@GMAIL.COM
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evidence does not apply to the construction loan agreement, therefore, jury, it's going to go to you and you can deal with it on the capital advisor case. Conversely, if your Honor says that it does apply, then your Honor makes a decision on that fraud in the inducement evidence at that time so that the jury 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, did Front $S i g h t$ have the right to control that money, was -- you know, did -- Impact Capital advisors somehow breach any duty they had to front sight, which is all jury. All jury.

So really the only logical way to make it work and avoid duplicative decisions and to efficiently get the process done is to bifurcate. And $I$ think it will have to be bifurcated eventually. I'm confident enough, almost 100 percent. The question is do we do it now versus later. We're pushing for us to do it now because doing it now has the added benefit of allowing the construction lender funded by EB5 investors to move quickly through this process to get final determination before the Court.

Because it's -- your Honor -- I think your
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Honor is going to have to bifurcate it at some time. So anyway, that's what $I$ have to say.

THE COURT: And here's just one other thought.
I was listening, and $I$ think it only goes one way. If someone disagrees, that's okay, and you can tell me why.

But if $I$ make a determination -- for example,
I haven't looked at the language, and this isn't that specific motion as it relates to the waiver of the jury trial and its impact pursuant to the language contained in the construction loan agreement. But if $I$ make a determination that there's a nexus between the construction loan agreement and the allegations of fraud in the inducement, it would appear to me as a matter of law that has to be decided by the terms and conditions as set forth in the construction loan agreement, versus if $I$ make a determination that they're unrelated, then maybe they're tried separately. I don't know.

MR. GREER: That's exactly what would happen. THE COURT: But those are just my thoughts from a legal analysis. MR. GREER: I think that's the logical way that it works out. THE COURT: Okay. Just -- Mr. Aldrich. You
(702)671-4402-CROERT48@GMAIL.COM
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can -- we're just having a dialogue here. Then IIl make some decisions.

MR. ALDRICH: Okay. So, I mean, I've kind of said my piece. I will clarify. Mr. Greer was explaining that EB5 Impact Capital Advisors is actually the regional center, and $I$ don't believe that it was the one that was paying money out, due to the marketing. I believe that was EB5 Impact Advisors.

And so that may help with, you know, some of the confusion, kind of -- sorry, kind of goes to my argument that it's all kind of one in the same. But, I mean, I've kind of -- I'm kicking a horse that's down already at this point. I mean, our position is that the fraud covers the whole time and it should not be bifurcated. But if the Court is going to bifurcate it - -

THE COURT: NO, no.
MR. ALDRICH: -- we got to do the --
THE COURT: I'm not sure.
MR. ALDRICH: -- I don't have anything else to add.

THE COURT: Okay. But $I$ think -- would you agree with this or disagree that if -- and my question is this: That if the fraud is somehow linked to the construction loan agreement, then the language in the
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construction loan agreement would dictate how we proceed procedurally as it relates to a jury trial or non-jury trial?

MR. ALDRICH: That's a good question.
THE COURT: That's what my --
MR. ALDRICH: Probably needs some briefing;
right? Because my position is that we were defrauded into entering in that agreement in the first place.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. ALDRICH: So to me fraud claims -- there are common law fraud claims. They're legal questions and should be in front of a jury. I mean, $\quad$ recognize that there's a construction loan agreement that has this waiver of a jury trial in it, and now I've already expressed my position that that's waived anyway. And so, you know, $I$ guess, $I$ would disagree to some degree, because $I$ think that they are common law claims that should be heard in front of a jury. And fraud.

MR. GREER: If I can, I think the law says there is a lot of law on this in the arbitration clase that $I$ think applies equally to the jury waiver clause. THE COURT: There is no doubt -

MR. GREER: Because you have to show fraud in the inducement of the particular clause in order to - to get around a clause that's in the agreement.
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itself does not get you around an arbitration clause.
It won't get you around a waiver of jury trial clause.
THE COURT: But, I mean, like the seminal case
involving the arbitration, enforceability of
arbitration clauses would be -- $I$ think it's the AT\&T v
Concepcion case that was decided by our United states
Supreme Courts, probably about six, seven, eight, nine
years ago. And that specifically dealt with the
enforceability of the arbitration clauses.

What was unique about that, $I$ mean, waiver of the right to a jury trial under the arbitration in a consumer contract setting, what's unique about that, that was actually a class action case. That is my recollection. I haven't read it in a long time.

But -- and -- and $I$ think the United States Supreme Courts said the typical defenses of procedural and substantive unconscionability didn't apply, because I think that's a California case. And typically that was a defense, and they actually overruled the California supreme Court in that case.

And -- but interesting. Because here's my thoughts. And this is one of those - I mean, normally I don't - it's rare that we bifurcate cases. We have Nevada case law that stands for the proposition that if
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the damages and liability are intertwined, it would be abuse of discretion for the trial court to grant bifurcation under those conditions, you know.

And, however, regardless of the -- whether you get a jury trial on one issue or not, or whether 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 throw this out. And this is one of the reasons why, when it comes to cases that might be somewhat more complex procedurally, and we've done this many times in this department. That's why we have trial protocols. And $I$ think everybody understands what that means.

And so this is what I'm going to do for now: I'm going to deny the motion to bifurcate without prejudice.

And this is why: I feel that before $I$ make a final decision, we have to vet, unless we have some sort of an agreement, as to specifically whether that fraud claim comes up under the terms and conditions as set forth in the consumer loan agreement. Although, if you want to do briefing on that, then we can.

And just as important, if $I$ rule that they do, then $I$ probably would bifurcate those out and have
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those tried together, if you understand what I'm saying.

MR. GREER: I don't think we can bifurcate just the fraud claims, though.

THE COURT: No, no, no. I'm saying 1 will try the construction loan agreement along with the -- with the fraud claims in the inducement together.

MR. GREER: And then to the extent they apply, they're determined. To the extent they don't apply and they relate to the other acts, then they're tried with the jury in the other action.

THE COURT: Potentially, yes.
MR. GREER: Okay.
THE COURT: You see what I'm saying,
Mr. Aldrich?

I think -- I'm not going to sit here and say, Look, sir -- and that's why I denied the motion -- that I'm not going to make a determination that the fraud claims as a matter of law without having briefing on the language as contained in the construction loan agreement stands for a waiver of your client's right to a jury trial as it relates to the fraud claims, without having full briefing on that issue.

I do think they're related. Right?
Just as important, too, looking at this, and
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this is where $I$ think we need to dig a little deeper, would fraud be -- if there's a determination of fraud, what impact does that have on the construction loan agreement? Right?

It's your position that it would be -- that it would -- that the construction loan agreement would be void and/or voidable, $I$ think; right?

MR. ALDRICH: Yes.
THE COURT: I understand that.

And $I$ know Mr. Greer doesn't agree with that; right?

But those are issues -- those are somewhat complex issues that we don't see every day; right? I mean, everyone here might see them, but I don't.

But -- and so -- pardon?
MR. GREER: So if - - if - -
THE COURT: GO ahead.
MR. GREER: So, your Honor, if I go up to a friend and, you know, and he wants to borrow some money, and $I$-- $I$ pull out my pocket, $I$ have 20 bucks. I can only lend you 20. Well, I need 40. I can only lend you 20. Right?

Then $I$ go back around the corner and reach in my other pocket, $I$ got another 20 . My friend sees it and he says, You lied to me. You had 40. You said you
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only had 20. I'm not going to pay you your 20 back, because you only gave me 20 when you had 40 .

I'm not seeing how that has any impact on his ability, his obligation to pay the money back.

THE COURT: Well, here's -- well, here's the thing. And I'm not necessarily saying that, and I don't think -- $I$ don't think plaintiff is taking a position that they don't have to repay the funds, the \$6 million.

Is that a position you're taking?
MR. ALDRICH: Your Honor, $I$ think that that all kind of remains to be seen at the end, whether they -- $I$ certainly see the scenario where they didn't pay back the $\$ 6.3$ million. There is also an argument to be had about damages. And all this is kind of addressed in the other motion that's out there.

THE COURT: I understand.
MR. ALDRICH: But - -

THE COURT: I do. But $I$ think werre - I think we can't simplify it in this regard. say, if we change our scenario slightly, where your friend came to you and said, Look, you know, I can raise $\$ 100,000$ for you. And $I$ got all this money set aside. And we can go ahead and start some improvements, and those types of things. And, yeah, I'm sure you can get the
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$\$ 100,000$, and lo and behold, it comes to light that maybe you can't get that 100,000 . And whether you knew or should have known, that is a different issue. And you can only get 20 .

MR. GREER: Yes.
THE COURT: And what impact does that have on the friend?

MR. GREER: Is it different, though, if he says, you know what, 1 can only get 20 . That's all we got. You want me to give the 20 back to the people $I$ raised it from? Or let me give it to you to for the loan -- you make the call. Clearly, 1 couldn't come up with what $I$ said earlier $I$ was going to come up with.

So -- and then if you take the 20 , $I$ think you have to pay it back with interest and terms, and I don't think that you can benefit from knowing that you're -- that the guy couldn't raise the whole hundred, and then take his 20 and take advantage of it.

THE COURT: And - and this is important to point out. And understand, $I$ try to think and make statements that are qualified. And there's a reason for that.

Understand, $I$ think when we had this discussion, $I$ said it was based upon the current procedural posture of the case; right? And so $I$
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haven't thrown out the fraud claims as a matter of law, have I?

MR. GREER: NO, sir.
THE COURT: You see where I'm going?
MR. GREER: Okay.
THE COURT: I can't -- it goes back to my
statement, remember, $I$ made regarding $I$ can't rush to judgment.

MR. GREER: Yes.
THE COURT: Right?
MR. ALDRICH: Correct.

THE COURT: Yeah. And that's why $I$ said all that, you know. I understand everybody's respective position. $I$ do get it.

But until certain claims are peeled off or whatever, or are still part of the case, look at it this way: Everything is still there.

Right, Mr. Aldrich? It's still there.
MR. ALDRICH: Yes.
THE COURT: And so $I$ think - and $I$ think that's when judges get in trouble from an appellate perspective, when they rush to judgment. Because you can, ultimately, maybe be right, but -- after it's all said and done, but if you don't go through the process, we're going to say you're wrong.

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR
(702)671-4402-CROERT48@GMAIL.COM

Pursuant to NRS 239.053 , illegal to copy without payment.

Right, Mr. Aldrich?
MR. ALDRICH: That's correct.
THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ALDRICH: Okay.
THE COURT: So where do we go from here?
And that's without prejudice. I just want to make sure you understand that.

MR. GREER: Sure.

THE COURT: Because $I$ do think - and I don't mind saying this. On some level we're going to have to revisit, and maybe this might even go to an issue more of trial protocol. But we're going to have to revisit how these cases ultimately are going to be tried.

All right. And $I$ don't know the answer to that yet. And $I$ rely on counsel to help me out on that.

MR. ALDRICH: Understood.
THE COURT: Okay. So.
MR. ALDRICH: The - I think the - you know, the supplemental Rule 16, or 16.1 , whichever qualifies as conference related to the counterdefendants and then the discussion of the NRCP 65(a)(2) notice.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's go to the Rule 16 issue.

MR. ALDRICH: Okay. So in this respect, I

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR
(702)671-4402-CROERT48@GMAIL.COM
pursuant to NRS 239.053 , illegal to copy without payment.
mean, $I$ think the issue there is the deadiines that are in the current joint case conference report, $I$ should have looked at it before $I$ came.

I don't know if, Kathryn, if you know what they are.

MS. HOLBERT: Yes.

MR. ALDRICH: I want to say trial is like a year from now, and experts are due in, like, June.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. ALDRICH: I'm - I mean, for purposes of the conference today, obviously the defendants want to start some discovery on the counterclaims because they want to have that conference, and then if the court is inclined, we need to talk about when we're going to really try the case. If the Court wants it to be different than what's in there in -- in the judgment of conviction right now.

MS. HOLBERT: Right. And typically for the purposes of the supplemental case conference report is do you agree with the current dates or not.

THE COURT: Right.
And, Ms. Holbert, where should we go on that? What's your -- do we hold -- because this is kind of -this is kind of interrelated to the notice $I$ gave regarding -- what was that? Let me see here.
(702)671-4402-CROERT48@GMAIL.COM
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Yeah, the status check regarding 65(a)(2)
notice; right?
MS. HOLBERT: Correct. Yes, I think we're --
we're doing those together.
MR. ALDRICH: They seem to go together.
THE COURT: They do.
MS. HOLBERT: Yeah.
THE COURT: That's my point.
MS. HOLBERT: Right. Really the main thing that we wanted is that the supplemental case conference, that provision of the rule is then satisfied. That's what we wanted today so that we can begin discovery on those. I think the broader question of can we move the trial up, do the dates stand as is goes more into the notice issue.

THE COURT: Right. So any objection to this meeting the requirements of 16.1 as it relates to the additional claims?

MR. ALDRICH: The counter-defendants.
THE COURT: Counter-defendants, yes.
MR. ALDRICH: NO.
THE COURT: Okay. So that's been handled.
MS. HOLBERT: Thank you.
THE COURT: All right. And, I guess, we - we will have to, $I$ guess, lodge or just file the
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supplemental report on that.
MR. ALDRICH: The supplemental --
THE COURT: 16.1.
MR. ALDRICH: -- joint case conference report.
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. ALDRICH: Correct.
THE COURT: Yeah. All right.
Next up would be Rule 65; right?
MR. ALDRICH: Correct. So - -
MS. HOLBERT: Correct.
MR. ALDRICH: -- the Rule 65 notice plus, you
know, if we're going to change any dates in the
supplemental joint case conference report.
MS. HOLBERT: Right.
MR. ALDRICH: Those seem to go together. And
now seems to be the time to do it.

THE COURT: Right. But $I$ don't know what you want to do, $I$ really don't, as far as dates are concerned. Do we have some recommended dates?

MR. ALDRICH: I mean, we have dates in the joint case conference report already.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. ALDRICH: Those are fine for me. I know the Court has expressed a desire to go faster.

THE COURT: And there's -- there's a reason
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why. And number one - let me look here.
This is a business court case.
MR. ALDRICH: It is.
THE COURT: Everybody understands that.
I don't mind saying this. $I$ spent more time on this business court case than any business court 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. I mean, I have. And - and notwithstanding they're all very important. $I$ don't mind saying that.

And so my point is this. I remember taking a look at the rule, and this is an often overlooked provision under Rule 65, I've done it in one other case, and it just seems to me that from an efficiency perspective, and that's more so than anything else, if you have a potential contract in place that impacts certain claims of whether there's a right to a jury trial or not, that I've heard a lot of testimony. We can all agree.

Just as important, too, some of the testimony it reminded me of -- it was -- some of it was deposition.

MS. HOLBERT: Yes.
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THE COURT: Great. Right. It was.
So I just thought about it, and I said - I looked at the provision. And $I$ said to myself, I'm always told by our Supreme Court, and more specifically I think this whole business court was the child of Justice Hardesty, $I$ think he started this. This is one of his pet projects. And there's nothing wrong with it. He wanted Nevada to become like the Delaware of the west --

MS. HOLBERT: Right.
THE COURT: -- and have the specific business court and the like. And so when $I$ looked at Rule 65(a) (2), and reflected a little bit, and it provides as follows:
"Before or after the commencement of a
hearing of an application for preliminary
injunction, the Court may order the trial of
the action on the merits to be advanced and
consolidated with the hearing of the
application."
And $I$ think $I$ understand why. Goes to the issue of efficiency; right?

MR. ALDRICH: Sure.
THE COURT: So where do we go from here?
Because those are my thoughts. And for the record, I
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haven't made any decision. That was a lot.
MS. HOLBERT: I don't think we're opposed with, you know, with consolidating the evidentiary hearing with that.

Another issue that is on calendar today is a status check regarding that evidentiary hearing.

Because, of course, we need to finish that. So it's hard to talk about when we're going to set a trial when we don't even know when the evidentiary hearing is going to be done.

THE COURT: I agree, ma'am. I do.
MS. HOLBERT: Right. So I don't know really
what we take first, but if we're still doing the evidentiary hearing in January, and haven't done some of the other stuff, $I$ don't know how we can do trial in February.

THE COURT: I understand, ma'am. I do. I get it.

MR. ALDRICH: Yeah. So my concern comes with a couple of things. Number one, right now, experts are set. Initial expert disclosure is March 5 of 2020 , which is just a little under five months away.

You know, we can move that up a little bit, but $I$ remind the Court we've still got discovery battles to fight. If $I$ lose those discovery battles in
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a couple of weeks, then that may change a little bit. But if $I$ win and the Court gives them a reasonable amount of time to provide the information I'm asking for, that's going to push us, I'm assuming, you know, close to the end of the month of November, or something to that effect. IVe got to have time to get that stuff together, get experts and all that kind of stuff. So that's where my concern comes.

You know, I'm fine with the current dates. I understand why defendants wouldn't be. At the same time, as the evidentiary hearing goes forward, $I$ got to be able to have discovery.

THE COURT: I'm not going to side step the process.

MR. ALDRICH: I will-- correct. And $\quad$ will tell the Court my reading of Rule 65(a)(2), and I did some research. $I$ - maybe 20 minutes, 30 minutes, just to see what $I$ can see about it. And really all $I$ found is it's the Court's discretion to do that.

And then it -- but it appears to me to be a combining of trial and the evidentiary hearing.

THE COURT: That's -- I agree with all that.
I do.
MR. ALDRICH: Right.
So that's how I read it, which then leads to
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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 got to be a practical amount of time to give us, you 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 April and early May, $I$ can't have a trial, so ...

THE COURT: I understand.
MR. GREER: I can -- just two cents here.
And $I$ also did a little bit of research on this. It looks like the Court has discretion at the end of this, of the evidentiary hearing, if the court looks like at that point in time it's got enough evidence to make the decision that we made at trial, it can be done.

And $I$ think as we move forward here, $I$ think it's highly likely that by the time we get through this preliminary injunction evidentiary process, your Honor is going to have everything before the court that it's going to need to make that decision.

I don't see that -- $I$ know we're talking about discovery. This is all, in my opinion, extraneous stuff because the real evidence is going on the stand, and your Honor is going to have it. And that rule is there so we don't have to put it on twice. And so it's -- $I$ think it's -- it would be more powerful then,

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR
(702)671-4402-CROERT48@GMAIL.COM

Pursuant to NRS 239.053 , illegal to copy without payment.
you know, summary judgment motion. But $I$ do think if the evidence plays out the way $I$ believe it's going to be, $I$ think your Honor is going to be in a position where you can do that, and not only make a ruling on the preliminary injunction, but concurrently make a ruling on the case. And that's $I$ - we would prefer that. The sooner the better.

So -- and, $I$ guess, that, again, would be answered as we go forward, because I think Mr. Aldrich is going to do a good job here and put on all the evidence that support his, you know, fraud in the inducement claim and all of his other causes of action in order to get that preliminary injunction ruled on in 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 Court is going to be able to rule on behalf of the defense, particularly $L V D$ Fund on the issues involving the loan. And we would encourage that.

THE COURT: Interesting.
MR. GREER: The Court has given notice to everybody, so everybody has adequate notice if the Court does that, makes that kind of decision.

THE COURT: What about - and there's another reason why $I$ didn't think it would be -- represent a significant problem in this specific case. Because
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```
it's my understanding, Mr. Aldrich, you've already
```

retained some experts; right?
MR. ALDRICH: I have.
THE COURT: Yeah, one specifically related to,
I guess, the interpretation of the contract and/or
construction loan agreement and whether there's been
compliance or not. That's my understanding. Is
that --
MR. ALDRICH: Well, I have -- I have --
THE COURT: Whether --
MR. ALDRICH: I've submitted a declaration
from an EB5 expert.
THE COURT: Right.
MR. ALDRICH: And I've submitted reports, the
jobs report. I'm -- I - I've got a financial expert.
I haven't produced a report from him yet because I
don't have all the information that $I$ need.
Am $I$ missing anything?
So that's it so far.
THE COURT: So, $I$ guess your most significant
concern would be regarding the financial expert,
without enough information?
MR. ALDRICH: Yeah. I mean, right now that's
my biggest concern. And because experts aren't due for
a long time, $I$ haven't done a formal --
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THE COURT: I understand.

MR. ALDRICH: -- you know, sit down with them, make sure they have every single thing they need and all that kind of stuff. $\quad$ mean, we're still in the process of that, but it's -- I mean, it's happening.

MR. GREER: It's really just administratively tabulating things because Front sight knows every penny that it gave to the defendants. It knows what its alleged damages are. It's in control of that information.

So even that is an easy issue to deal with. And you want to make -- for the record, your Honor, those -- the declarations are hearsay and should not be admitted thus far. I think if counsel got his expert on the stand and -- as he should, then it would be admissible.

THE COURT: Don't worry about that. I mean, I get that.

MR. GREER: Yeah. I mean that's dangerous.
THE COURT: Don't worry about that. Those are -- I guess, you know, number one, the reports don't get admitted into evidence. Many times lawyers don't take depositions of experts because they want to limit them to what's contained in their report. And $I$ get it. But you got to have live testimony. I understand.
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So I'm not worried about that.
And you shouldn't have that concern. I mean, ultimately, at some point if there are experts to testify during our journey, they will, of course, have to meet all the requirements under Hallmark. They do. 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. $I$ believe in due process. I don't mind saying that.

So is this something we should visit a little later? But $I$ think there is - even if we do that, we still have to decide because this -- this is flowing in now to the motions for protective order and/or motions to compel; right? Because at the end of the day we have to make $a$ - $I$ have to make a determination on discovery. And, $I$ guess, the quicker specific documents get in the hands of the plaintiffis expert, it will, of course, accelerate the ability to prepare for the ultimate determination; right?

Do you agree with that, Mr. Aldrich?
MR. ALDRICH: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. So what do we --
MS. HOLBERT: I think, your Honor, if we can
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just leave the dates as they are right now, you file a joinder on behalf of the counter-defendants to the current cases in a joint case conference report, and then we revisit the issue.

But then we also need to set a continued date to get a plan to finish the evidentiary hearing.

THE COURT: Right.
MS. HOLBERT: Will that work?
MR. ALDRICH: That's fine with me. We're here in two weeks, or we can set a different one after that. Two weeks may not be soon enough to make that - -

MS. HOLBERT: To do what?
MR. ALDRICH: To discuss what we're doing on the rest of the individual --

MS. HOLBERT: We just need a date; right? From the Court. The Court's availability; right?

THE COURT: Right. Right.
MS. HOLBERT: Because you're not done; right?
MR. ALDRICH: I'm not done, that's correct.
THE COURT: They're not done.
How many days has it been now?
MR. ALDRICH: We've had four days of testimony. One of them was real short, but four days. MS. HOLBERT: And that's not on the $23 r d ;$ right? That's just a law and motion calendar on the
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## MR. ALDRICH: Correct.

THE COURT: Right.

How much more time do we anticipate, Mr. Aldrich, as far as how many more days do you need?

MR. ALDRICH: Well, Judge, I got some experts
I got to call. And $I$ don't have the discovery. I mean, $I$ realize it's a preliminary injunction hearing, but the case has been pending over a year now. And I -- mean, we'll get to this in a couple weeks when we come, but I've been waiting for supplemental disclosures or a supplemental response or something for months, with promises that they were coming, and then they haven't come.

And so, you know, $I$ mean, certainly another day, maybe longer. But again, $I$ mean, this --

THE COURT: Should we decide this on the $23 r d ?$
MR. ALDRICH: Probably.
THE COURT: And $I$ think for the $23 r d$, should we set a status check for setting additional days for the evidentiary hearing and testimony?

MR. GREER: What was that?
THE COURT: You're going to be here on the $23 r d$, at least for now. Assuming you're not in trial. If you're in trial, Mr. Greer, I get it. Welll just
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move it to a time convenient for everyone. And $I$ hate kicking the can down the road, but there still are a lot of balls in the air, $\quad$ think, right now.

MR. ALDRICH: Yes, please.
THE COURT: And then they're going to have to fall ultimately.

But on the $23 r d$, we should plan on setting more days for testimony; right? Within the next -within that next month or so.

MR. ALDRICH: That's fine.
THE COURT: And maybe get everything potentially done, except for experts. And maybe if we can -- I'm not sure. But welll talk about that on the $23 r d, \quad b u t$ we should definitely set a plan for - for who's anticipated the next witnesses will be and have a time set for those witnesses.

MR. ALDRICH: Okay.
THE COURT: So, Ms. Holbert, do you agree?
MS. HOLBERT: Yes. Thank You, your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. All right.
You got that? Status check regarding dates for the evidentiary hearing schedule.

To my understanding, we might want it --it might be premature, but I'd love to get that set.

So what do we have left now? Pending motions;
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right?

MR. ALDRICH: We have two. Well, it's two issues, but it's the -- they filed eight motions to quash. I filed an omnibus opposition, so there's that set. And then there's a set. I filed a motion to quash related to some subpoenas that they sent out. So we can start with theirs because they came first.

THE COURT: Okay.
THE COURT REPORTER: Should we take a break now, Judge.

THE COURT: If You need a break, we can take a break.

What we'll do, we'll come back about 3:05 or so. No later than 3:10.

We'll take a break, ma'am.

- ○ O O-
(Recess) - ○00-

THE COURT: Okay. I guess next we go to the motions to quash; right?

MR. ALDRICH: That's correct. MR. GREER: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Motion to quash. MR. GREER: Your Honor, to help us get through these in an efficient fashion, I've broken them down into three categories.
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You have subpoenas that Front Sight has issued to Empyrean West, J. Carter and David Keller.

THE COURT: I'm ready when you are, sir.
MR. GREER: Okay.
Your Honor, this is -- Empyrean West is a company that Mr. Dziubla was associated with prior to his involvement with Front sight. It involves the use Of $E B 5$ capital regarding the $S a n$ Diego Hyatt project. There's been testimony from Mr. Dziubla on the stand and the various declarations that this was his prior EB5 experience directly with the raising and developing of that property.

So arguably there would be some relevance to information confirming that he was associated with this and that he had this $E B 5$ experience. However, the problem we have with the subpoenas is they are just way too broad.

If we go to -- the Exhibit A's are the same on each of the three subpoenas: The Keller, Carter and Empyrean. So they just ask for the exact same information just from different parties.

The Question Number 1 is: Provide all documents you possess or control showing communications between any employee, officer, member, manager, agent, or principal of Empyrean $W e s t$ and Robert Dziubla, John
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Fleming, Kenworth Capital, Legacy Realty Company, Las Vegas Development Fund pertaining to the san Diego Hyatt project" for which Empyrean West raised EB5 (indiscernible) investors through Liberty west Regional Center.

Way overbroad. The burden it would put on Empyrean would be overwhelming and not relevant for the most part. If it was specifically tailored to identify what Mr. Dziubla's position was or relationship was, what functions he was responsible for, what he was involved with, they would arguably have some relevance. It's just this takes in everything under the sun and needs to be quashed. For that reason, it's just it's just uncontrollably broad.

The second one suffers from the same problem. The second one is even more broad, in fact, because it asks for:
"All communications, all documents you possess controlling, showing communications of any type between any employee, officer, member, manager, agent, or principal of Empyrean West and Robert Dziubla, John Fleming, Kenworth Capital, Legacy Realty Capital, Linda Stanwood, EB5 Impact Advisors, EB5 Impact Capital Regional Center, Las Vegas Development Fund,
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```
    LLC, from March 2012 forward."
    Again, incredibly overbroad, covering
potentially privileged things affecting the privileges
of third parties, potential attorney-client privilege
material. It's just way, way too broad and
unmanageable.
    The third one is all documents showing
communications between you and all those same players
again. So that's for the same thing, again with no
subject matter at all.
    And then the last one:
            "Provide any documents you possess or
            control regarding the Front Sight project and
            the EB5 fundraising that sought investors from
            the Front Sight project by and through EB5
            Impact Capital."
            Now, there may very well not be any documents
                    in that category because they weren't involved in it at
                    all, but as phrased it -- it has the same concern as
                we've seen in the past, where Front sight is trying to
                                    get its hands on very important, guarded -- jealously
                                    guarded proprietary information about the names and
                                    contact information of LVD Fund's investors, its
                                    brokers, its agents. When we said in this court
                                    before, the problems that LVD Fund had with Mr. Piazza
                                    Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR
                            (702)671-4402 - CROERT48@GMAIL.COM
Pursuant to NRS 239.053, illegal to copy without payment.
```

and Front $S i g h t$ 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 $L V D$ 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
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not have a right to that information.
So that is the first group. It might be easier just to do these as a group at the time. I suggest, your Honor, that Mr. Aldrich -- unless your Honor has some questions for me, that Mr. Aldrich maybe address these three, and we get them handled.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ALDRICH: Thank you, your Honor.
I guess $I$ have to start with Mr. Greer and I did talk about protective orders and an order from the Court that we not share this information except outside -- or $I$ 'm sorry, except within the litigation. He made that same statement to me about Dr. Piazza. I just have to address that initially.

There's -- Dr. Piazza has complied with all court orders in this case. He hasn't been ordered not to do anything. He hasn't done anything he was ordered not to do. So -- and interesting that defendants come in and say that because we've got a court order for an accounting. We didn't get a full accounting. And then they filed his tax returns in the open forums, some different things like that.

So if that's the basis for the objection, then we should get the information. The Court can order that we can't use it except in the litigation, and off
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we go.
But let me address these points here. The
first point that $I$ mentioned was the -- that the motion's late. And so procedurally the Court, you know, can deny and allow the discovery right off the bat.

But with J. Carter, Dave Keller, and Empyrean West, the Court may recall that Mr. Dziubla represented a couple of things significant. One was that they weren't together on the san Diego Hyatt project, which ultimately Mr. Dziubla certainly admitted, never went anywhere, but he represented them as partners early on for starters. He also represented them as the only ones allowed to do EB5 fundraising in Viet Nam. Those are all significant related to the fraud claims.

The other thing is that there -- these are actually narrowly tailored. We're asking for communications that they possess or control-- Im looking at No. 1. -- between any employee, Mr. Greer went through it, of Empyrean West and Robert Dziubla, a party to this litigation.

John Fleming, a party to this litigation, and the other person who was supposedly out raising money with my client's money.

Kenworth Capital, Inc. Well, that is
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Mr. Dziubla's company. He testified as much that one of the first engagement letters is on Kenworth Capital letterhead.

Legacy Realty Capital. My understanding is that that this Mr. Fleming's company.

So again, $I$ haven't even gotten outside of any parties yet.

No. 5, Las Vegas Development Fund. Also a party.

Rule pertaining to the san Diego Hyatt project. That's -- that's it. That is narrowly tailored.

There hasn't been an argument that that's so many documents it's overly burdensome. And we're at an interesting position because $I$ put in my pleadings that they don't have standing to object to these. Interestingly enough, when we argue the next motion, we have to deal with that issue for myself.

But nonetheless, since that's the main objection is that it's overly burdensome, then that's why $I$ addressed them individually.

But that No. 1 is a narrowly tailored request.
Now, No. 2 admittedly is a little bit broader because it doesn't limit it to the San Diego Hyatt project, but it is limited in time from March 2012 to

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR
(702)671-4402-CROERT48@GMAIL.COM

Pursuant to NRS 239.053 , illegal to copy without payment.
present day, which is the relevant time frame. I suspect -- again, we haven't had an argument that this is a huge amount of the documents. I suspect there probably aren't that many documents, certainly from the 2014 or 2015 time forward, but we're certainly entitled to discover these things. Remember, $I$ know the Court knows this already, but whether these become admissible or not is one thing; discoverability is broader than admissibility anyway.

The next thing, the request was communications between at least these three: Dave Keller, J. Carter, or Empyrean West between you and Robert Dziubla, a party; John Fleming, a party; Kenworth Capital, Mr. Dziubla's company; Legacy Realty Capital, Mr. Fleming's company; Linda stanwood, also a party; EB5 Impact Advisors, LLC, also a party; EB5 Impact Capital Regional Center, also a party; and Las Vegas Development Fund, from March 2012 to the present. Relevant time frame.

The last one:
"All documents you possess or control regarding the Front sight project and the eB5 fundraising that sought investors for the front Sight project by and through EB5 Impact Capital Regional Center, LLC."
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Now, this one is important because there were representations, number one, that this was the only project that they were working on, even though apparently there was also a San Diego Hyatt project going on at the same time.

We continued to hear about the proprietary nature of the jealously guarded information about investors. And $I$ guess a couple of points on that real quick. Number one, we're a year in the litigation. We continue to hear this is proprietary. It's privileged. We have no citation to authority why it's privileged. I've addressed in my brief this trade secret argument that they've made. It's not a trade secret. This is information that has to be provided to the USCIS.

MR. GREER: Lacks foundation.
I'm sorry, it does have to be provided. I
withdraw that objection.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ALDRICH: It has to be provided to the USCIS. Now, I cannot stand here and tell the Court that I'm going to get it from the USCIS. I did a FOIA request a long time ago, and $I$ don't have it back. And 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 certainly goes to the USCIS.
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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 were 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
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all that goes.
So with regard to these three that welve talked about -- Dave Keller, J. Carter, and Empyrean West -- those are proper subpoenas. They're narrowly tailored. And we're entitled to that information.

One other thing $I$ want to address. Mr. Greer 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 them are served with notice -- well, I'm sorry. Let me back up.

They weren't served. We also intend to subpoena them for deposition testimony, and we included some topics for a PMK. Those haven't been addressed by Mr. Greer, but it's - they're very similar. And I think the same arguments apply. We think we are entitled to issue these subpoenas and take this discovery.

Does the Court have any questions for me?
THE COURT: NO, sir.
MR. ALDRICH: All right. Thank you.
MR. GREER: I want to gather that Mr. Aldrich is saying these are narrowly tailored because they're limited to correspondence involving parties to the litigation.

That is not narrowly tailored. Just because
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they are a party to this litigation doesn't mean that any correspondence they ever did in the past is all of a sudden discoverable from third parties. You know, we need to keep in context here this is third party discovery. One, they have to make a showing that they can't get it any other way. They haven't made any efforts to do that.

Two, this privacy issue, there's no argument here as to why they need the names of the investors, why they need the names of the brokers. And there's no evidence that the brokers are ever disclosed in any of the USCIS documentation. So this -- this isn't information that they would have a way to get through any source. It's very, very protected by LVD Fund, and actually anybody in the EB5 business who has relationships with brokers.

With regard to the EB5 investors having to come forward, they don't. The money here is lent by LVD Fund. The money gets paid back to LVD Fund. It then goes to the $E B 5$ investors. This is all regulated through the USCIS. I don't think Mr. Aldrich is seriously saying that there aren't EB5 investors involved here.

Also there is another reason for privacy with the investors is there's a potential for repercussions
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in their own country. Remember, they're trying to escape countries. And thus have an interest in keeping their interest, their identity from being publicly discussed in their home countries where it could cause -- they can have repercussions from that.

And what's missing from this whole picture is why do they need the names? Why do they need the names of brokers? Why do they need the names of investors? That really isn't even an issue here.

If these documents -- any documents that were produced would necessarily have to be redacted, and that would not take away any of the value. Because the only thing of relevance here is was Mr. Dziubla involved in this and what was his experience. So I think these are all way overbroad, your Honor. They bring in privileged proprietary information and potential attorney-client privileged information as phrased. And the motion to quash should be granted.

With regard to timing under Rule 26 , these are timely and the Court has the discretion to consider them anyway.

So at this point in time $I$ would ask that just the whole thing be quashed, counsel be directed to draft more narrowly tailored requests.

THE COURT: What would be more narrowly
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tailored?

MR. GREER: Well, what -- they're not just -you can't just narrow it to the party, to the subject here.

Documents identifying Mr. Dziubla's position with the company. Documents, you know, identifying projects he worked on.

Really this -- all that they need to confirm or deny is whether or not he was involved with that project. And without crawling into another company's business who is not a party to this lawsuit, they could do it with a very narrowly tailored request that says documents identifying Mr. Dziubla's association and involvement with the company excluding information relating to names of investors and brokers. That, I think, would come very, very close to that.

Right now it asks for, you know, if you sent birthday cards, it would be covered, or well wishes, or vacation discussions. I mean, they're just incredibly broad. They should be narrowed by issue not just by the party.

THE COURT: And I look at Exhibit A to defendant's motion to quash subpoena for deposition and documents to Empyrean, I'm looking at No. 1. He does list out -- he's looking for communications between
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employee, officers, members, managers, agents, and principals of Empyrean West, LLC.

And he sets forth the names of specific individuals, and then limits it to the San Diego Hyatt EB5 project of which Empyrean West raised investment funds.

What's specifically wrong with that?
MR. GREER: Number one?
THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. GREER: So all documents, communications between anybody at Empyrean West and all these list of -- list of the entities pertaining to the project for which Empyrean West raised funds from EB5 during investors, literally, your Honor, that would mean that any type of internal communication, marketings that - marketing solicitations and attorney-client privilege communications.

Irrelevant social communications. It doesn't ask by topic. It just - it asks for any communication with anybody at that company with any of these people. What -- what kind of burden are you going to be placing on this -- this company. And what's -- there's no showing of any relevance to any of it, other than what was Mr. Dziubla's job there.

THE COURT: Well, $I$ think what it is -- and
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correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Aldrich is looking for his pre-history and experience in EB5 funding; right?

MR. ALDRICH: Correct.
MR. GREER: And, again, your Honor, that's part of the issue really here is, your Honor, is to just repeat this, it's very, very important. It would 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 model. It would disclose to Front Sight, very, very strictly guarded proprietary information.

Now, again, if it was excluding their names, if they just want to know was -- I don't even know how it's relevant. But if Mr. Dziubla has communications with investors in an $E B 5$ project, before he came across Front sight folks, how would it even be relevant here, other than the existence of Mr. Dziubla having experience. You don't need the names. You don't need the contact information from brokers for people that he was developing as his base for soliciting EB5 investment proceeds.

If $I$ can imagine how they're going to do this, your Honor, this company, are they going to go between every employee, officer, member, manager, agent or principal, and then identify all communications with
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each one of these separate individuals.
THE COURT: I would think, I would think they have a file.

MR. GREER: I'm on communications of Front Sight defendants?

THE COURT: Well --
MR. GREER: You know, it's not -- it's going to be -- and it's open ended. For how long? There's no time frame on it.

MR. ALDRICH: Your Honor.
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. ALDRICH: Number one, on here, it is -this one -- Mr. Greer, actually addressed No. 2.

No. 1 is related to the EB5 San Diego Hyatt project.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. ALDRICH: I don't know how long that
lasted. I mean, Mr. Dziubla admitted that it didn't go anywhere. So, you know, $I$ don't know how much it is, but they haven't made an offer of proof that it's any significant amount either. Honestly, that is what Empyrean $W e s t$ would do when they were served with it. If they come back and say, It's 7,000 pages of documents, then we have a different issue.

But that isn't what we're here talking about.
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We're here talking about is this sufficiently tailored, narrowly tailored to seek discoverable evidence? And the answer to that is yes.

MR. GREER: If I may. My question is why, why is it relevant?

THE COURT: I think it goes -- I mean, I don't -- based upon what $I$ know about the case, I assume he's making - this might go to the fraud in the inducement issue.

MR. ALDRICH: Absolutely.
MR. GREER: To the extent that he was involved with the project, yes. I mean, did he have experience? Did he work with them? What was the EB5? But they don't need the names of the brokers that he dealt with and the investors he dealt with, your Honor. That doesn't - that doesn't add anything to the case. If there -- if there are communications between Mr. Dziubla and brokers, or between other Empyrean people and Mr. Dziubla and brokers, the identity of the broker doesn't matter. The fact that the communication was made would show that he was involved in the process. But there's no evidentiary value in identifying the name of the broker that was involved, and there is a very strong proprietary interest in keeping that secret, confidential.
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So if this was tailored, one, as to time, it would be a significant limitation; two, to exclude the names of investors and brokers, which are proprietary, that would at least limit the damage that would be caused by this incredibly overbroad request.

If, with those limitations, the company then 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 Regional Center of Front Sight getting access to proprietary information. It's not necessary for its case, but is damaging to the defendants.

MR. ALDRICH: Your Honor, here's an interesting thing. Listen, $I$ hope that your Honor can see that inside I'm like jumping up and down, okay, because this -- think about these arguments. The argument is, $W e$ don't want Front Sight to know if we had any brokers in place in 2012 or 2013 or 2014 . Why? Because $I$ don't think there are any. Why does that matter? Because the representations are that they were raising tens of millions of dollars for an EB5 funding for the $S$ an Diego Hyatt project, that they have a vast network of agents and people. They're going to just bring them in, at the beginning, four or five months,
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and promises by Thanksgiving day and all these different things. It makes no sense.

They would -- should have wanted to go, here yet, your Honor, make an order that we can't use it anywhere outside of this litigation, but we're going to show you this, Mr. Dziubla is telling the truth. But 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. And that is not going to fly.

And with respect to Mr. Dziubla, he's sitting 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 going to trust if your Honor let's him or has someone else redact documents. He threw away the EB5 documents. Threw them away. Hasn't provided a proper accounting. We're not taking their word for anything. This is absolutely 100 percent talking about, number one, it is easy, no brainer, relevant.

MR. GREER: Your Honor - -
MR. ALDRICH: And discoverable.
MR. GREER: He's - we'd love to let - if there was a broker involved, the fact that there was a broker involved, is relevant. He should have a right to it. The identity of that broker is what is the
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problem here. Because it is proprietary information.
Now, if they were properly redacted with initials where you can get the substance of the - in 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 disclosed, come before this Court and say, Okay. Your Honor, $I$ - I now have a reason that $I$ need to know the identity of this broker, and here it is. But right now all they need to know is did Mr. Dziubla have interaction with brokers. They can get that with the broker's name redacted with only the initials and some non-identifying information so that Mr. Piazza, who, as the Court knows -- I've had a prior class action with him, $\quad$ work with him well, and dealt with him in the past and know what he does.

I think this Court has also seen his -- his alerts that he sends out to all his members, talking about things that happens in this courtroom. He's not able to be controlled. And so we want to give it to plaintiffs --

THE COURT: I actually haven't looked at any of that. I don't look -- I just focus on what's in front of me.

And here's my point. I mean, it appears to me what Mr. Aldrich is attempting to do, and $I$ think what
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any lawyer would try to do when it comes to certain aspects of the case, he wants to know, $I$ mean, really and truly, Okay. You worked on the San Diego Hyatt EB5 project. Show me what you wrote. Show me what you did.

MR. ALDRICH: Sure.
THE COURT: Isn't it really that simple?
MR. ALDRICH: Sure. It is.
MR. GREER: They should have a right to that.
MR. ALDRICH: And Mr. Keller and Mr. Carter, I believe attended a meeting early on as well that had to do with this. And then that's the information that Im looked for.

And just to address this proprietary issue again, okay. Mr. Dziubla testified, he sat right there in that chair, and he said he's not marketed this project since the end of 2017 . That is almost two years ago. So $I$ don't know what we're protecting in proprietary fashion. This is the only project they're working on.

MR. GREER: That's not true.
MR. ALDRICH: That's exactly 100 percent true.
I can pull it up.
THE COURT REPORTER: I need one at a time.
THE COURT: One at a time.
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MR. ALDRICH: But this whole, It's all proprietary -- but, again, there's an easy fix to that. It's easy. The Court says, Mr. Aldrich, I'm going to let you try to get this information. And it's going to be restricted. You can only use it in this case. Your client can only use it in this case. You're not to go publish it out in the world.

That's very easy, and I'm willing to do that.
MR. GREER: See, but, your Honor, this case is, Let's call these people and talk to them about this litigation.

And then -- and undermine -- we already know that he's attempting to squeeze off the income from $L V D$ Fund by not paying for all these months, and still not paying default interest.

He's a very aggressive and creative gentleman. And he will take that, and he will use it to his advantage, and they don't need it. They don't need the names. You only need the names you're going to contact those people, and they shouldn't be contacting them. So we need --

MR. ALDRICH: I'm not - -
MR. GREER: So we should get them everything, but not the names of the brokers and the investors because that is proprietary and it will be misused.
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MR. ALDRICH: I won't belabor the fact. The Court knows --

THE COURT: How can $I$ - how can $I$ do that? What is the appropriate vehicle in place to even do that?

MR. GREER: Just with -- have they produced these documents, whatever you decide the scope is, with redacting the names of any brokers or investors that are involved. I mean, they have -- they have third-party privacy rights themselves also.

But here it's the most -- we're concerned about, in addition to that, is not letting Front Sight, Ignatius Piazza, get his hands on these because he will do something with them. And he doesn't need them. so we could just say, Produce it, redacting the names.

And then if Mr. Aldrich sees this and says, Hey, $I$ need these names, we get a chance to meet and confer. We can get around that and just give them to you. If not come into court say, your Honor, Mr. Greer said we wouldn't need the names. I disagree. I need the names for this reason, and then the court can make the ruling. Are we giving them carte blanche?

MR. ALDRICH: Am $I$ going to get a chart that is blank?

MR. GREER: No. You would have -- with his
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correspondence with just -- we could do it -- just give you the initials, and just do the initials of the first and last name, and -- so you can see --

THE COURT: How do we know that they will do that?

MR. GREER: Because it's proprietary to them 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, and they're going to have to have a right to come in and do this.

MR. ALDRICH: One of the struggles here is that we don't know what there is. There could be nothing at all. Or there could be 7,000 pages. But that's why we get to ask, so that we can find out what is there.

MR. GREER: And if the names are redacted, doesn't matter whether it's zero or 7,000.
(Brief pause in proceedings.)
THE COURT: See, my concern, $I$ was thinking about how to do this in such a manner where - I don't know if, in the production of documents, we can rely on redactions from the source. I'm wondering if whatever is produced should be sealed. We bring them to open court and you can take a look at them without anyone
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having access, except for the parties here. And if there is an issue and something should be redacted, we can redact the names at that time.

MR. GREER: Attorney's eyes only for that part of the process?

THE COURT: Any problem with that?
MR. ALDRICH: That would certainly give me an opportunity to look at it and make noise if $I$ want to.

THE COURT: Right. And - -
MR. ALDRICH: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- my point is this: You keep them sealed. When you get them back you come back here and -- or you could do it in your offices together, you know, or something like that. But $I$ think potentially the documents could be, no question, relevant. $I$ get the relevance issue.

MR. ALDRICH: Right.
THE COURT: But $I$ was looking at it from this perspective: How do you even instruct them what to do?

Ms. Holbert, ma'am?
MS. HOLBERT: NO, I agree. The problem, though, is depositions then. When are you going to take the deposition?

MR. ALDRICH: Yeah, we'll have to set the deposition for a later time, $I$ guess.
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THE COURT: Well, you want to read the documents.

MR. ALDRICH: Yeah.
THE COURT: And then maybe -- I mean, we don't
know. What if there's no documents?
MS. HOLBERT: Right.
THE COURT: You going to take the deposition?
MR. ALDRICH: Well, $\quad$ might.
THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. ALDRICH: Because there are going to be some facts.

So if I'm understanding, the suggestion then is so if $I$ send the subpoena out and something comes back to my office, we will put it in the envelope. I will not look at it.

THE COURT: Or whatever you get from them it stays sealed.

MR. GREER: Stays in the envelope.
MR. ALDRICH: Okay. Fair enough.
MR. GREER: The instruction as to the producing party is to put it in a sealed envelope.

MR. ALDRICH: Okay.
MR. GREER: And put it in another in the mail and it remains sealed.

MR. ALDRICH: That's fine. And we'll hold
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that until we can get together or come here to look at it.

MR. GREER: We can meet at his office.
THE COURT: I think that's the best way to do it, Mr. Aldrich.

MR. ALDRICH: Okay.
MR. GREER: So with that, though, even -- I guess, they're going to object to it. We can let them object over the breadth, $I$ think, because they are still incredibly --

THE COURT: I mean, if you want to set a 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 an order immediately, $I$ can do that.

MR. ALDRICH: We can coordinate that because there's a couple ways we can do it really. We can even call the law clerk or the JEA and ask about your availability.

THE COURT: Exactly.
MR. ALDRICH: And then just we can meet at my office or come here, either way, so that your Honor could do that with us. We can make that work.

MR. GREER: Okay.
THE COURT: Okay.
So that's regarding the Empyrean West; right?
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MR. GREER: That also would apply to --
MR. ALDRICH: Keller and Carter.
MR. GREER: -- Keller and Carter.
THE COURT: Okay. So can you change the subpoena on that, sir? Can you adjust that --

MR. ALDRICH: Yes.
THE COURT: -- and make sure Ms. Holbert or
Mr. Greer sees it before it goes out?
MR. GREER: I would ask that an instructional
letter be included with that.
THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ALDRICH: Yes.

Does the Court wish for us to prepare an order

Or --

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. ALDRICH: -- is the transcript okay? You
want an order?

THE COURT: Probably a simple order would be fine.

MR. ALDRICH: Okay.
THE COURT: It saves - -

MR. ALDRICH: So - -
THE COURT: Order signed off, filed. There's never any confusion after that; right?

MR. ALDRICH: Agreed. So what I'll do is IIll
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prepare an order. So far we're only the first three, as to Keller, Carter, and Empyrean West. I'll run it by counsel. And then $I$ will do a cover letter that it will include the order and the cover letter with the subpoena. Does that sound good?

THE COURT: And, I guess, the way to address the -- the motion would be granted in part, denied in part. Is that correct? Because we're not quashing the subpoena.

MR. ALDRICH: Correct.
THE COURT: We're modifying the subpoena.
MR. ALDRICH: Okay.
MS. HOLBERT: Yeah, the motion was to quash or for protective order. So the Court is entering a protective order.

MR. ALDRICH: Right.
THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. ALDRICH: So granted in part, denied in part, protective order as to what welve talked about.

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. ALDRICH: I'll get that in the order, and we'll follow that process. Is that okay?

MR. GREER: Yes. Yes. Okay.
THE COURT: All right.
MR. GREER: Affirmative.
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THE COURT: So that one is done.
Let's move on to the next one.
MR. GREER: Yeah, three of them.

THE COURT: So next we're dealing with Bank -Open Bank, Bank of Hope, Signature Bank. Is that it?

MR. ALDRICH: Just give us just one second, your Honor.

MR. GREER: We do banks. We can do banks.
MR. ALDRICH: We can do banks. Okay.
MR. GREER: Your Honor, there were four subpoenas to banks. I think we have a lot of similar issues, with Wells Fargo being the first one I'd like to deal with.

Your Honor, as we've -- we've filed motions in -- as to each of these subpoenas discussing the protections afforded to financial information. These are -- this is financial information of a party before a judgment has been entered against the party.

And those are - those are clearly protected unless directly relevant to the proceedings.

Now, Wells Fargo is the bank that's impact -EB5 Impact Advisors banked at. The Court ordered an accounting of that. All the bank statements have already been produced to Front sight on that, along with additional documentation to promote or to support
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the accounting.
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. That's the business of $L V D$ Fund as the lender. The interest
 to know where that money went, what it was used for.

So as to everybody else, other than Impact
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Advisors, this would be completely inappropriate financial information, private information that is not appropriate to compel the production of prior to there being a judgment being entered and their finances and their banking information being relevant. That actually holds true for every other bank, including Wells Fargo, as to all of the named defendants other than Impact Advisors.

That's really -- your Honor, we cite the authority, just because somebody is a party doesn't mean you have the obligation to open up their bank account statements and their financial information. And law is very clear on that. So $I$ don't really have much to add other than that. I mean, it's pretty clear law.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
MR. ALDRICH: All right. The bank, the request for documents to the banks are a little bit different, depending on what the account was being used for. So $I$ notice, you know, signature Bank. Number one on the request, the signature Bank it asks:
"Please provide any and all bank statements and other documents for NES Financial's escrow account for Las Vegas Development Fund, LLC, account number," and it gives a number, "for
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the time period beginning March 2012 to the present date."

So this is -- this will go some to -- I would expect that they would complain that this is going to have some proprietary information or something like that in it, which goes to the resolution we already talked about, but --

MR. GREER: I'm sorry.
MR. ALDRICH: -- the significant thing here is that over a period of time, Mr. Dziubla was making representations to my client about how many investors he has; money in the bank.

And that is particularly relevant to the fraud claims. It's also particularly relevant to the may 12 , 2016, email and then the representations Mr. Dziubla made to Dr. Piazza thereafter, as Dr. Piazza testified last time, when he was here -- when we were here. And - -

THE COURT: NOW, Mr. Aldrich, I understand that. But isn't there - - aren't there other ways you can find out that information without subpoenaing the bank records?

MR. ALDRICH: NO.
THE COURT: Why is that?
MR. ALDRICH: They're not providing them to
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us. We've asked for them. That's the subject I mentioned in the motion to compel, whether the defendant entities or people would have to provide them. But, no, there's not another way to get this information.

And like $I$ said, the defendants are not providing it. They're not providing anything like this. They've objected to every request related to this, just as they did to the subpoena.

THE COURT: Well, it would be -- it's a different animal. The reason why $I$ am focusing on the financials, $I$ understand what your position is.

MR. ALDRICH: Yeah.
THE COURT: I understand I ordered an accounting, and $I$-- I - it's my impression you feel whatever was produced was very much deficient.

MR. ALDRICH: That is correct.
THE COURT: Okay. I get that. All right.
Well, in certain respects, you have factual allegations that they were underfunded or whatever and had no experience --

MR. ALDRICH: Correct.
THE COURT: -- and you make that allegation. Aren't they going to have to come forward with some evidence to show that they had that experience if they
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don't come forward with it?
MR. ALDRICH: Well--
THE COURT: Maybe you win on that issue? I don't know.

MR. ALDRICH: Well, $\quad$ will win on that issue because Mr. Dziubla already admitted he didn't have any experience. But the issue --

THE COURT: Or the finances.
MR. ALDRICH: -- the issue here --
THE COURT: The finances.
MR. ALDRICH: -- on the finances is -- there's several issues here. Okay?

Remember, we got defendants, Las Vegas Development Fund, whose CEO and founder is Mr. Dziubla. EB5 IC, which is the regional center, which Mr. Dziubla is an owner of that. We've got EB5 IA, which is the marketing entity, Mr. Dziubla is the person in charge of that. That's the entity that he destroyed the records for, and I'm not happy about the accounting.

We've got Fleming. Mr. Fleming, who is --
THE COURT: But think about what you're saying. You're saying he destroyed the records for and you're not happy with the accounting. Ultimately, doesn't that have some sort of impact on an evidentiary perspective?
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MR. ALDRICH: Yes. And I filed that motion. But this is -- so this -- this -- right now talking about Signature Bank.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. ALDRICH: Okay. This relates specifically to the representations that Mr. Dziubla made as to how many investors he had at any given time.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. ALDRICH: And the Court hopefully will recall when Dr. Piazza testified last time, we talked about that meeting that occurred shortly after the May 12, 2016 , email and he testified that Mr. Dziubla came in and said, we have to change the capital stack. We have to take out the minimum raise. But Ive got these guys lined up and $I$ have $x$ number of people, and I don't remember the number right now, lined up ready to go as soon as we do this. And then he did.

As to Signature Bank, and this first request that $I$ have, it's absolutely relevant to that.

The rest of the requests really relate mostly to the other entities and whether they also had accounts in those banks. We're trying to track down where the 500,000 and change from my client went.

I don't know that there's going to be any other information related to these other requests, but

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR
(702)671-4402-CROERT48@GMAIL.COM

Pursuant to NRS 239.053 , illegal to copy without payment.

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

Now, there -- there really hasn't been -- with one exception that $I$ can recall as I'm standing here, there hasn't really been an objection that - that Im going to even get information related to the parties in the case. There was an objection raised or a concern by Mr. Dziubla that perhaps one of these subpoenas would result in us receiving information related to an account his son is also on.

Again, on the one hand $I$ certainly see why he wouldn't want that to happen. On the other hand we want to know where the money came from or if there was any money from my clients. So if we need to do -follow that same protocol, we're willing to do that.

But even the Wells Fargo documents that we received, there's a whole bunch, tens of thousands of dollars that to unknown vendors we can't even tell where it went, on the stuff we've already gotten.

And so I'm certainly hopeful that $I$ might get a little more information asking from wells Fargo, but they're all relevant and discoverable, and we'll abide by whatever protective order the court imposes related to that information.

THE COURT: This is -- these are my thoughts.
(702)671-4402-CROERT48@GMAIL.COM
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And $I$ think it's important to distinguish this case from a typical business court case in this regard. Normally, what we would see, we would have a scenario where you have, maybe, a receivership or there's allegations of misuse of corporate assets or 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.

To me that appears to be a different animal here because you have a breach of contract, allegations of fraud in the inducement and so on. And so - and it's different in this regard, because clearly, Mr. Aldrich, you have your burden of proof on certain issues. Just as important, you have to remember when it comes to certain forms of defenses, you just can't say you got a burden of proof there too.

And so $I$ think it's slightly - it's a slightly different animal because these are the separate accounts of the defendant in this case; right? And so it's kind of like a different analysis. And I'm just wondering from a traditional perspective because, for example, $I$ think one of the cases that was cited by the defendants in this case was Schlatter v. Eighth
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Judicial District Court.
And it's a 170 s case, but it really focuses --
and it's a slightly different case, and realize it dealt with -- it was a tort case. But the key language, based upon my recollection is this: They wanted to force the plaintiff to sign medical authorizations, income tax authorizations and the like. And the Nevada Supreme Court said, wait a second here.

And it's kind of analogous to what we have going on here. You just can't go on a fishing expedition; right? That was the language that was used.

But my point is this: Can't you just straight up ask for stuff; right? And then ask for documents, and really specifically what you want, limited in time and location, and request them to produce it. If they don't produce it, that's a problem. Right?

MR. ALDRICH: Yes, I can. Yes, I did.
THE COURT: That's --
MR. ALDRICH: That's the motion to compel
that's out there.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ALDRICH: But the Court will recall, the reason -- part of why this went out is because - I mean, it's the same objection. The same objection to
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my request for production to them as they're making here today. Okay. And the Court will recall that we had a hearing in July that they came in, asked for special master, and the Court, instead of appointing a special master, said, I'm going to impose a 14-day deadline on a request for production for documents.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. ALDRICH: So I had it ready to go. I dropped, $I$ don't remember, between 550 and 600 over the six parties. I was serious.

THE COURT: I understand.
MR. ALDRICH: Okay. And -- and in those answers, $I$ got a whole bunch of repetitive objections.

I talked about the repetitive objections in my motion --

THE COURT: Right.
MR. ALDRICH: -- or opposition. But I got a whole bunch of those. Not one document got identified, not one got identified to even one response.

Okay. No justification of a privilege objection, proprietary objection. No citation, no case, nothing. Okay.

So what did I do? $I$ subpoenaed it from a third party. Why? Because it's relevant for us. It's relevant to the fraud claims. It's relevant to the
(702)671-4402-CROERT48@GMAIL.COM
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fact that my client paid 520-ish thousand dollars to - to try to move forward on this based on the representations that were provided.

So can $I$ ask for it in a request for production? Absolutely. And I did.

And it's the same objection. They're going to say the same thing when we come here in two weeks as they're saying today.

MR. GREER: If we had a request for something specifically, we could do it. When you get 600 of all documents to support anything that you disagree with in paragraph 12 of the complaint, all documents that support anything you disagree with in paragraph 13, 1 mean, times 600 or whatever, we -- we get, like, 40 requests, and we thought about it. We focused on it. We asked for it. And that's how you get a response, your Honor, $I$ think.

I think he's being unfair here by, saying $I$ asked for a million things and $I$ didn't get anything. That's because it's lost in the message.

The Court said 14 days, and that was to speed things up and make it easier. And $I$ think that put a burden on counsel to use that judiciously and really focus, rather than say, Hey, here's 600 things, respond in 14 days. What are you going to do?
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MR. ALDRICH: Ninety days ago. That was 90 days ago.

MR. GREER: But we did -- but in response we are producing everything we have. He's getting documents.

MR. ALDRICH: They did provide --
THE COURT REPORTER: I need one at a time.
THE COURT: One at a time.
MR. ALDRICH: They provided a supplement to initial disclosures, six-ish thousand pages.

MR. GREER: 6,000 pages.
MR. ALDRICH: Okay. I - - they sent a request asking for the attachments to the emails because they were not attached, and they're confusing, but that's - -

MR. GREER: We fixed that - -
THE COURT REPORTER: I need one at a time.
THE COURT: One at a time.
MR. ALDRICH: They did provide a supplement to 16.1 disclosures.

MR. GREER: And we took that last request and we paired up the attachments with the emails and have that for you.

MR. ALDRICH: It's coming?
MR. GREER: I think $I$ was probably supposed to bring them today.
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MR. ALDRICH: Okay.
MR. GREER: But it's -- because it's too big for email.

But, yes, it's done and we agreed to produce it in writing. Our response, we agreed.

MR. ALDRICH: That's true.
MR. GREER: We'll work with them, your Honor. We all need to get to the same point at trial here. I just think we all need -- it's better if we focus, really rather than throwing those broad nets everywhere which cause distractions.

THE COURT: Is that what's set for the $23 r d$, the motion to compel and for sanctions?

MR. ALDRICH: Yes.
THE COURT: And with the documents that have been produced, does that satisfy some of the issues you pointed out in your motion to compel, or do you know at this point?

MR. ALDRICH: No. The documents that were produced were mostly emails and some of the transactional documents. Very little that $I$ didn't already have.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. GREER: Which makes sense because both parties had the transactional documents and the emails Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR
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between each other. There should be very little that either side has the other doesn't.

THE COURT: Mr. Aldrich, do you remember - and $I$ don't expect you to have an infallible computer-like recollection of specifically what was requested, but do you remember in a general sense, for example, what was requested from any documents in possession of the defendant as it relates to the Signature Bank?

MR. GREER: I don't think we got that. We got it in the subpoena, not in the discovery. They're very general discovery demands. Nothing specific really.

MR. ALDRICH: I cannot make that
representation because $I$ don't remember. I will certainly look. I mean, with that 14-day order, $I$ guess, $I$ can send new requests.

THE COURT: Let me look here.
MR. ALDRICH: The large majority of the requests were contention interrogatories related to the paragraphs of the complaint.

MR. GREER: Excuse me, Your Honor. I just had notes after Mr. Aldrich's presentation. He made the comment they wanted to know where the money went. I think that's exactly what case law says is inappropriate here.
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them everything showing where the money went, including the bank statements. Regarding what the lender does with the interest money, what the lender does with his progress payments, with his incentive bonuses, they have no right to that.

That's like, you know, the mortgagee subpoenaing the bank saying where did you spend my points $I$ paid on the loan and where did you spend the interest $I$ paid on the loan.

Certainly not the personal banking information, everybody who's named as a defendant in this case.

MR. ALDRICH: And we believe we do because it was money targeted for a specific purpose.

MR. GREER: So we're going to be able to get Piazza's banking statements and Mrs. Piazza's banking statements because LVD Fund gave Front sight money we want to know where it went? That is Mr. Aldrich is going to stipulate to that being relevant and become the law of the case, is that the proposed stipulation?

MR. ALDRICH: No. But $I$ can look at what you asked for from Jennifer Piazza.

THE COURT: Gentlemen, we're not going to go into -- and ladies, of course -- we're not going to go
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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
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laser like and focused than just a broad, Hey, Signature Bank, $I$ want all the stuff. Right? Because I don't think that's proper. I really don't. There's privacy issues there. There's issues as to whether it's relevant or not, and that's kind of how $I$ see that.

Now, if we have any other comments you want to make on this specific issue, but $I$ think I'm ready to rule. Anything else?

MR. ALDRICH: No, your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. This is what I'm going to do. As far as the banking records are concerned, two things: First and foremost, regarding defendant's motion to quash subpoenas for deposition and/or documents to Open Bank, $I$ guess we can include Bank of Hope, Signature Bank, and, $I$ guess, there's probably one more at $W e l l s$ Fargo, I'm granting that.

Mr. Aldrich, I want to make sure I'm perfectly clear on this. I'm not saying that potentially that information, you can't seek certain financials. I'm not saying that. I'm just quashing the subpoenas.

If you want to have a specific laser-like request for production of documents as it pertains to specific financials that you feel are important as it relates to your claims for relief, you can do it, sir.
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And if they don't produce it, come in, we deal with it.
You see what I mean?

MR. ALDRICH: I understand, so it's granted today without prejudice. Something in the future if I can --

THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. ALDRICH: -- hone it in.
THE COURT: No impact on a request for production of documents, because I just - I just feel that it would be - it's just opening up pandora's Box. I really and truly do.

Because, yes, you might have a right to - if they're taking a position that, for example, monies are being spent for all these things and you feel, you know what, Judge, they mislead my client, they didn't do that - - I'm just being very general in nature - you have a right to focus in on that.

I think potentially that might be relevant, and even if it wasn't relevant for the purposes of admissibility at trial, it might be relevant for the purposes of discovery. But $I$ think it's better to approach it from that regard.

And that's one of the reasons, too, I don't want unnecessary delay. That's why I put a shortened time period on the responses to the request for
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production of documents, not so this case won't get bogged down; right?

MR. GREER: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: So is there more?
MR. GREER: One more.
MS. HOLBERT: One more.
THE COURT: So we're actually getting something done.

MS. HOLBERT: Yes, we are.
THE COURT: Ms. Holbert, it doesn't always seem that way to me.

MS. HOLBERT: Right. We're making progress. We're doing good today.

THE COURT: Right.
MS. HOLBERT: The last one is for the defendant Sean Flynn.
(Brief pause in proceedings.)
MR. GREER: We're working it out here, your Honor.

THE COURT: I've been very patient. That's what $I$ just told my clerk. I said, Maybe they're working it out.

MS. HOLBERT: Right.
(Brief pause in proceedings.)
MR. GREER: Okay. So, your Honor.
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THE COURT: Yes, sir.
MR. GREER: To the last one with Sean Flynn, we've agreed to a compromise without prejudice to plaintiffis right to bring the motion in its entirety again or as to specific issues raised. But as to sean Flynn, as to Items 3 and 4 , we're going to fully comply.

That has to do with the documents regarding the economic study that he performed for EB5 impact at the regional center, No. 3; No. 4, documents relating to his receipt of the equity in the company in lieu of $\$ 20,000$ payment for doing the economic study in their entirety.

As to 1 and 2, we're going to produce documents to Mr. Aldrich as requested with the names of -- sensitive names of any investors or brokers and identifying information redacted.

And if there any communications which are not being produced for any reason, $I$ will be discussing them with Mr. Aldrich and we will give him the opportunity to seek further intervention from the Court.

MR. ALDRICH: Nevada law [indiscernible] --
THE COURT REPORTER: I didn't get what you said.
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MR. GREER: Nevada law. Anything that's not been provided, we'll provide a log with the general subject matter and identifying information of the date of the parties, and then the reason for the -- not producing them.

THE COURT: So, in essence, that would be akin to a privilege log, is that it?

MR. ALDRICH: Yes, it would be a privilege log.

THE COURT: Which is appropriate. No question.

So has that been resolved for now?
MR. ALDRICH: Yes, it has.
MR. GREER: Now, we have your motion to quash our subpoenas to Morales Construction.

MR. ALDRICH: We're almost there, your Honor.
THE COURT: Is this plaintiff's motion to quash subpoenas of third parties?

MR. ALDRICH: Yes.
So defendants issued three subpoenas or notices of intent to issue three subpoenas to Morales Construction, Top Rank and All American.

The gist of our objection -- I mean, we've kind of laid it out in the motion. But we had a big discussion a few minutes ago about the breadth of my
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requests. I had four to seven requests.
These requests are essentially identical. There's some typo as to some numbering, which is a little bit confusing, but there's around 31 or 32 requests to each of these entities.

And $I$ think the main issue here is that 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 best efforts to get senior debt.

But when we look at these requests -- Ill just kind of walk through. I'm going to walk through the -- it's my Exhibit A to the motion. I'm sorry, Exhibit 1 to the motion. And it's the one to Top Rank.

My understanding is that this construction
line of credit with Morales, $I$ don't have an understanding, and $I$ don't think one has articulated as to why Top Rank and All American are here, are being subpoenaed. But the first request to All American - I'm sorry, Top Rank is the one I'm looking at.

The first request to Top Rank is:
"All documents you used or relied on in entering into the construction line of credit."

I don't believe that's this entity, which
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automatically makes them all nonrelevant.
And then the next one is:
"Any communications that relate or refer to the construction line of credit."

Again not relevant to any of the issues here.
And it goes on. I really -- I mean, I could 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. And they don't serve any need or purpose in the case. And that's the gist of our objection.

These are entities that Front Sight still works with. $W e$ think it's really just to harass them or make Front $S$ ight look bad, or try to make Front Sight look bad.

Some of these are duplicates, too, by the way. Numbers 19 and 20 are duplicative of 7 and 8. Anyway, this goes through like that. But they're just overly broad and not relevant. That's the gist of our objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
MR. GREER: Your Honor, these three entities are each identified as parties to the construction line of credit, so that's where we sent requests out to each of the three.
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The issues that we have with regard to line of credit is, one, is it real? Is it a sham?

Two, what money, what has been done on the property? LVD Fund, Mr. Dziubla have reporting requirements which are coming up from its eB5 investors. They need to know how much work was done on the project.

The breach of the contract of the construction loan agreements, Front sight has not provided that information. So, $I$ mean, granted we had -- we have roughly 30 requests on these. They are each very, very specific and designed to address specific issues that are relevant in this case.

Documents that you used to rely on in entering into the construction line of credit, this goes to whether or not this is a sham agreement or actually a bona fide line of credit. The construction loan agreement required Front Sight to get senior - a senior lender. So we allege that that's not the case, that this is a sham. It's not a senior lender, and that is a breach of the contract. So we need to have evidence to show whether it's a sham or not.

So did Front Sight do an application? Did they give their financial information like they would to a lender? Did they provide any type of security to
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the lender? That's the type of thing that the lenders would rely upon that we have asked here, clearly relevant.

Communications that relate to the -- between Front $S i g h t$ and each of the three companies regarding the construction line of credit is directly relevant to both issues. Documents have been given to you from Front sight relating to the construction line of credit. Obviously directly on point.

We then go into documents asking for monies that have been spent, clearly directly on point. Documents reflecting construction on the project, very relevant and very, very important for the EB5 reporting.

Remember, Front Sight has not given their bank statements on any of their prior productions. They have now missed their most recent required production Of EB5 documentations. They didn't give anything. So now we're trying to figure, okay, where can we go to get that information. Clearly here, the Morales and this group are the companies that allegedly did the work on the project. They got paid for the work on the project. We just need to know what work was done and what they were paid for. And every single one of these questions goes directly to that.
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We asked about construction schedules, construction plans, if they have any. That's something there under the construction loan agreement that $L V D$ Fund has a right to. Any of the books and records of Front Sight that it has reviewed, that's something that the construction loan agreement, we have a right to. Any photographs or video recording of the project to see what has been done, that's something that we have a right to.

There's nothing privileged in here. Everything we've asked is directly related to front Sight's application for this line of credit, the basis for them granting it. And lastly, in the end, their ability to actually service this large a line of credit, the last handful of questions, ask each of these individual companies what portion of that \$36 million line of credit are you responsible for. And then to provide the documentation to show that you are capable of servicing or carrying that portion of that debt. That goes right to whether this is a sham or not.

I'll be very, very careful here to make sure that everything is relevant and carefully tailored. Your Honor, $I$ think we did so. And it's just - and we need these to proceed with the case.
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From what we can gather, this is the only company -- these are the only companies that have done work on the property that have been able to figure out. 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 reported to the immigration service before the end of the year.

Thank you. Good point.
Yeah, these were included in our request for production --

THE COURT: I did see that.
MR. GREER: Okay.
THE COURT: There was a request for production of documents specifically --

MS. HOLBERT: Right.
THE COURT: -- dealing with a lot of these
issues.
MR. GREER: I did attempt an alternative method, yes.

All right. Thank you.
MR. ALDRICH: I haven't received any objection to my responses for request for production. Point that out.

But a couple of things. First of all, Mr. Greer said that Front Sight is required to get
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senior debt. They're not required to get senior debt;
they're required to use best efforts to obtain senior
debt.

And, by the way, Dr. Piazza testified about this when he was here last time, and he talked about the fact that as he was entering into this agreement with Morales, that he was communicating with Mr. Dziubla about it the entire time.

There was -- Mr. Greer just mentioned that Front sight has not given documents, and there is some most recent reporting or something that was due. I don't know what that is. I know that they brought your Honor another thing they filed this morning called notice of further monetary default. It says nothing about not providing information.

I know that we provided -- Front Sight has provided thousands and thousands of pages of documents. And so -- at any rate, this is all-- they're asking for information that they can get elsewhere. Although I will admit, it may be me that it would come from, you know.

MR. GREER: We asked.
MR. ALDRICH: But like $I$ said, $I$ hadn't got any objection to the response that we prepared. So, anyway, that's -- $I$ think I've said my piece. $I$ don't
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have anything else to add.
THE COURT: So you're saying that it's premature, is that it? I'm trying to figure out what your position is, Mr. Aldrich. Because I'm looking at it -- $I$ think this is on page 13 of the subpoena duces tecum. The Top Rank Builders, for example. And Request No. 1 would be:
"All documents that you used or relied upon in entering into a construction loan line of credit."

Is there anything specifically wrong with that?

MR. ALDRICH: (No audible response.)
THE COURT: Because $I$ understand you said -earlier you said, Look, Judge, we're just required to make our best efforts to get one.

MR. ALDRICH: Yeah.
THE COURT: But it's my understanding, you used your best efforts and there was -- your client obtained a line of credit.

MR. ALDRICH: Through Morales.
THE COURT: Right.
MR. ALDRICH: Yeah. And the consent of Mr. Dziubla.

But, your Honor, doesn't that, right,
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automatically - first of all, it's best efforts.
Okay. And then they did it. But the fact that it's
best efforts makes all of it not relevant in the first
place.

MR. GREER: If it's best efforts to get a senior, obtain a senior loan, then they said they got a senior loan, but it becomes real relevant when it's fraud. And it's not a senior loan, it's a sham.

Best efforts don't include getting something and faking like it is a valid senior loan.

MR. ALDRICH: Huh.
MR. GREER: They said they got it. We need to know whether they really did or whether using their best efforts they put together a sham to avoid having to use their best efforts.

MR. ALDRICH: There wasn't a sham. Dr. Piazza has already testified about it. He took the stand last time and talked about it.

MR. GREER: I think he said it was a sham.
MR. ALDRICH: No, he didn't.
THE COURT: Well, ultimately, that might be a factual determination for someone else to make, so I won't call it one way or another, but $I$ do think they have a right, just like we talked about before, if your client is taking the position that they did obtain a--
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was it a $\$ 36$ million line of credit, then okay. That's fine. But what documents support that; right? what happened? How was it obtained?

MR. GREER: And why did they use it if it's real? I mean, that's what caused all the suspicion.

MR. ALDRICH: Dr. Piazza already talked about that. He talked about it when he was here.

MR. GREER: That's - -
THE COURT: But here's the thing. And I'm not saying you're wrong, Mr. Aldrich, but clients can talk about a lot of things, but you need - is there evidence to support their position? And that's really all -- all they're doing is they're just testing his testimony.

And hypothetically, if, for example - and I don't know how this works under the new circumstances. But if he added a line of credit, who issued it? How was it funded? How is there access? And I'm just talking in a very general nature.

For example, it you go to every Bank of America and get a HELOC loan, it gets you a line of credit on the house, there is documents you submit to the bank, and they look at it. They approve it. And they issue a line of credit to you, and -- and you can access that typically at your own discretion; right?
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Based upon the line of credit that was issued.
Now, $I$ don't know how much this differs from that scenario, but that's typically how lines of credit work. You're given a certain sum out there, whether it's \$500 or whether it's \$50 million, depending on your financials that you can access that. And $I$ think that's all they're asking for.

That's from what $I$ can tell; right? So what's wrong with that? That's my ultimate question.

MR. ALDRICH: I understand. Like I said, I've said my piece. $I$ don't have anything to add to what I've already talked about.

THE COURT: Okay.
You get the last word, sir. No, you don't.
It's Mr. Aldrich gets the last word.
Okay. And for the record, there was a request for production that wasn't responded to, so you're saying the subpoena the records directly from --

MS. HOLBERT: Still--
MR. ALDRICH: I know there hasn't been any discussion or anything about my responses. None.

MR. GREER: Your Honor, it's -- if we asked for it and they say, $W e{ }^{\prime} r e$ not going to give it, nothing says, okay, $I$ got to tie this up in court for three months on a motion to compel and what not. You
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know what, we asked them nicely. They said they weren't going to give them, so we go right to the source. We don't know if we can trust them. To be disparaging here. Going to the source is the safer way to go anyway, and so we did try to get it directly. They said no. We decided to go to the source.

MR. ALDRICH: I actually don't remember what $I$ said to that one. I don't know if it was because there was 14 days and $I$ didn't have time to get it. But, again, no one has mentioned anything to me about anything wrong with my responses. But $I$ remind the Court, I did. $I$ wrote a 13 -page single space letter to opposing counsel explaining the problems with their responses. And then repeatedly was told $I$ was going to get supplemental responses, and $I$ didn't get them, so I filed a motion to compel. But $I$ get where we are. I understand --

THE COURT: Well, you filed a motion to quash --

THE COURT REPORTER: I need one at a time.
MR. ALDRICH: No, I filed a motion to compel. That's on the $23 r d$. Related to this -- I'm talking about related to the response.

MR. GREER: Your Honor, I probably missed the call when Mr. Aldrich called me and said, Hey, Keith,
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you know what, you got that motion filed. I'll go and give them to you. Let's work it out here.

I didn't get that. $I$ got an opposition back, so ...

MR. ALDRICH: That is true.
THE COURT: All right. I mean, I do think they have a right to that information at the end of the day. I don't want to side step the processes.

So is there anything else I need to know? I mean --

MR. ALDRICH: I have nothing to add, your Honor.

THE COURT: I mean, am $I$ somehow prejudicing your client by making this determination without going through the process? I just want to make sure I'm not rushing to judgment here. That's all.

There is nothing else, Mr. Aldrich?
MR. GREER: No, Your Honor.
MR. ALDRICH: No, your Honor. I stated our position.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, for the record we're talking about plaintiff's motion to quash subpoenas of third parties; right?

MR. GREER: That's it.
MR. ALDRICH: That's correct.
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MS. HOLBERT: Yes.

THE COURT: This is what I'm going to do regarding the motion to quash, I'm going to deny it.

MR. ALDRICH: No limitation at all on those requests?

THE COURT: I'm asking -- I'm trying to get you to qualify --

MR. GREER: Limited to the dates.
THE COURT: You said no, you're limited.
MR. GREER: I limited each one to the dates, to the subject, to the type.

MR. ALDRICH: Okay.
THE COURT: That's why, Mr. Aldrich, I was wanting to make sure $I$ understood your position, and you said -- $I$ just -- is there something I'm missing? I need to dig in a little deeper.

MR. ALDRICH: I mean - -
THE COURT: That's why $I$ wanted to know --
MR. ALDRICH: I've said my piece. They are completely overbroad. Okay? They're repetitive and everything else, but $I$ can - $I$ can go on and on. I know what the Court is going to do. I can see it. The Court has indicated, and $I$ don't want to waste the Court's time.

THE COURT: Well, it's not necessarily - I
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don't -- whatever time is necessary to make sure the request is proper, $I$ don't think I've rushed you out of
here. I probably should have done so on many occasions, but $I$ haven't, Mr. Aldrich.

MR. ALDRICH: I'm not saying you have, your Honor. Absolutely not.

THE COURT: But if there's a concern with the request, just like we dealt with some of the prior requests, I'm willing to listen. I realize it's late in the day, but I'm not ever going to just rush to judgment. If there's a concern you have, let me know with a little bit of particularity so $\operatorname{c}$ an address it. But $I$ do think they have -- for example, they have a right, just like we talked about before, and your client has a right to test certain aspects of their case, they have a right to test whether or not there's a valid construction loan agreement.

And, for example, $I$ mean, $I$ look at it and they do appear to be unlike, say hypothetically, just bank statements, but, for example, Request No. 1:
"All documents you relied upon in entering into the construction loan" -- I'm sorry, "construction line of credit."

Right? That's pretty specific. That's not asking for anything else, but anything that they were
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given that they relied upon before they issued this "construction line of credit." That is all. Nothing more; nothing less.

Request No. 2:
"All communications between and among you, Front $S i g h t$, that relate or refer to the construction line of credit."

And it just seems to me, all documents - I mean, No. 3 and No. 4, they're all going to one item, and that's the construction line of credit.

Now I'm looking at these. Then it goes to project dates. Right? I'm just kind of going through it a little bit.

Construction points, if any.
MR. ALDRICH: Okay. No. 14. No. 14 asks for:
"Documents relating to or reflecting Front Sight's financial status, including without limitation, financial statements, banking records, tax returns, accounting records."

They already have all that.
MR. GREER: But that would only be to the extent they were in the lender's possession as part of the construction loan agreement, which would show if they had those things, it would tend to prove plaintiffis case that it was a legitimate process. If
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they don't have any of those, it would tend to, I think, support defendant's position that it was not a legitimate process.

THE COURT: Well, for example, No. 14 potentially could be tweaked to reflect No. 15. And what $I$ mean by that is this. No. 14 says:
"All documents referring to, related to, or reflecting Front Sight's financial status,
including without limitations, financial
statements, banking records, tax returns, and accounting rules."

But No. 15 -- and this is a very cursory review by me on the bench. No. 15 says:
"All documents that refer or relate to any of the Front Sight -- Front Sight's books and records you have reviewed."

MR. GREER: Yeah. The reason the two of those are distinct are, One, if they have any documents in their possession relating to that item; but, Two, if they went to front Sight's, you know, offices and they reviewed books, they don't have copies themselves, maybe they just decided to go over and look at the books and records at Front Sight. They wouldn't keep copies, but they would say in their records, Today we reviewed, you know, whatever the progress was on the
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project or reviewed the cash flow statements, whatever, with Mr. Piazza at his offices, or anything like that. That was just things they might not have, but they actually reviewed.

MR. ALDRICH: All right. So Request No. 24, I see where the Court is so I'm going to jump down a couple of those. Request No. 24:
"All documents reflecting communications between or among Top Rank Builders, Inc., Morales Construction Inc, All American Concrete and Masonry, Inc., regarding the project."

Those are third party to third party communications.

No. 25 :
"All documents reflecting contracts between Front Sight and Top Rank Builders, other than relating to the construction line of credit or project."

Now we're outside the construction line.
THE COURT: These are -- Mr. Aldrich, these are the points you needed to bring up to me. I mean, really, they are.

Are there more in here you want me to look at, sir?
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MR. ALDRICH: No. 26 :
"All documents reflecting the business relationship between Top Rank Builders, Morales, and All American."

Again, not relevant. Overbroad.
Communications with the Nye County planning department, No. 27 .

MR. GREER: Your Honor, this is -- these are -- a lot of these are based in part on front sight not giving us any information about the projects. so this was designed -- if there were discussions about any pertinence or any type of research into the project involving communications with Nye County and Front Sight's construction, which is the project, that would be relevant too.

With regard to the communications between these three folks and what their relationship is, they're all three together on -- on the line of credits. They all three have the same president. They're all three the same office address. And so I was trying to figure out how they're related. So that was -- and actually, you know what, each of these - every one of these, excuse me, every one of these has to do with the project.

Communications between you three regarding the

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR
(702)671-4402-CROERT48@GMAIL.COM

Pursuant to NRS 239.053 , illegal to copy without payment.
project. Communications with Front sight regarding the project. Everything in there is related to --it's all limited by the project. It's limited by time, by scope and by subject.

Yeah, that's right. They were the lenders and the ones working on the project. They are the ones doing the work.

MR. ALDRICH: So, your Honor, I reviewed the rest, and $I$ think I've noted everything, but 25 is not related to the project.

MR. GREER: It's not? I thought it was.
MR. ALDRICH: I'm looking at All American. There was some confusion. This one - for the record:
"All documents reflecting contracts between Front Sight and Top Rank Builders, Inc., other than relating to the construction line of credit or the project."

So that's everything not related to the project.

MR. GREER: Again, this was establishing the relationship between the parties and if there was any type of quid pro quo going on on a sham line of credit.

THE COURT: You have a few more minutes, Mr. Aldrich. You can take your time and look at it from, like, 28 on.
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THE COURT: All right. For the record, it's my understanding there were objections to Requests No. 14, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 32. And by my notes, regarding 14 - -

MR. ALDRICH: Your Honor, I'm sorry, I just want to be clear. So $I$ was operating off of the Top Rank --

THE COURT: I think that's --
MR. ALDRICH: - - ones. The numbering is a little bit different because there's some typos. So would this be -- if there are some that the court is going to limit on, you may want to read that into the record so we can make sure we have the right ones.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ALDRICH: Yeah. And there is - - 24 and 25 are -- there is a couple of --

THE COURT: You know what I'm going to do? In light of -- $I$ know -- $I$ understand what the respective positions of the parties are, and $I$ think out of fundamental fairness, I'm not going to rush. If you want to - when you get back to your office over the next day or two, and just file me some sort of document as to the ones you object to, $I$ will at least look at that.

I understand, Mr. Greer, what your position
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is. I get it.
MR. GREER: Yeah. We need it fast because we got reporting --

THE COURT: Fast.
MR. GREER: -- requirements coming. Werre not getting it from there.

THE COURT: I know, but I'm going to give him -- I'm not going to give him a week or two, just within the next 48 hours.

And what I'll do, as soon as I get that, I'll look at it. Because, for example, this is kind of how 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.

But, for example, there's an objection to Request No. 4 , and $I$ think this is under Top Rank. Let me look to make sure. And -- but I'll go through each one. I think it's the first one. Is that - who's the tort. Yeah, it's Top Rank. And there's an objection to No. 24 that's been lodged by Mr. Aldrich. That one, after reviewing it, $I$ don't mind telling you, I'm going to overrule that objection.

But, for example, No. 25, there's an objection. And it's all documents reflecting contracts between Front Sight, Top Rank Builders, and - and relating to the construction agreement. I'm going to
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grant that one because $I$ think that's going a little bit too far. But the gist of most of what you're requesting, $I$ understand why.

But what $I$ want to do is this: I'm going to go back and look at each one with particularity. But I don't want you to be at a disadvantage, Mr. Aldrich, and just - we cram it down. I want to give you a chance to look at it. You can lodge it. And then IIl go through it and read each one. And $I$ just want everybody to understand, for example, $I$ get what you're doing here, Counsel, Ms. Holbert, and Mr. Greer.

You're looking to see, Look. For example, Request No. 1, which $I$ think is clearly appropriate:
"All documents that you used or relied upon in entering into the construction loan line of credit."

It's like the first example $I$ gave is regarding Bank of America in a HELOC. The same thing; right?

MR. GREER: You know, do you know which ones you object to? I don't mind dealing with it if $I$ can stip to it. I'd rather have some clean requests and get this thing rolling.

THE COURT: If you want to stip and narrow, maybe have the items that -- I mean, I'll give you a
(702)671-4402-CROERT48@GMAIL.COM
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few minutes. We'll step down and you can talk.
MR. ALDRICH: Just one second.
MR. GREER: Yeah.

THE COURT: For example, No. 1 is pretty good.
MR. ALDRICH: Okay.
MR. GREER: Understood.
MR. ALDRICH: Your Honor, I'm going to provide the objections.

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. ALDRICH: No later than Friday.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ALDRICH: Today is Wednesday, so no later than Friday. I will try to do it in an easy way that the court can turn that around pretty quickly.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. ALDRICH: Okay.
THE COURT: Okay. I understand. And $I$ think it's important to do that for the record. Because I don't want to rush you out of here, but welll get it done. And if you get me -- I can --

Can you remind me to do this Monday? We're in trial; right?

I'm going to have my court clerk remind me once $I$ get the objections to do a minute order on Monday, just kind of go through them. And this is one
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that's -- that's -- it will be, I think, easier for me to make that quick turnaround than it would on other issues that are more complex.

Sir.

MR. ALDRICH: If I may, I have a suggestion to help with that. If it pleases the court, perhaps we 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 retype. We don't do that very often in state court, but I'd be happy to offer to do that.

MS. HOLBERT: I can do it. I've already got it in Word.

MR. ALDRICH: Yeah.
MS. HOLBERT: SO I can send you the Word of the 30 or however many there are, make sure that there aren't any typos and it's clean. I'll be happy to send it to you first. In fact, IIl send it to you first if you want and then you can make it red line, $I$ object to this. Then he can red line - -

MR. GREER: In fact, why don't we send -- go through -- and there's a couple of numbering issues in there. Let's just clean them all up and send the court a clean copy and him a clean copy, and when we're done
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we'll have a nice --
MS. HOLBERT: Yeah, I'm happy to do that.
THE COURT: But to be candid with you, $I$ want to tell everybody, all $I$ would do is issue a simple minute order --

MS. HOLBERT: Right.
THE COURT: -- where, okay, Request No. 1,
granted.

Request No. 2, denied.
MS. HOLBERT: Perfect.

MR. ALDRICH: Okay.
THE COURT: That's all.

MS. HOLBERT: Right.
MR. GREER: Keep it simple.
MR. ALDRICH: We'll work on a way that makes it make sense, because one of them doesn't have the typos, and we'll get it cleaned up. We will get it submitted to the Court. But $I$ was just offering that in case the Court wanted to do it that way.

THE COURT: No. We'll make it really, really simple.

Mr. Aldrich, $I$ want to make sure you have a chance, sir, to sit back and reflect.

MR. ALDRICH: Um-hum.
THE COURT: Versus on the run.
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MR. ALDRICH: I appreciate that.
MS. HOLBERT: And for the record, your Honor, we, of course, sent these starred with notices of intent to serve. They have not yet been served, so - -

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. HOLBERT: -- they're set for the 17 th , but we will, of course, get a new date. so they have not actually been served. So $I$ don't think we need any interim order to stay or anything.

THE COURT: And - and here's the thing. You can always ask to reconsider issues; right? Im not going to --

But is there anything else I need to know? Because $I$ understand what your position is. It's focusing, Look, what did they rely upon to issue this line of credit; right? That's basically what it is. And $I$ get it.

And if, for whatever reason, after I issue my decision, if there's something there you want to - I'm not saying you're waiving your right to come back again, but ultimately, who knows. When you get all the documents, for example, Request No. 1 might cover everything. Right?

MR. ALDRICH: All right. Anyway, your Honor, we appreciate your time today.
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1

MS. HOLBERT: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. GREER: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: Enjoy your day.
MS. HOLBERT: Thank you.
THE COURT: And remind me.
In fact, as far as the requests are concerned, you're going to be sending me new requests; right? so

I don't have to rely upon these. I just need to go back through them again.

MS. HOLBERT: Correct. Right?
MR. GREER: What?
MS. HOLBERT: You'll actually deliver that to him in a hard copy so that he's got a clean hard copy of what he needs to deal with?

MR. ALDRICH: Yeah. I figure I'd just file a supplement.

MS. HOLBERT: Okay. Right. Right.
(Proceedings were concluded.)
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```
STATE OF NEVADA)
            :SS
COUNTY OF CLARK)
```

                        REPORTERIS CERTIFICATE
    I, PEGGY ISOM, CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER DO
    HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I TOOK DOWN IN STENOTYPE ALL OF THE
PROCEEDINGS HAD IN THE BEFORE-ENTITLED MATTER AT THE
TIME AND PLACE INDICATED, AND THAT THEREAFTER SAID
STENOTYPE NOTES WERE TRANSCRIBED INTO TYPEWRITING AT
AND UNDER MY DIRECTION AND SUPERVISION AND THE
FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT CONSTITUTES A FULL, TRUE AND
ACCURATE RECORD TO THE BEST OF MY ABILITY OF THE
PROCEEDINGS HAD.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I HAVE HEREUNTO SUBSCRIBED
MY NAME IN MY OFFICE IN THE COUNTY OF CLARK, STATE OF
NEVADA.
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FRONT SIGHT MANAGEMENT LLC v.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & 147 / 20148 / 10 \\ & 150 / 2 \quad 150 / 5 \quad 151 / 20 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 81 / 2582 / 1893 / 19 \\ & 108 / 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4:00 o'clock [1] } \\ & \text { 14/19 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ```IN UNISON: [1] 4/7 MR. ALDRICH: [246] MR. GREER: [157]``` | 152/3 152/6 153/22 |  | 2013 [3] 18/24 |  |
|  | /3 |  |  |  |
|  |  | -o0o [4] 31/3 31/4 | 2014[2] 82/5 | 50 million [2] |
|  | [56] 4/12 5/3 6/19 | 7 |  | 50 |
| $4 / 147 / 19$ 8/5 8/13 $8 / 178 / 259 / 29 / 11$ | 7/24 9/1 9/13 9/17 | 1 | 82/5 | 111 |
| $8 / 178 / 25 ~ 9 / 2 ~ 9 / 11 ~$ $9 / 16$ 9/19 10/3 10/7 | 13/16 13/20 15/8 | 10 | 2016 [12] 18 | 520-ish [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 | 54 |
| 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 |
| 16/23 17/1 18/5 | 63/10 64/2 64/12 $70 / 2571 / 871 / 12$ | 100,000 [1] 56/2 | 2017 [2] 25/25 | 579-3900 [1] 2/8 <br> 5th [2] 5/15 8/20 |
| 18/10 18/14 18/18 | 70/25 71/8 71/12 <br> 71/15 71/18 71/24 | 11-13 [4] 13/18 | $\begin{aligned} & 96 / 17 \\ & 2018[1] \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 18/20 24/4 24/9 | $\begin{aligned} & 71 / 1571 / 1871 / 24 \\ & 73 / 19100 / 21101 / 6 \end{aligned}$ | 13/19 13/20 13/21 | $2019 \text { [2] } 1 / 214 / 1$ | 6 |
| $31 / 635 / 1835 / 20$ $35 / 2336 / 2 ~ 36 / 16$ | 73/19 100/21 101/6 $104 / 13$ $125 / 6$ $125 / 9$ | 12 [7] $20 / 20$ 21/13 $26 / 7$ 26/16 108/14 | 2019 [2] 1/21 2020 [1] $64 / 21$ | 6,000 [1] 118/ |
| $35 / 23$ 36/2 36/16 $43 / 2444 / 144 / 24$ | 104/13 125/6 125/9 $125 / 12$ $125 / 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26 / 7 \text { 26/16 108/14 } \\ & 111 / 12117 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | 2020 [1] 206 [1] $2 / 6$ | 600 [4] 116/9 |
| 43/24 44/1 44/24 | 125/23 133/15 | 13 [7] 13/17 13/18 | 227-1975 [1] 3/11 | 117/10 117/14 |
|  | 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 |
| 50/19 50/23 53/3 | 154/2 154/6 154/10 | 13-page [1] | 10/3 10/8 10/13 | 613-6680 [1] 2/19 |
| 53/8 53/13 54/16 | 154/13 155/2 155/6 | 139/12 | 11/10 12/18 12/21 | 65 [9] 17/10 18/1 |
| 54/18 56/5 56/8 | 156/1 156/5 156/11 | 14 [10] 7/22 | 13/11 13/24 15/20 | /22 60/1 61/8 |
| 57/3 57/5 57/9 58/8 | 56/13 156/18 | 117/21 117/25 | 24/25 71/24 72/1 | 62/15 63/ |
| 66/8 67/20 69/6 | COURT | 139/9 143/15 | 72/17 72/19 72/24 | 6677 [1] 2/18 |
| 69/19 72/22 74/21 | CLERK: [2] 14 $15 / 5$ | 143/15 144/4 144/6 | $73 / 773 / 14119$ $139 / 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6677[1] \\ & 6680[1] \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 74/23 75/4 83/15 | THE COU | 149/3 149/4 | $24 \text { [5] } 145 / 5 \text { 145/7 }$ |  |
| 85/21 88/2 89/8 | REPORTER: [7] | 14-day [2] 116/5 | 24 [5] 145/5 145/7 | 7 |
| 89/10 90/4 91/4 | 8/3 74/9 96/24 | 120/15 |  | 7,000 [3] 91/23 |
| 91/7 92/4 92/11 $94 / 2094 / 22$ 96/9 | 118/7 118/16 | $140 \text { [1] 46/19 }$ | $25 \text { [5] } 145 / 15$ | 99/14 99/18 |
| 94/20 94/22 96/9 |  | 14th [1] 8/15 15 [3] $144 / 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25[5] 14 b / 15 \\ & 147 / 9149 / 3149 / 15 \end{aligned}$ | 70 million [1] |
| 96/21 97/9 97/23 $98 / 698 / 2599 / 6$ | THE COURT: [304] |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 147/9 } \\ & 150 / 22 \end{aligned}$ | 20/23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 98 / 698 / 2599 / 6 \\ & 99 / 17100 / 4101 / 18 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 144/12 144/13 } \\ \text { 15th [2] } 5 / 158 / 19 \end{array}$ | 2510 [1] 2/5 | 702 [3] 2/8 3/10 |
|  | \$ | $16 \text { [4] } 17 / 1118 / 2$ | 26 [3] 87/19 146/1 | $3 / 11$ |
| 102/3 102/7 102/23 |  | 58/20 58/23 16.1 [4] 58/20 |  |  |
| $103 / 1103 / 3103 / 9$ $104 / 23104 / 25$ | $55 / 2256 / 1$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \mathbf{1 6 . 1}[4] 58 / 20 \\ 60 / 1761 / 3 \quad 118 / 19 \end{array}$ | $28 \text { [1] } 147 / 25$ | 8 |
| 105/3 105/8 105/10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \$20,000 [1] } \\ & 126 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 160 \text { [1] } 3 / 8 \\ & 1601[113 / 7 \end{aligned}$ | 3 | 10 |
| 108/8 117/9 118/3 | \$36[2] 132/17 | $1601[1] 3 / 7$ $17150[1] 2 / 15$ | 30 [3] 65 | 858 [2] 2/18 2/ |
| 118/11 118/15 | $\begin{aligned} & 137 / 1 \\ & \$ 36 \text { million 「21 } \end{aligned}$ |  | 130/11 153/17 | 89074 [1] 2/7 |
| 118/20 118/24 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17th [1] } 155 / 6 \\ & \mathbf{1 9} \text { [1] } 129 / 17 \end{aligned}$ | 31 [1] 128/4 <br> 32 [3] 128/4 148/2 | 89146 [1] 3/9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 119 / 2119 / 7119 / 24 \\ & 120 / 10120 / 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \$36 million [2] } \\ & 132 / 17137 / 1 \end{aligned}$ | 1975 [1] 3/11 |  | 9 |
| 121/16 125/3 125/5 | \$360,000 [1]$46 / 18$ | 1:00 [1] $4 / 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32[3] \text { 128/4 148/2 } \\ & 149 / 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 90 \text { [1] } 118 / 1 \\ & 92127 \text { [1] } 2 / 17 \\ & 9: 30[1] \quad 14 / 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| 125/18 125/25 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 35 \text { million [1] } \\ & 37 / 13 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 126/2 127/1 127/14 | $\$ 500 \text { [1] } 138 / 5$ | 2 | 3900 [1] 2/8 |  |
| $12$ | \$500,000 [3] | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \mathbf{2 0} \text { [14] } 54 / 20 \\ 54 / 2154 / 2254 / 24 \\ 55 / 155 / 155 / 256 / 4 \\ 56 / 956 / 1056 / 14 \end{array}$ | 3:05 [1] 74/13 |  |
| 136/5 136/12 | 40/15 40/24 46/1 |  | 3:10 [1] 74/14 | :SS [1] 157/2 |
| 136/19 137/4 137/8 |  |  | 4 |  |
| 138/22 139/24 | $\$ 6.3[1] 55 / 14$ |  |  |  |
| 140/18 140/24 | \$6.3 million [1] | 56/18 65/17 129/17 | $55 / 2 \quad 117 / 14$ | A's [1] 75/ |
| 141/8 141/10 | $55 / 14$ | 2011 [1] 23/1 2012 [8] 31/18 | $48 \text { [1] } 150 / 9$ | [ [3] |
| 143/21 144/17 |  | $2012 \text { [8] 31/18 }$ | $4: 00 \text { [3] } 14 / 20$ | 5 113/22 |
| 146/8 147/11 |  | 37/22 41/11 77/1 | $15 / 218 / 8$ | ability [7] 33/21 |
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| A | 107/19 107/2 | 67 | 96/15 97/2 113/11 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ab | 107/25 112/11 | adjust [1] 103/5 | 126/5 129/5 139/10 | al [1] 13/23 |
|  | 112/12 112/24 | administratively | 146/5 147/20 | ALDRICH [51] 3/5 |
| 132/14 157/11 | 113/10 |  | 155/21 156/10 | 3/6 4/11 4/19 10/6 |
| able [9] 21/20 |  | missibility [ | against [4] 11/ | 11/16 15/24 22/1 |
| 36/20 65/12 67/16 | 40/17 | 82/9 124/ | 11/14 11/17 105/18 | 30/1 31/7 32/7 |
| 84/2 84/22 95/19 | accounting [11] | admissible [3] | agent [4] 75/24 | 38/13 46/17 48/25 |
| 121/16 133/3 | 40/16 79/20 79/20 | 23/16 69/16 82/ | 76/21 90/24 112/2 | 53/15 57/18 58/1 |
| about [87] 9/24 | 94/17 105/23 106/1 | admit [2] 112/19 | agents [5] 31/15 | 67/9 68/1 70/22 |
| 10/6 10/22 13/7 | 109/15 110/19 | 134/20 | 77/24 78/6 89/1 | 72/5 78/11 79/4 |
| 17/21 18/1 21/11 | 110/23 143/19 | admitted [5] 69/ | 93/24 | 79/5 85/21 86/21 |
| 24/19 24/24 26/7 | 144/11 | 69/22 80/11 91/18 | aggressive [2] | 90/1 95/25 97/3 |
| 27/6 28/3 31/11 | accounts [6] | 110/6 | 11/25 97/16 | 98/16 102/5 108/19 |
| 33/6 34/13 38/12 | 111/22 112/25 | admittedly [2] | ago [9] 19/24 | 114/15 120/3 |
| 39/14 40/13 40/22 | 114/7 114/21 122/6 | 81/23 112/14 | 29/21 29/22 51/9 | 21/19 123/18 |
| 43/18 45/4 51/8 | 122/22 | advance [4] 5/7 | 83/22 96/18 118/1 | 26/15 126/20 |
| 51/11 51/13 55/15 | ACCURATE [1] | 6/3 6/11 6/24 | 118/2 127/25 | 35/4 137/10 |
| 59/14 63/2 64/8 | 157/11 | advanced [2] 6/8 | agree [15] 11/22 | 38/15 139/25 |
| 65/18 66/20 67/23 | achieved [2] 21/12 | 63/18 | 35/18 36/14 38/25 | 40/17 141/13 |
| 69/17 69/20 70/1 | 32/2 | advantage [4] | 39/3 39/7 49/23 | 42/4 145/21 |
| 73/13 74/13 77/22 | across [1] | 26/25 56/18 78/19 | 54/10 59/20 62/21 | 47/24 148/21 |
| 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 | 120/2 |
| 94/12 94/18 95/18 | actions [3] 62/8 | 47 | 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] | legation [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 11 | 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 | 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 | 49/5 51/14 51/20 | 106/12 107/1 107/8 | 30/17 31/19 31/19 | 6/6 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 | affect [1] 33/18 | 37/1 37/7 37/10 | 122/17 122/18 |
| 136/18 136/24 | 125/7 130/16 | affecting [1] 77/3 | 37/18 37/22 38/2 | allege [2] 130/19 |
| 137/6 137/7 13 | 132/14 139/7 145/4 | affirmative [3] | 38/5 38/9 39/7 | 148/12 |
| 138/12 138/21 | 146/22 155/8 | 42/8 42/13 104/25 | 39/20 39/24 40/7 | alleged [4] 15/15 |
| 139/10 139/23 | 156/13 | afforded [1] | 41/7 41/20 42/17 | 21/10 25/21 69/9 |
| 140/22 142/14 | add [8] 18/22 | 105/16 | 43/22 44/6 44/ | allegedly [2] 26/1 |
| 146/10 146/11 | 49/21 92/16 107/14 | after [22] 6/10 | 44/19 45/8 45/17 | 131/21 |
| absolutely [11] | 135/1 138/11 | 7/21 10/24 16/ | 47/2 48/11 48/ | alleging |
| 25/7 35/20 35/20 | 140/11 148/25 | 16/12 25/22 31/10 | 48/17 49/25 50/1 | alleviating [1] |
| 36/15 40/4 92/10 | added [2] 47/21 | 31/18 32/5 32/10 | 50/8 50/13 50/25 | 33/7 |
| 94/18 111/19 117/5 | 137/17 | 35/23 45/13 46/14 | 51/1 52/8 52/20 | allow [4] 20/9 |
| 122/10 142/6 | addition [1] | 57/23 63/15 71/10 | 52/22 53/6 53/2 | 22/20 80/5 95/4 |
| abuse [1] 52/2 | additional [4] | 103/24 106/15 | 54/4 54/6 68/6 | allowed [2] 22/20 |
| accelerate [1] | 26/15 60/18 72/20 | 111/11 120/22 | 130/16 130/18 | 80/14 |
| 70/20 | 105/25 | 150/20 155/18 | 132/3 132/6 134/6 | allowing [1] 47/21 |
| accept [3] 25/25 | address [11] 4/18 | afternoon [6] 4/6 | 142/17 143/23 | allows [2] 37/6 |
| 31/9 84/3 | 80/2 | $10 \text { 4/12 14/1! }$ | 150/25 | 84/18 |
| access [5] 93/11 | $\begin{aligned} & 85 / 685 / 796 / 6 \\ & 104 / 6130 / 17 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { agreements [6] } \\ & 18 / 2525 / 525 / 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { almost [3] } 47 \\ 96 / 17127 / 16 \end{gathered}\right.$ |
| 100/1 137/18 | $142 / 12 \text { 146/20 }$ | $32 / 13 \text { 33/4 33/6 }$ | $39 / 1340 / 25$ |  |
| 137/25 138/6 <br> accommodat | addressed [6] | 67/8 70/9 72/16 | ahead [4] 4/8 | $105 / 24$ |
| 1] | 55/16 81/21 83/12 | 77/2 77/9 77/9 | 13/24 54/17 55/2 | already [29] 5/19 |
|  | 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 |
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| A | 23 | 138/21 139/10 | 33/13 33/13 35/16 | argue [1] 81/17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| already... [22] | 43/24 46/1 58/14 | 13 |  | 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 |  |
| 50/14 61/21 68/1 | 92/3 | 145/2 148/4 148/24 | 39/25 40/2 40/2 | argument [10] |
| 78/19 82/7 97/12 | answered [1] 67/9 | 155/9 155/13 | 40/6 41/3 41/13 | 18/20 33/6 46/24 |
| 105/24 106/3 108/6 | answers [1] | anyway [11] 16/6 | 43/18 45/2 45/3 | 49/11 55/14 81/13 |
| 110/6 112/6 112/20 | 116/13 | 16/7 24/23 48/2 | 45/10 46/22 47/9 | 82/2 83/12 86/8 |
| 113/19 119/22 | ante [1] 102/13 | 50/15 82/9 87/21 | 48/21 50/11 50/17 | 93/18 |
| 136/17 137/6 | anticipate [1] 72/ | 129/17 134/25 | 52/1 54/12 54/12 | arguments [2] |
| 138/12 143/20 | anticipated [2] | 139/5 155/24 | 56/21 57/15 57/1 | 85/15 93/17 |
| 153/13 |  | anywhere [3] | 58/13 59/1 59/5 | 11] $6 / 5$ |
| also [27] 4/15 5/2 | any [80] 7/18 | 80/12 91/19 94/5 | 59/8 61/18 61/23 | 6/12 14/21 50/25 |
| 8/22 23/20 25/23 | 11/17 12/8 12/13 | apparently [1] | 63/25 64/20 66/2 | 51/2 51/3 54/23 |
| 26/6 27/1 27/11 | 15/15 28/7 33/10 | 83/4 | 69/9 69/13 69/21 | 78/3 98/18 128/4 |
| 32/21 39/23 55/14 | 35/10 37/24 47/13 | appear [3] 38/15 | 70/3 71/1 73/2 75/3 | 152/14 |
| 66/9 71/5 80/13 | 55/3 60/16 61/12 | 48/14 142/19 | 75/16 75/18 78/7 | 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] 52/2 | 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 |
|  | 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 | 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] 2 | 89/11 89/20 112/18 | approve [1] | 145/13 145/21 | 104/19 105/14 |
| 46/22 | anymore [1] 23/17 | 137/23 | 145/22 145/23 | 105/15 106/22 |
| analogous [1] | anyone [2] 11/23 | April [1] 66/6 | 145/24 146/9 146/9 | 106/25 107/7 |
| a $115 / 9$ | 99/25 | arbitration [6] | 147/6 148/13 | 108/16 109/9 111/6 |
| analysis [2] | anything [36] 13/5 | 50/20 51/2 51/5 | 148/19 148/22 | 111/17 111/17 |
| 114/22 | 42/20 44/13 45/16 | 51/6 51/10 51/12 | 149/11 149/16 | 111/18 112/7 113/4 |
| Angeles [1] 14/ | 49/20 62/17 68/18 | are [153] 6/17 | 149/19 153/3 | 114/16 116/1 117/7 |
| animal [3] 109/11 | 78/24 79/17 79/17 | 9/11 11/8 11/9 | 153/17 156/7 | 120/8 121/12 123/4 |
| 114/11 114/20 | 92/16 94/8 94/17 | 15/14 15/25 18/17 | aren't [9] 25/4 | 123/12 123/12 |
| another [14] 29/23 | 106/2 106/5 109/7 | 19/8 19/24 20/2 | 36/9 36/25 68/24 | 123/23 123/24 |
| 34/20 34/25 54/24 | 117/11 117/13 | 20/5 21/5 21/10 | 82/4 86/22 108/20 | 126/5 126/5 126/6 |
| 64/5 67/23 72/15 | 117/19 123/9 127/1 | 25/2 25/5 26/20 | 109/24 153/18 | 126/14 126/15 |
| 86/24 88/10 99/8 | 131/18 135/1 | 27/1 27/2 28/7 | arguably [2] 75/13 | 128/3 128/18 |
| 101/23 109/4 | 135/11 138/11 | 28/17 29/9 32/7 | 76/11 | 129/23 134/6 |
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| A | 39/6 39/16 41/6 | 83 | 10 | 14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| as... [6] 143/22 | 42/6 42/24 43/4 | authorizations [2] | base [1] 90/20 | 22/ |
| 149/23 150/10 | 43/6 43/19 43/21 | 115/7 115/7 | based [11] 23/22 | 123/2 124/9 124/12 |
| 150/10 156/7 156/7 | 44/5 46/24 47/6 | automatically [2] | 28/18 42/25 45/6 | 135/4 135/14 139/8 |
| aside [1] 55/23 | 48/1 48/8 49/13 | 129/1 136/1 | 56/24 92/7 115/5 | 149/10 150/2 |
| ask [16] 15/19 | 51/6 52/6 53/25 | availability [2] | 117/2 138/1 146/9 | 150/11 151/1 |
| 24/1 29/17 75/20 | 55/12 57/16 59/3 | 71/16 102/18 | 148/7 | 152/18 154/16 |
| 87/22 89/19 99/15 | 62/14 63/3 63/12 | available [2] 42/14 | basic [1] 148/19 | 155/14 |
| 102/17 103/9 | 65/10 66/5 66/10 | 78/8 | basically [1] | become [3] 63/8 |
| 112/25 115/14 |  |  |  |  |
| 115/14 117/4 | 77/10 77/18 79/3 | 99/8 136/14 | 79/23 132/12 | [3] 5/2 |
| $122 / 25132 / 15$ $155 / 11$ | 80/19 81/14 82/11 | Awada [1] 30/ | bat [1] 80/6 | 7/9 11/25 13/14 |
| asked [15] 24/16 | 83/5 84/11 87/22 | away [7] 20/25 | battles [2] 64/25 | 22/16 24/24 25/16 |
| 24/21 28/20 109/1 | 88/22 88/24 89/11 | 27/16 39/25 64/22 | 64/25 | 29/10 29/12 34/8 |
| 112/23 116/3 | 89/20 93/4 93/25 | 87/12 94/15 94/16 | be [186] | 38/16 52/6 60/22 |
| 117/16 117/19 | 1 96/24 96/25 | B | because [134] | 68/6 70/10 71/21 |
| 121/23 131/2 132/1 | 25 100/3 |  | 25 5/24 6/17 | 72/11 75/9 |
| 132/11 134/22 | 100/18 |  | 10/4 10/10 10/15 | 79/16 81/13 85/13 |
| 138/22 139/1 | 101/15 102/1 102 |  | 11/18 12/7 13/2 | 105/18 105/24 |
| asking [16] 5/13 | 102/13 102/20 | 23/1 30/10 35/3 | 13/14 14/25 15/10 | 106/3 113/3 113/5 |
| 15/16 24/24 25/2 | 105/22 106/3 111/7 | 47/8 54/23 55/1 | 15/13 16/15 19/6 | 119/16 125/20 |
| 40/14 65/3 80/17 | 118/7 118/8 118/16 | 55/4 55/14 56/10 | 21/10 25/4 25/16 | 127/2 127/12 130/3 |
| 106/9 112/10 | 118/17 119/8 | 56/15 57/6 74/13 | 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 | 28/21 29/10 29/12 | 133/3 133/5 138/20 |
| 131/10 | 122/21 123/17 | 91/23 100/12 | 29/18 29/21 31/8 | 148/22 150/19 |
| 138/7 141/ | 124/20 126/9 | 100/12 101/14 | 31/8 31/18 32/14 | 155/4 155/8 |
| asks [5] 76/17 | 128/12 128/21 | 106/18 122/7 140/3 | 32/23 33/12 34/8 | before [28] 1/18 |
| 88/17 89/19 | 129/8 129/9 134/18 | 149/21 151/5 | 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 |
|  | 137/25 139/20 | 156/10 | 38/4 38/13 39/4 | 29/9 29/16 29/16 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { aspec } \\ 39 / 4 \end{gathered}$ | 140/7 141/4 142/18 | bad [2] 129/14 | 40/14 40/24 41/2 | 30/19 35/15 39/12 |
|  | 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 |
|  | 145/24 147/12 | balls [1] 73/3 | 47/21 47/25 50/7 | 90/15 95/6 103/8 |
|  | 147/24 148/5 | bank [38] 37/14 | 50/17 50/23 51/18 | 05/17 133/6 |
| asserted [1] 28/15 | 148/23 149/23 | 40/14 40/22 105/4 | 51/22 55/2 57/22 | 36/24 142/14 |
| assets [2] 114/5 | 149/23 150/11 | 105/5 105/5 105/5 | 58/9 59/12 59/23 | 143/1 157/6 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { assets } \\ 114 / 6 \end{gathered}$ | 150/12 150/13 | 105/21 105/23 | 63/25 64/7 66/22 | BEFORE-ENT |
| associated [ | 151/5 151/6 151/8 | 106/5 107/6 107/1 | 67/9 67/25 68/16 | ] 157 |
| 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 | 70/14 70/16 71/18 | egin [1] 60/13 |
| 2/13 | 118/ | 108/12 108/22 | 74/7 76/16 77/18 | ginning [2] |
| associati | attachments [2] | 111/3 111/18 112/ | 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 | ehalf [5] 4/11 |
| assume [1] 92/8 | attempt [1] 133/18 | 114/7 120/9 121/3 | 81/24 83/1 84/12 | 4/13 4/14 67/16 |
| assumed [1] 25/19 | attempting [2] | 121/8 122/6 122/2 | 84/23 85/22 85/25 | 71/2 |
|  | 95/25 97/13 | 123/2 123/15 | 87/12 93/17 93/20 | behold [1] 56/1 |
| $72 / 2484 / 11$ | attended [1] 96/11 | 123/15 123/16 | 93/21 95/1 97/25 | being [18] 19/3 |
|  | attorney [3] 77/4 | 131/15 137/20 | 98/13 99/6 101/10 | 26/8 33/1 34/2 |
|  | 87/17 89/16 | 137/23 142/20 | 102/9 102/15 104/8 | 35/17 78/23 87/3 |
| 14/11 15/1 | 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 |
|  | 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] 105/8 105/8 105/9 105/11 | 119/2 119/24 | 98/1 |
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| B | 149/10 151/2 | br | 134/13 139/25 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| believe [11] 5/4 | blanche [1] 98/22 | 76/14 76/16 77/5 | came [10] 26/1 | 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 | 9/25 84/18 86/6 |
| 128/25 | board [1] 15/22 | 81/23 82/8 | 116/3 | 88/3 94/4 113/18 |
| bench [3] 34/7 | bogged [1] 125/2 | broken [1] 74/24 | CAMPO [1] 2/ | 4/17 115/10 |
| 42/22 144/13 | bona [1] 130/17 | broker [6] 92/20 | can [125] 5/22 6/4 | 115/13 122/5 |
| benefit [2] 47/21 | bonuses [2] 46/1 | 92/23 94/23 94/ | 6/5 11/22 12/20 | 3/20 |
| 56/16 | 121/5 | 94/25 95/8 | 13/1 13/25 14/2 | ndid [1] 15 |
| best [13] 6/23 | books [5] 122/9 | broker's [1] 95/11 | 14/2 17/24 20/5 | cannot [3] 11/ |
| 102/4 128/11 134/2 | 132/4 144/15 | brokers [23] 31/15 | 22/24 23/5 24/2 | 83/20 120/13 |
| 135/16 135/19 | 144/21 144/23 | 77/24 78/2 78/4 | 28/3 35/13 36/10 | capable [1] 132/1 |
| 136/1 136/3 136/5 | borrow [1] 54/19 | 78/20 86/10 86/11 | 36/14 38/25 39/13 | pital [30] 19/3 |
| 136/9 136/14 | borrower [2] | 86/16 87/8 88/15 | 39/15 40/18 47/3 | 25/11 31/13 32/9 |
| 136/15 157/11 | 19/16 21/16 | 90/7 90/8 90/9 | 48/5 49/1 50/19 | 32/19 32/24 33/14 |
| better [4] 14/17 | both [9] 17/8 18/9 | 90/19 92/14 92/18 | 52/23 53/3 54/21 | 45/20 46/5 46/10 |
| 67/7 119/9 124/21 | 19/8 22/1 35/21 | 92/19 93/3 93/19 | 54/21 55/22 55/23 | 47/3 47/9 47/12 |
| between [27] | 35/25 119/24 131/7 | 95/10 97/24 98/8 | 55/25 56/4 56/9 | 49/5 75/8 76/1 |
| 20/15 21/9 48/12 | 148/19 | 126/16 | 56/16 57/23 60/12 | 76/23 76/23 76/24 |
| 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/ | 95/3 95/10 96/23 |  |
| 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] 26/1 | 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] | /23 | 100/3 102/1 102 | carrying |
| 20/16 25/1 27/10 | 19/18 148/12 | burdensome [3] | 102/8 102/12 | 132/19 |
| 30/11 30/16 30/22 | breaches [1] 19/ | 81/14 81/20 93/8 | 102/12 102/14 | arte [1] 98/22 |
| 32/14 35/23 40/8 | breadth [2] 102/9 | business [17] 8/1 | 102/15 102/16 | Carter [9] 75/2 |
| 40/20 41/17 43/20 | 127/25 | 20/8 62/2 62/6 62/6 | 102/16 102/20 | 75/19 80/7 82/11 |
| 44/2 44/3 44/16 | break [4] 74/9 | 63/5 63/11 86/15 | 102/22 103/4 103/5 | 85/3 96/10 103/2 |
| 47/17 48/1 49/15 | 74/11 74/12 74/15 | 88/11 90/9 90/9 | 105/8 105/9 108/21 | 103/3 104/2 |
| 51/24 52/16 52/25 | bridge [4] 23/2 | 106/22 114/2 114/7 | 112/6 113/4 115/18 | case [92] $1 / 12 / 3$ |
| 53/3 | 23/3 23/6 23/7 | 114/9 122/12 146/2 | 117/4 120/16 | 9/23 10/20 11/18 |
| bifurcated [6] | brief [9] 18/16 | but [218] | 121/22 122/25 | 11/20 12/8 12/16 |
| 30/16 37/17 38/1 | 23/23 27/5 30/15 | C | 123/15 123/25 | 15/22 17/4 18/23 |
| 47/18 49/15 52/7 | 83/12 99/19 125/17 |  | 124/5 131/19 133/1 | 19/4 20/3 20/10 |
| bifurcates [1] | 125/24 148/1 |  | 134/19 137/10 | 20/15 22/14 23/9 |
| 46/23 | briefed [3] 34/ | /21 | 137/24 138/6 138/8 | 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 |
| 44/2 | 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 | /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 | 152/14 152/20 | 44/3 46/24 47/3 |
| 46/7 119/2 127/24 | 37/12 37/12 37/13 | California [2] | 152/21 153/8 | 47/8 51/4 51/7 |
| biggest [1] 68/24 | 43/4 87/16 93/25 | 51/19 51/21 | 153/13 153/16 | $51 / 1951 / 21$ |
| birthday [1] 88/18 | 99/24 102/12 | call [10] 9/2 | 153/20 153/21 | 51/25 56/25 57/16 |
| bit [12] 32/6 63/13 | 118/25 126/4 | 14/23 16/5 24/19 |  | /2 59/15 59/19 |
| 64/23 65/1 66/9 | 145/22 | 56/12 72/7 97/10 | can't [31] 5/6 | 60/10 61/4 61/13 |
| 81/23 107/18 12 | bringing [1] 4/24 | 102/17 136/23 | 11/16 11/23 12/3 | 61/21 62/2 62/6 |
| $142 / 12143 / 13$ | brings [1] 22/14 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 139 / 25 \\ \text { called [3] } 24 / 19 \end{array}$ | 12/8 12/13 27/21 | 62/7 62/16 67/6 |
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| C | 157/4 | clause [6] 50 | CO | comply [2] 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| case... [33] 67/25 | CERTIFY [1] 157/5 | 50/21 50/24 50/25 | $\text { [1] } 63 / 15$ | $126 / 7$ |
| 71/3 72/9 79/16 | $\mathbf{c e}$ |  | co | $\begin{aligned} & \text { component [1] } \\ & 39 / 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| 92/7 92/16 93/13 | chair [1] 96/16 | $\begin{gathered} \text { clause } \\ 51 / 10 \end{gathered}$ | comments [3 | compromise |
| 112/13 113/7 114/1 | challenge [1] $8 / 19$ | clean [6] 151/2 | 23/22 123/7 148/8 | 126/3 |
| 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 | 12 |
| 115/4 116/22 | change [6] 55/21 | 156/14 | communicating | compu |
| 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 |  |  | C |
| 125/1 129/10 | changed [2] 7/7 | 30/13 43/17 44/20 | 89/15 89/19 92/20 | 51/ |
| 130/13 130/19 | 31/ | 107/14 123/19 |  | concern [13] |
| 132/25 142/16 | charge [1] 110 | 107/14 123/19 | [26] 75/23 76/18 | 10/19 17/21 6 |
| 143/25 154/19 | chart [1] 98 | 149/6 | 76/19 77/8 80/ | /8 |
| cases [14] 12/10 | check [8] 13/25 | clearly [8] 56/ | 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 | concerned [5] 9/7 |
| 52/11 58/13 71/3 | checked [1] 13/17 | 151/13 | 143/5 145/8 145/14 | 61/19 98/11 123/12 |
| 114/24 | checks [2] 31/20 | clerk [3] | 146/6 146/13 | 156/7 |
| cash [1] 145/1 |  | client [18] | $146 / 16 \text { 146/25 }$ $147 / 1148 / 3$ | $13$ |
| categories [1] | chooses [1] 27/ | $24 / 140 / 1440 / 2$ | companies [4] | $15 / 15$ |
|  | chose [1] 22/25 | 77/4 84/2 84/4 | 131/5 131/21 | concise [1] 18/2 |
| 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/ |
| 70/7 | circumvent [1] | 117/1 124/15 | 76/1 81/1 81/5 | conclusion [1] |
| cause [3] 27/7 | 12/3 | 135/19 136/25 | 82/14 82/15 88/6 | 35/11 |
| 87/5 119/11 | citation [2] | 140/14 142/15 | 14 89/20 89/2 | Concrete [ |
| caused [3] 93/5 | 116/21 | client's [2] 53/2 | 90/23 93/6 126/11 | 145/1 |
| 137/5 148/11 | cite [1] |  |  | urrently |
| causes [4] 26/20 | cited [3] 30/1 <br> 30/14 114/24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { clients [2] } 113 / 14 \\ & 137 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { company's [1] } \\ 88 / 10 \end{array}$ | $67 / 5$ <br> conditions [3] |
| 26/21 36/24 67/12 | $\text { civil [2] } 26 / 2227 / 3$ | close [2] 65/5 | $\text { compel [10] } 9 / 14$ | $48 / 1652 / 352 / 21$ |
| $\text { CCR [2] } 1 / 24$ | CLA [1] 40/7 | close [2] 65/5 $88 / 16$ | $70 / 16107 / 3109 / 2$ | conduct [2] 11/25 |
| $1!$ | claim [9] 27/6 | combining [1] | 115/20 119/13 | 34/14 |
|  | 28/24 35/12 35/25 | 65/21 | 119/17 138/25 | conducting [1] |
| $76 / 576 / 2582 / 17$ | 38/23 41/19 52/21 | come [27] 14/22 | 139/16 139/21 | 122/4 |
| $82 / 2593 / 11 \quad 106 / 11$ | 67/12 122/24 | 16/6 16/7 20/24 | compelling [1] | confer [1] 98/18 |
|  | claims [34] 27/12 | 20/24 34/13 56/12 | 22/1 | conference [12] |
| cents [1] 66/8 | 27/15 28/7 28/12 | 56/13 72/11 72/14 | complain [2] 25/14 | 17/11 18/2 58/21 |
| CEO [21 25/9 | 28/17 29/9 30/16 | 74/13 79/18 86/18 | 108/4 | 59/2 59/11 59/13 |
| $110 / 14$ | 30/22 35/16 36/5 | 88/16 91/23 95/6 | complaint [6] | 59/19 60/11 61/4 |
| $14$ | 36/12 36/18 36/22 | 98/19 99/10 100/12 | 28/10 28/16 36/6 | 61/13 61/21 71/3 |
| 84/19 96 | 36/22 36/25 37/4 | 102/1 102/21 | 36/18 117/12 | conferred [1] |
| 84/19 96/1 | 37/24 41/15 43/18 | 109/24 110/1 117/7 | 120/20 | 78/11 |
| $114 / 17 \text { 123/20 }$ | 50/10 50/11 50/17 | 124/1 134/20 | complete [1] 22/7 | confident [1] |
| 138/4 142/15 | 53/4 53/7 53/19 | 155/20 | completely [2] | 47/1 |
| certainly [14] | 53/22 57/1 57/15 | comes [11] 12/ | 107/1 141/20 | confidential [1] |
| 28/11 28/17 55/13 | 60/18 62/19 80/15 | 30/13 37/7 52/11 | completion [2] | 92/25 |
| 72/15 80/11 82/4 | 108/14 116/25 | 52/21 56/1 64/19 | 22/5 106/16 | confirm [1] 88/8 |
| 82/5 83/25 100/7 | 123/25 | 65/8 96/1 101/13 | complex [5] 12/9 | confirming [2] |
| 113/11 113/20 | clarify [1] 49/4 | 114/17 | 52/12 54/13 62/7 | 19/24 75/14 |
| 120/15 121/11 | CLARK [3] 1/7 | coming [8] 31/12 |  | t [1] 8/1 |
| CERTIFICATE [1] | 157/3 157/14 | 32/24 33/6 72/13 | compliance [2] | confusing [2] |
| $157 / 1$ | class [2] 51/14 | 118/23 130/5 | 68/7 70/7 | 118/14 128/4 |
| CERTIFIED [1] | 95 | 148/14 150/5 | complied [1] 79/15 | confusion [3] |
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| C | 78 | 11 | co | $10$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| confusion... [3] |  |  |  |  |
| 49/10 103/24 | contemplate [1] | correct [23] 18/12 | 8/24 9/20 9/20 | [1] $49 / 14$ |
|  | 34/11 | 24/14 27/23 28/23 | 10/19 13/4 13/6 | cram [1] 151/7 |
| consider [2] 20/19 | contention [3] | 30/8 57/11 58/2 | 14/18 15/11 15/11 | crawling [1] 88/10 |
| 87/20 | 23/17 46/7 120/19 | 60/3 61/6 61/9 | 15/13 15/21 16/23 | create [1] 23/3 |
| consistency [1] | context [1] 86/4 | 61/10 65/15 71/19 | 17/24 20/18 23/16 | created [2] 22/1 |
|  | 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 |
|  | continued [8] 3/1 | 109/17 109/22 | 29/1 29/22 29/23 | credit [33] 22 |
| consolidated | 17/14 25/20 25/25 | 140/25 156/11 | 29/24 30/12 30/15 | 23/6 128/17 128/24 |
|  | 31/9 71/5 83/6 94/9 | corrected [2] 24/9 | 30/21 30/24 33/16 | 129/4 129/24 130/2 |
| consolidat | 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 | continuing | [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 |
| CONSTITUTE | continuous | could [20] 11/2 | 52/2 59/13 59/15 | 137/1 137/17 |
| 157/10 | 30/20 31/8 | 23/11 26/4 26/17 | 61/24 62/2 62/6 | 137/22 137/24 |
| construct | contract [19] | 28/11 44/20 87/4 | 62/6 63/4 63/5 | 138/1 138/3 142/23 |
| 18/25 19/7 19/15 | 26/23 27/13 33/5 | 88/11 93/7 98/15 | 63/12 63/17 64/24 | 143/2 143/7 143/10 |
| 19/19 20/3 20/5 | 33/25 36/17 36/21 | 99/1 99/13 99/14 | 65/2 65/16 66/10 | 145/18 147/17 |
| 20/10 22/2 22/3 | 41/15 42/7 43/8 | 100/13 100/15 | 66/11 66/18 67/16 | 147/22 148/18 |
| 22/12 23/4 25/18 | 44/10 51/13 62/18 | 102/22 117/10 | 67/20 67/22 71/16 | 148/18 151/16 |
| 27/21 29/4 33/12 | 68/5 84/18 114/12 | 129/6 144/5 153/7 | 77/24 78/16 79/11 | 155/16 |
| 33/24 35/14 36/7 | 122/18 130/8 | couldn't [3] 8/16 | 79/16 79/19 79/2 | credits [1] 146/19 |
| 36/9 37/1 37/10 | 130/21 148/12 | 56/12 56/17 | 80/4 80/8 82/6 | urrent [6] 41 |
| 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 | [2] 31/21 45/12 |
| 45/7 47/1 47/22 | contractua <br> 19/6 27/3 |  |  | D |
| 48/11 48/13 48/16 | control [9] 32/15 | counter [4] 17/12 |  | damage [1] 93/ |
| $49 / 2550 / 150 / 13$ $52 / 853 / 653 / 20$ | $46 / 1246 / 1547 / 11$ | 60/19 60/20 71/2 | 114/2 115/1 115/8 | damages [3] 52/1 |
| 52/8 53/6 53/20 54/3 54/6 68/6 | 69/9 75/23 77/13 | counter-defendant | 115/23 116/2 116/4 | 55/15 69/9 |
| 54/3 54/6 68/6 127/15 127/22 | 80/18 82/21 | s [4] 17/12 60/19 | 117/21 122/12 | damaging [2] |
| $8 / 8 \text { 128/16 }$ | controlled [1] | 60/20 71/2 | 126/22 129/7 129/8 | 78/19 93/13 |
| $128 / 24129 / 4$ | 95/19 | counterclaims [3] | 138/24 139/12 | dangerous [1] |
| 129/23 130/8 | controlling [1] | 27/2 41/15 59/12 | 141/22 141/23 | 69/19 |
| 130/15 130/17 | 76/19 | counterdefendants | 145/6 149/11 | date |
| 131/6 131/8 131/12 | convenient [1] | [1] 58/21 | 152/14 152/23 | 6/21 9/23 13/15 |
| 132/1 132/2 132/3 | 73/1 | countries [2] 87/2 | 153/6 153/8 153/11 | 22/5 22/25 22/25 |
| 132/6 135/9 14 | Conversely [2] | 87/4 | 153/24 154/18 | 71/5 71/15 108/2 |
| 142/22 142/23 | 19/10 47/4 | country [1] 87/1 | 154/19 | 127/3 155/7 |
| 143/2 143/7 143/10 | conversion [ | COUNTY [5] 1/7 | Court's [6] 65/19 | DATED [1] 1/2 |
| 143/14 143/23 | 26/22 27/3 | 146/6 146/13 157/3 | 71/16 84/5 141/24 | dates [13] 59/20 |
| 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 | 6/2 71/1 73/21 |
| 151/15 | 102/15 | 80/9 83/8 102/16 | 18/9 | 141/8 141/10 |
| consumer [2] | copies [3] 1 | 133/24 145/7 | courtroom [2] | 143/12 |
| 51/13 52/22 | 144/21 144/2 |  | 9/22 95/18 | $82 / 1185 / 3$ |
| contact [4] 77/23 | $153 / 25 \text { 153/25 }$ | $40 / 2442 / 242 / 3$ | $51 / 17$ | David [1] 75/2 |
| 78/21 90/19 97/19 | $156 / 14156 / 14$ | $42 / 464 / 770 / 4$ | covenant [2] 26/24 | day [18] 9/10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { contacting [1] } \\ & 97 / 20 \end{aligned}$ | corner [1] 54/23 | 70/20 121/25 155/3 | 122/19 | 14/11 14/18 14/25 |
| contacts [2] 78/6 | corporate [1] | 155/7 | cover [3] 104/3 | $\begin{aligned} & 16 / 1752 / 754 / 13 \\ & 70 / 1672 / 1682 / 1 \end{aligned}$ |


| D | 19 | designed | 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 |
| $94 / 1116 / 5 \text { 120/ }$ | 97/15 134/14 | desire [2] 10/20 | 96/3 | 120/11 120/12 |
| 140/8 142/10 | defendant [7] 1/13 | 61/24 | difference [1] 36/2 | 122/5 124/2 |
| 149/22 156/4 | 2/2 109/3 114/21 | destroyed [2] | different [30] 19/1 | discretion [6] |
| 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 | 125/1 | determination | 21/25 27/9 28/4 | 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 | 107/19 109/11 | discussing [2] |
| deadline [1] 116/6 | 19/4 25/2 26/8 29/6 | determined [1] | 114/11 114/14 | 105/15 126/19 |
| deadlines [1] 59/1 | 29/12 30/14 39/17 | 53/9 | 114/20 114/22 | discussion [13] |
| deal [8] $5 / 2247 / 3$ | 59/11 60/19 60/20 | determines [1] | 115/3 122/15 | 8/10 9/18 16/20 |
| 69/11 78/4 81/18 | 65/10 69/8 71/2 | 46/25 | 122/16 122/20 | 17/10 17/20 17/25 |
| 105/13 124/1 | 79/18 91/5 93/13 | detrimental [1] | 149/10 | 43/11 56/24 58/22 |
| 156/15 | 107/7 109/6 110/13 | 78/9 | differs [1] 138/ | 66/1 127/25 128/8 |
| dealing [8] 18/ | 114/25 127/20 | develo | difficult [2] 40/3 | 138/21 |
| 26/24 43/5 43/7 | defense [2] 51/20 | 75/11 90/20 | 112/15 | discussions [3] |
| 105/4 122/19 | 67/17 | DEVELOPMEN | dig [2] 54/1 141/16 | 34/18 88/19 146/11 |
| 133/16 151/21 | defenses [4] 42/8 | [20] 1/12 19/2 | dilatory [1] 11/24 | disingenuous [ |
| dealt [7] 38/8 51/9 | 42/13 51/17 114/17 | 19/17 19/23 25/11 | dire [1] 34/15 | 31/11 32/21 |
| 92/14 92/15 95/14 | defer [1] 16/8 | 25/19 31/9 31/21 | directed [1] 87/23 | disparaging [1] |
| 115/4 142/8 | deficient [1] | 32/16 32/18 39/19 | DIRECTION [1] | 139/4 |
| debt [8] 4/22 | 109/16 | 76/2 76/25 81/8 | 157 | disparate [1] |
| 128/9 128/10 | definitely [1] | 82/18 93/9 106/1 | directly [13] |  |
| 128/11 132/20 | 73/14 | 107/24 110/14 | 11 78/2 78/3 | dispute [4] 24/ |
| 134/1 134/1 134/3 | defrauded [1] 50 | 112/23 | 78/20 105/20 131/6 | 24/15 45/16 84/15 |
| decide [8] $4 / 18$ | degree [1] 50/16 | dialogue [1] 49/1 | 131/9 131/11 | distinct [5] 21/25 |
| 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 [ | 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 | 47/12 65/16 66/9 | disagree [8] 34/23 | distinguish [1] |
| 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 | 11 | distractions [ |
| 28/25 40/8 44/9 | 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] | 118/6 118/18 121/8 | disagrees [1] 48/5 | 1/19 115/1 |
| 40/12 42/24 42/25 | 120/12 | 121/9 130/23 | disclose [1] 90/10 | dividing [1] 21/8 |
| 44/11 44/12 45/3 | denied [4] 53/17 | 130/23 130/25 | disclosed [ |  |
| 47/5 47/7 47/7 | 104/7 104/18 154/9 | 131/21 132/24 | 86/11 95/6 | DOCKET [1] |
| 52/19 64/1 66/13 | deny [4] 52/16 | 133/11 133/18 | disclosure [1] | doctrine [1] 33/ |
| 66/19 67/22 15 | 80/5 88/9 141/3 | 136/2 136/13 | 64/21 | document [3] |
| decisions [3] | department [2] | $136 / 25137 / 4139 / 5$ $139 / 2155 / 15$ | disclosures [3] | 116/18 149/22 |
| 44/17 47/16 49/2 | 52/13 146/7 depending [2] | 139/12 155/15 didn't [17] 24/6 | $\begin{aligned} & 72 / 12118 / 10 \\ & 118 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | 153/7 <br> documentation |
| declaration [2] | depending [2] $107 / 19138 / 5$ | $51 / 1855 / 1367 / 24$ | discover [1] | 86/12 105/25 |
|  | deposition [7] | 79/20 85/7 91/18 | discoverability [1] | 132/18 |
| declarations | 62/24 85/12 88/23 | 110/6 117/19 | 82/8 | documenta |
|  | 100/23 100/25 | 119/21 124/15 | discoverable [5] | [1] 131/1 |
| deed [2] 4/2 | 101/7 123/14 | 126/24 131/18 | 86/3 92/2 94/21 | documents [74] |
|  | depositions [2] | 136/20 139/9 | 112/8 113/22 | 40/16 40/18 70/1 |
|  | 69/23 100/22 | 139/15 140/3 | discovery [16] | 75/23 76/18 77/7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ppe } \\ & 1 / 1 \end{aligned}$ | 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 |


| D | 11/16 13/5 14/3 | 15 | 105/15 120/1 128/5 | 136/9 136/14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| documents... [62] | 14/16 14/22 15/10 | double [1] 13/17 | 129/7 129/23 | /15 |
| documents... [62] | 16/17 22/17 22/20 | double-checked | 129/24 130/11 | eight [2] 51/874/3 |
| 88/6 88/13 88/24 | 24/20 24/22 25/14 | [1] 13/17 | 131/5 132/15 | Eighth [1] 114/25 |
| 89/10 91/24 94/15 | 28/9 28/16 33/9 | doubt [1] 50/22 | 141/10 146/22 | either [7] 20/16 |
| 94/16 98/7 99/22 | 34/5 34/8 34/24 | down [16] 5/12 | 150/16 151/5 151/9 | 28/17 36/17 42/23 |
| 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 | 134/19 |
| 124/9 125/1 126/8 | 64/12 64/15 66/20 | 26/6 26/9 79/13 | 22/4 22/12 22 | email [7] 20/20 |
| 126/10 126/15 | 66/24 68/17 69/17 | 79/15 108/16 | 23/4 23/10 23/17 | 26/7 26/16 37/11 |
| 128/23 130/14 | 69/20 69/21 69/22 | 108/16 111/10 | 25/10 25/10 25/21 | 108/15 111/12 |
| 131/7 131/10 | 70/11 72/7 81/16 | 134/4 136/16 137/6 | 31/13 31/16 32/24 | 119/3 |
| 131/12 133/14 | 83/22 83/23 86/18 | draft [1] 87/24 | 33/12 39/19 40/16 | emails [5] 24/18 |
| 134/10 134/17 | 86/21 90/13 90/18 | dragged [1] 20/6 | 46/18 47/22 49/5 | 118/13 118/21 |
| 135/8 137/2 137/ | 90/18 91/17 91/19 | dropped [1] 116/9 | 49/8 68/12 75/8 | 119/20 119/25 |
| 142/21 143/8 | 92/7 92/14 93/18 | duces [1] 135/5 | 75/11 75/15 76/3 | employee [5] |
| 143/16 144/7 | 93/20 94/8 94/8 | due [11] 7/21 8/2 | 76/24 76/24 77/14 | 75/24 76/20 80/19 |
| 144/14 144/18 | 95/22 96/18 97/18 | 8/6 8/15 12/3 49/7 | 77/15 80/14 82/16 | 89/1 90/24 |
| 145/8 145/16 146/2 | 97/18 99/13 99/21 | 59/8 68/24 70/11 | 82/16 82/22 82/24 | Empyrean [20] |
| 147/14 150/23 | 101/4 107/13 110/1 | 134/11 148/14 | 84/13 86/15 86/17 | 75/2 75/5 75/20 |
| 151/14 155/22 | 110/4 111/16 | duplicates [1] | 86/20 86/22 89/5 | 75/25 76/3 76/7 |
| does [23] 13/6 | 111/24 115/17 | 129/16 | 89/13 90/2 90/15 | 76/21 80/7 80/20 |
| 18/4 29/1 30/24 | 116/9 120/4 120/10 | duplicative [4] | 90/20 91/14 92/13 | 82/12 85/3 88/24 |
| 33/17 38/15 39/25 | 120/14 122/20 | 27/8 47/7 47/16 | 93/10 93/10 93/22 | 89/2 89/5 89/11 |
| 47/1 47/4 51/2 54/3 | 122/22 123/3 123/3 | 129/17 | 94/15 96/3 105/22 | 89/13 91/22 92/18 |
| 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 | 142/2 144/1 144/21 | 80/11 80/20 82/12 | EB5 IC [1] 110/15 | 133/6 140/7 |
| 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 | 43/14 91/8 |
| 99/18 107/10 | 151/6 151/21 | 93/9 94/6 94/11 | 22/22 23/8 | ability [2] |
| 110/24 112/18 | 152/19 153/11 | 95/9 96/15 106/10 | 22/22 23/8 | 51/5 51/10 |
| 120/2 125/10 | 153/22 155/8 156 | 108/10 108/15 | economy [1] 23/8 | gement |
| 135/25 154/16 | done [33] 8/20 | 110/6 110/14 | effect [1] 65/6 | 18/24 19/4 19/11 |
| doing [12] 32/20 | 22/6 22/7 22/7 | 110/15 110/17 | efficiency [4] 12/6 | 9/11 23/1 38/11 |
| 47/21 60/4 64/13 | 23/12 39/22 42/25 | 111/6 111/12 | 14/4 62/16 63/22 | 39/23 81/2 |
| 67/14 71/13 125/13 | 47/17 52/12 57/24 | 112/15 113/8 130/4 | efficient [2] 43/2 | joy [1] 156/4 |
| 126/12 137/13 | 62/15 64/10 64/14 | 134/8 135/24 | 74 | enough [8] 22/16 |
| 147/7 151/11 153/9 | 66/4 66/14 68/25 | Dziubla's [7] 76/9 | efficiently [2] | 5/13 47/19 66/12 |
| dollars [4] 26/1 | $\begin{aligned} & 71 / 1871 / 1971 / 20 \\ & 73 / 1279 / 17105 / 1 \end{aligned}$ | $81 / 182 / 1488 / 5$ <br> 88/13 89/24 90/8 | $\begin{aligned} & 46 / 1147 / 16 \\ & \text { efforts [12] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68/22 71/11 81/17 } \\ & 101 / 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| 93/22 113/18 117/1 | 73/12 79/17 105/1 | 88/13 89/24 90/8 |  |  |
| don't [139] 5/1 | $130 / 3130 / 6131 / 23$ | E | 135/16 135/1 | 153/9 |
| 5/14 6/2 6/4 6/6 6/9 6/9 8/11 9/24 9/24 | 132/8 133/2 142/3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { each [18] 19/1 } \\ & 20 / 2575 / 1991 / 1 \end{aligned}$ | 136/1 136/3 136/5 | entered [3] 37/21 |
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| E | 58 | exactly [6] 27 | ex | Ft |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| entered... [2] | 70/13 76/16 81/6 | 48/20 96/22 | 50 | 18/24 64/16 |
| 105/18 107/4 | 83/3 87/9 90/13 | 102/19 120/24 | 61/ | February 2013 [1] |
| entering [8] 50/8 | $\begin{aligned} & 90 / 1698 / 4100 \\ & 102 / 7102 / 161 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { exte } \\ 39 / 2 \end{array}$ |  |
| 104/14 128/24 | $13 / 16 \quad 113 / 18$ | 38/12 114/24 120/7 | extensive [1] | FEDOR [1] $2 / 3$ |
| 130/14 134/6 135/9 | $\begin{aligned} & 13 / 16113 / 18 \\ & 16 / 19124 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | 48/7 114/24 120/7 $124 / 13135 / 6$ | extensive [1] $34 / 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FEDOR [1] } 2 / 3 \\ & \text { fee [1] } 21 / 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| $142 / 21151 / 15$ <br> entire [1] 134/8 | eventually [2] | 137/15 137/20 | extent [6] 53/8 | feel [6] 46/12 |
| entirely [1] 85/7 | 20/11 47/18 | 142/13 142/18 | 53/9 78/25 92/11 | 52/18 109/15 |
| entirety [2] 126/4 | ever [4] 12/8 86/2 | 142/20 144/4 | 93/7 143/22 | 123/24 124/9 |
| 126/13 | 86/11 142/10 | 150/11 150/14 | extinguish [2] | 24/14 |
| entities [10] 25/10 | every [15] | 150/22 151/10 | 3/ | ] |
| 89/12 106/7 106/12 | 32/6 54/13 69/3 | 151/12 151/17 | extraneous [1] | few [7] 12 |
| 109/3 111/21 | 69/7 90/24 94/9 | 152/4 155/22 | 66/21 | 19/23 26/10 40 |
| 122/16 128/5 | 7/6 109/8 112/ | except [7] 25 | eyes [1] 100/4 | 127/25 147/23 |
| 129/12 129/22 | $131 / 24137 / 20$ $146 / 23146 / 23$ | 79/12 79/25 | F | 152/1 <br> fide [1] 1 |
| entitled [4] $82 / 5$ $85 / 585 / 16157 / 6$ | 150/12 | exception [1] | facially [1] 12 | fight [3] 28/3 |
| 85/5 85/16 157/6 | everybody [9] |  | fact [17] 6/10 | 64/25 122/ |
| [5] 25/22 | 37/11 52/14 62 | exclude [1] | 11/25 22/21 28/22 | fighting [1] 122/13 |
|  | 67/21 67/21 106/25 | excluding [2] | 31/25 42/19 76/16 | figure [8] $12 / 5$ |
|  | 121/12 151/10 | 88/14 90/12 | 92/20 94/23 95/4 | 33/9 84/25 131/19 |
| envelope [3] $101 / 14101 / 18$ | 154/4 | excuse [2] 120/21 | 98/1 117/1 134/6 | 133/3 135/3 146/2 |
| $101 / 21$ | everybo | 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 |
| able [9] | everyone [2] | 75/18 88/22 128/14 | facts [4] 26/18 | 7/10 7/12 23/14 |
|  | 54/14 73/1 | 128/15 | 35/4 42/15 101/11 | 60/25 71/1 91/3 |
| $36$ | everything [19] | Exhibit 1 [2] 20/19 | factual [2] 109/19 | 149/22 156/16 |
| $43 / 1043 / 18$ | 8/24 10/5 13/4 15/7 | 128/15 | 136/22 | filed [23] $5 / 25 / 3$ |
| equity [1] | 57/17 66/18 73/11 | Exhibit A [2] 88/22 | failing [1] 19/ | 5/10 7/9 7/17 13/1 |
| 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 | Exhibit A's [1] | 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 | 74/5 79/21 84/15 |
| 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 | existence [1] | 37/19 122/19 | 1 134/13 |
| 42/20 | everywhere [1] | 90/17 | faking [1] 136/10 | 139/16 139/18 |
| ESQ [3] 2/4 2 | 119/10 | expect [2] | fall [1] 73 | 1 140/1 |
| 3/6 | evidence [27] | 120/4 | falls [1] 78/2 | files [1] 5/10 |
| essence [3] 20/3 | 22/16 23/7 23/15 | expectations [2] | far [9] 13/22 61/18 | filing [1] 22/18 |
| $22 / 4127 / 6$ | 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 | final [2] 47/23 |
| 27/8 128/2 | $40$ | 115/ | 156/7 | 52/19 |
| establish [1] 31/16 | $47 / 666 / 136$ | experience [9] $75 / 1175 / 1587$ | 105/21 106/3 107/7 | $10 / 8110 / 10$ |
| establishing [1] | 67/2 67/11 69/22 | 90/2 90/18 92/12 | 112/14 112/17 | 110/1 |
| 147/20 | 84/10 86/11 92/2 | 109/21 109/25 | 113/16 113/21 | financial [12] |
| estoppel [1] 42/9 | 109/25 130/22 | 110/7 | 123/17 | 68/15 68/21 105/16 |
| et [3] 13/23 19/14 | 137/12 | expert [6] | FARMER [1] $2 / 3$ | 105/17 106/9 107/2 |
| I [1] | evidentiary [13] | 68/12 68/15 68/21 | FARMERCASE.COM | 107/12 130/24 |
|  | 64/3 64/6 64/9 | 69/14 70/19 | [1] 2/9 | 143/17 143/18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { et cetera [2] 19/14 } \\ & 78 / 8 \end{aligned}$ | 64/14 65/11 65/21 | experts [9] 59/8 | fascinating [2] | 144/8 144/9 |
| Evans [2] 22/22 | 66/11 66/17 71/6 | 64/20 65/7 68/2 | 29/18 43/16 | Financial's [1] |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Evans } \\ \text { 23/8 } \end{gathered}$ | 72/21 73/22 92/22 | 68/24 69/23 70/3 | fashion [2] 74/2 | 107/23 |
| even [32] | 110/ | 72/6 73/12 | 96/19 | nancials [4] |
| 11/24 13/4 21/10 | ex [2] 4/19 6/9 | explain [1] 35/5 | fast [2] 150/2 | 109/12 123/20 |
| 22/9 31/10 34/23 | ex parte [1] 4/19 | explained [1] 26/9 | 150 | 23/24 138/6 |
| 35/2 35/6 36/11 | exact [3] 41/2 |  | ter | financing [1] |
| 38/7 40/6 46/16 | /20 112/11 | 49/5 139/13 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { favor [1] } 67 / 14 \\ \text { Fax [2] } 2 / 193 / 11 \end{array}$ | 15/ |
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| F | following [1] 8/16 | $12$ | 31/9 31/21 32/10 | 56/4 56/9 57/14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ] 13 | follows [1] 63/14 | fraudulent [2] | 32/16 32/19 32/22 | 4/17 65/6 |
| 99/15 108/21 114/9 | force [1] 115/6 | 19/12 26/15 | 32/23 39/19 46/20 | 65/7 66/4 66/16 |
| 148/9 | foreclosure [2] | fraudulently [1] | 67/17 76/2 76/25 | 67/13 69/18 69/22 |
| finder [1] 28/22 | 20/12 27/4 | 37/9 | 77/25 78/4 78/5 | 69/24 70/19 71/6 |
| finds [1] 28/2 | FOREGOING [1] | Friday [9] 7/17 | 78/9 81/8 82/18 | 72/10 72/25 73/11 |
| fine [11] $7 / 15$ | 157/10 | 9/19 9/25 10/9 14/1 | 86/14 86/19 86/19 | 73/24 74/23 77/21 |
| 14/20 14/21 61/ | foremost [1] | 14/9 18/8 152/10 | 93/9 97/14 106/15 | 79/6 79/20 79/24 |
| 65/9 66/1 71/9 | 123/13 | 152/13 | 106/19 106/22 | 83/21 83/23 84/24 |
| 73/10 101/25 | forget [1] 14/8 | friend [4] 54/19 | 107/24 110/14 | 86/6 86/13 95/3 |
| 103/19 137/2 | formal [1] 68/25 | 54/24 55/21 56/7 | 112/23 121/18 | 95/10 97/4 97/23 |
| finish [2] 64/7 71/ | forms [1] 114/17 | front [91] $1 / 9$ | 130/4 132/4 | 98/13 98/17 98/18 |
| FIRM [1] 3/5 | forth [5] 22/15 | 15/15 19/18 19/18 | Fund's [1] 77/23 | 98/23 99/15 100/12 |
| first [36] $4 / 22$ | 23/20 48/16 52/22 | 19/23 20/14 20/21 | fundamental [2] | 100/15 101/16 |
| 10/24 23/24 27/13 | 89/3 | 21/7 21/16 21/22 | 22/21 149/20 | 102/1 104/21 109/4 |
| 28/1 30/14 30/23 | fortunate [1] 9/22 | 21/22 22/15 22/22 | funded [2] 47/22 | 109/18 112/18 |
| 35/25 37/4 38/8 | forums [1] 79/21 | 22/24 23/16 23/25 | 137/18 | 113/6 113/20 |
| 40/5 43/6 44/3 | forward [18] | 25/21 26/1 29/22 | funding [2] 90/2 | 117/10 117/14 |
| 44/12 44/17 44/22 | 11/12 20/10 21/5 | 29/23 31/12 31/23 | 93/22 | 117/16 117/19 |
| 50/8 64/13 74/7 | 21/8 21/9 21/17 | 31/24 32/11 32/15 | fundraising [4] | 119/8 121/16 125/1 |
| 79/2 80/3 81/2 9 | 37/7 41/1 41/3 | 32/17 32/20 32/22 | 31/16 77/14 80/14 | 126/24 128/11 |
| 104/1 | 65/11 66/15 67/9 | 33/1 33/1 33/7 | 82/23 | 130/18 131/20 |
| 111/18 | 77/1 82/5 86/18 | 43/11 46/7 46/10 | funds [8] 19/13 | 133/25 134/1 |
| 128/20 | 109/24 110/1 117/2 | 46/15 46/19 47/11 | 19/14 21/18 55/8 | 134/19 135/16 |
| 133/24 136 | found [1] 65/18 | 47/13 50/12 50/18 | 89/6 89/13 106/16 | 136/5 137/21 |
| 150/17 151/17 | foundation [1] | 69/7 75/1 75/7 | 106/17 | 138/14 139/5 139/9 |
| 153/19 153/19 | 83/15 | 77/13 77/15 77/20 | further [4] 15/20 | 139/15 139/15 |
| fishing [1] 115/ | founder [1] 110/1 | 78/1 82/22 82/23 | 106/5 126/21 | 139/16 140/3 141/6 |
|  | four [5] 71/22 | 84/16 90/10 90/16 | 134/14 | 149/21 150/1 |
| $\text { five [5] } 5 / 167 / 2$ | 71/23 93/25 105/10 | 91/4 93/11 93/18 | future [2] 7/15 | 150/10 151/10 |
| $8 / 164 / 2293 / 25$ | 128/1 | 95/23 98/12 105/24 | 124/4 | 151/23 152/19 |
| fix [1] $97 / 2$ | frame [3] 82/1 |  | G | 52/20 152/24 |
| fixed [1] 118/15 | 82/19 91/9 |  |  | 54/17 154/17 |
| Fleming [9] 26/11 | frankly [1] 129/9 | 121/18 129/12 | gather | 55/7 155/17 |
| 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 |
|  | 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 $40 / 540 / 9416$ | 145/17 146/9 | gentleman [1] | 151/2 |
| focus [6] 34/25 | 40/5 40/9 41/6 | 146/13 147/ |  | ve [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 | 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 45/17 46/24 | full [4] 29/18 53/23 | 121/24 | 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 [2] 34/16 | 49/14 49/24 50/10 | fully [3] 34/9 38/16 | 6/20 7/21 9/22 | 05/6 126/20 |
| focusing | 50/11 50/18 50/23 | 126/6 | 11/11 11/11 12/3 | 130/24 131/18 |
| $109 / 11155 / 15$ | 51/1 52/7 52 | functions | 12/20 14/18 15/7 | 138/23 139/2 140/2 |
| FOIA [1] 83/21 | 53/4 53/7 53/18 | 76/10 | 21/3 21/20 22/11 | 150/7 150/8 151/7 |
| folks [2] 90/16 | 53/22 54/2 54/2 | FUND [42] $1 / 12$ | 22/24 23/6 23/11 | 151/25 |
| 146/17 | 57/1 67/11 80/15 | 15/16 19/2 19/17 | 24/2 32/19 32/20 | given [17] 31/13 |
| follow [3] 34/22 | 92/8 108/13 114/13 | 19/23 21/15 21/18 | 41/18 47/16 47/23 | 31/20 32/8 32/9 |
| 104/22 113/15 | 116/25 122/17 | 21/19 25/12 25/19 | 50/25 51/2 51/3 <br> 52/5 55/25 56/2 | 32/10 32/12 33/1 |
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| G | $34$ | $46$ | 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 | H | 22/15 23/21 26/21 |
| 46/10 67/20 106/14 | 37/13 37/15 37/20 | 65/6 65/11 66/3 | H | 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 |  | 84/24 110/13 $110 / 16110 / 20$ | $12 / 1412 / 15$ $26 / 10$ $29 / 23$ $32 / 25$ | $48 / 15$ 50/13 55/3 $61 / 2466 / 1067 / 20$ |
| giving [3] 78/8 | 52/15 52/16 53/16 <br> 53/18 55/1 56/13 | $110 / 16110 / 20$ $111 / 14112 / 19$ | 26/10 29/23 32/15 $32 / 17$ 32/19 43/4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61/24 66/10 67/20 } \\ & \text { 67/21 71/21 72/9 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 98/22 146/10 $\text { go [76] } 4 / 81$ | 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 | 122/15 127/24 | 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/ | 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 | 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 |
| $\text { goes [23] } 24 / 23$ | 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 | 6/11 31/21 34/13 |
| 57/6 60/15 63/21 | 149/20 150/7 150/8 | group [5] 46/5 | 48/20 84/7 84/12 | 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] | 39/18 39/22 39/22 |
| 132/20 143/11 | gone [4] 12/10 | guess [24] 7/11 | 69/5 94/7 | 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 | 54/25 56/8 63/6 |
| 10/4 10/4 11/9 | 4/10 4/12 14/5 | 50/16 60/24 60/25 | 110/23 153/12 | 63/8 69/15 75/14 |
| 14/17 16/4 16/6 | 14/13 17/1 23/19 | 67/8 68/5 68/20 | 153/18 154/2 | 75/15 76/10 76/10 |
| 16/7 16/23 17/4 | 25/2 25/3 26/24 | 69/21 70/18 74/18 | harass [1] 129/13 | 78/16 78/20 79/13 |
| 20/22 20/23 20/24 | 28/8 37/19 50/4 | 79/9 83/8 100/25 | hard [4] 64/8 | 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 | 84/4 88/7 88/9 |
| 21/18 25/14 27/7 | got [50] 11/13 | guide [1] 16/3 | Hardesty [1] 63/6 | /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 | 90/19 92/11 92/12 |
| 32/1 32/3 33/10 | 23/21 40/16 40/17 | guy [1] 56/17 | has [70] 5/2 5/3 10/9 10/10 10/19 | 92/13 92/14 92/15 |
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| H | 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 $12 / 20 \quad 13 / 8 \quad 15 / 14$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { his [32] } 23 / 1355 / 3 \\ 55 / 456 / 1863 / 7 \end{array}$ | 120/21 123/10 | I |
| 94/15 94/24 95/15 | 16/4 16/7 16/17 |  |  | I'd [9] 6/25 7/16 |
| 95/17 96/2 96/15 | $16 / 416 / 716 / 17$ $18 / 2022 / 222 / 23$ | 67/11 67/12 67/14 $67 / 15$ 69/14 75/7 | $125 / 25127 / 16$ $129 / 20129 / 22$ | 15/18 29/17 73/24 |
| $96 / 16 ~ 97 / 17 ~ 97 / 17 ~$ $98 / 13$ 98/14 108/12 | 23/6 25/5 25/16 | 75/10 78/15 78/18 | 132/24 134/13 | 105/12 151/22 |
|  | 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 | hope [4] 93/1 | 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 | $\text { 28] } 4 / 245 / 9$ |
| 67/14 78/16 78/17 |  | HOLBERT [8] 2/8 | hopeful [1] 113/20 hopefully [3] | 10/21 12/5 13/5 |
| 78/18 78/19 88/25 | 95/1 95/8 98/11 | 100/20 103/7 | 12/20 20/10 111/9 | 14/6 14/21 16/7 |
| 92/8 94/11 94/13 | 99/7 99/12 100/1 | 125/10 151/11 | horse [1] 49/12 | 18/17 23/21 25/13 |
| $94 / 22$ 95/18 96/16 $97 / 13$ 97/16 112/16 | 100/12 102/1 | hold [3] 24/4 59/23 | hot [1] 17/2 | 28/6 30/6 34/2 |
| 97/13 97/16 112/16 <br> 117/18 118/4 | 102/12 102/21 | 101/25 | hours [1] 150/9 | 34/10 35/19 38/19 |
| 18 118/4 | 108/9 108/17 | holds [1] 107/6 | house [1] 137/22 | 40/13 41/11 41/22 |
|  | 108/17 110/9 | holiday [3] 8/5 8/7 | how [55] 6/17 10/6 | 42/9 43/19 45/14 |
|  | 110/12 113/4 | 8/12 | 10/15 11/18 17/21 | 45/22 45/23 47/18 |
| $16$ | 114/12 115/8 | home [1] | 26/3 27/11 28/3 | 49/12 49/19 52/15 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 10 / \\ & 35 /: \end{aligned}$ | 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 | Honor [104] 4/7 | 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 | 55/3 58/13 64/15 | 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 |
| 45/6 50/18 62/20 | 139/4 140/2 140/16 | 15/9 16/21 18/14 | 72/5 90/13 90/16 | 71/19 73/13 75/3 |
| 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 |
| 15/20 17/15 24/16 | 152/19 | 28/14 29/20 31/6 | 99/4 99/21 100/19 | 88/24 90/1 91/4 |
| 63/16 63/19 64/4 | here's [16] 8/17 | 35/18 36/4 36/17 | 108/11 111/6 | 93/16 94/13 96/12 |
| 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 | 97/3 97/8 97/22 |
| 65/11 65/21 66/11 | 44/24 44/25 48/3 | 44/1 44/4 44/10 | 137/3 137/16 | 99/23 101/12 108/8 |
| 71/6 72/8 72/21 | 51/22 55/5 55/5 | 44/10 44/11 44/11 | 137/17 137/18 | 110/19 113/4 113/5 |
| 73/22 116/3 | 93/14 95/24 117/24 | 44/13 44/16 44/18 | 138/2 138/3 146/21 | 113/20 114/22 |
| hearings [1] | 137/9 155/10 | 45/18 46/23 47/4 | 148/8 150/11 | 116/5 122/2 122/3 |
| hears [2] 44/10 | HEREBY [1] 157 | 47/5 47/25 48/1 | however [4] 27/9 | 123/8 123/11 |
| $44 / 10$ | HEREUNTO [1] | 54/18 55/11 66/17 | 52/4 75/15 153/17 | 123/17 123/18 |
| hearsay [4] 22/ | 157/13 | 66/23 67/3 69/12 | huge [1] $82 / 3$ | 123/19 123/20 |
| 22/20 22/20 69/13 | Hey [5] 20/22 | 70/25 73/19 74/21 | Huh [1] 136/11 | 123/21 124/16 |
| d [3] | 98/17 117/24 123/1 | 74/23 75/5 79/4 | hum [2] 43/13 | 128/13 128/14 |
| /20 | 139/25 | 79/5 79/8 87/15 | 154/24 | 128/21 128/21 |
| ELOC [2] | hide [1] 94/7 | 89/14 90/4 90/5 | hundred [1] 56/18 | 135/3 135/4 137/9 |
| $151 / 18$ | highlight [1] 23/23 | 90/23 91/10 92/15 | hurt [1] 112/18 | 137/18 139/22 |
| help [5] 16/3 49/9 | highly [1] 66/16 | 93/14 93/15 94/4 | Hyatt [10] 75/8 | 140/15 141/2 141/3 |
|  | him [12] 11/14 | 94/14 94/20 95/7 | 76/3 80/10 81/10 | 141/6 141/6 141/15 |
| helps [1] 78/13 | 68/16 94/12 94/14 | 97/9 98/19 102/21 | 81/24 83/4 89/4 | 142/5 142/9 142/10 |
| HENDERSON [1 | 95/14 95/14 95/14 | 105/7 105/10 | 91/14 93/23 96/3 | 142/22 143/11 |
| $2 / 7$ | 126/20 150/8 150/8 | 105/14 106/8 107/9 | hypothetically [2] | $\begin{aligned} & 143 / 12145 / 6 \\ & 147 / 12149 / 5 \end{aligned}$ |
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| I | 82/16 82/16 82/2 | 26/15 27/12 27/15 | instance [2] 29/24 | 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] $7 / 812 / 8$ | 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] 19/2 | 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 | in [342] | 85/5 86/13 87/16 | 106/22 121/4 | 77/18 78/15 86/23 |
| 39/19 40/16 110/16 | inappropriate [2] | 87/17 88/14 90/11 | 121/10 | 87/14 88/9 92/11 |
| 112/12 | 107/1 120/25 | 90/19 93/12 95/1 | interesting [7] | 92/23 92/23 |
| IC [1] 110/15 | Inc[5] 80/25 1 | 95/12 96/12 97/4 | 29/14 29/15 51/22 | 94/24 98/9 |
| identical [1] | 145/10 145/11 | 105/16 105/17 | 67/19 79/18 81/15 | involvement [2] |
| identified [3] | 147/15 | 106/9 107/2 107/2 | 93/15 | 88/14 |
| 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/ | 108/21 109/5 | 25/13 81/ | 19/12 22/3 75/7 |
| 129/23 | include [7] 36/23 | 111/25 112/24 | interests [1] 22/1 | involving [10] |
| 90/9 90/25 | 41/14 41/15 45/1 | 113/6 113/9 113/21 | interference [2] | 19/2 36/25 38/1 |
| identifying | 104/4 123/15 136/9 | 113/24 121/12 | 26/25 27/2 | 47/9 51/5 62/8 62/9 |
| 88/5 88/6 88/13 | included [3] 85/12 | 122/25 123/20 | interim [1] 155/ | 67/17 85/23 146/13 |
| 92/23 95/12 12 | 103/10 133/9 | 126/17 127/3 | internal [1] 89/15 | Irrelevant [1] |
| 127/3 | including [6] | 130/10 130/24 | interpretation [1] | 89/1 |
| 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 |
| if [171] | 115/7 | 148/15 148/17 | interrogatories [1] | isn't [10] 12/1 |
| Ignatius [3] | 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 | intervention [1] | ISOM [3] 1/24 |
| immediately [1] | indicated [2] | initial [3] 41/ | 126/21 | 4 157/17 |
| 102/14 | 141/23 157/7 | 64/21 118/10 | into [23] 21/20 | issue [51] 4/17 |
| immigrant | indiscernible [2] | initially [1] 79/14 | 26/2 37/10 37/17 | 29/3 29/14 |
| $84 / 8 \text { 84/10 }$ | 76/4 126/23 | initials [4] 95/3 | 37/21 46/8 50/8 | 29/19 29/22 30/3 |
| immigratio | 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 |
| impact [34] 19/3 | individually [1] | 15/13 17/15 20/12 | 128/24 130/15 | 38/17 43/16 45/6 |
|  | 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 |
| 38/20 | 78/23 89/4 91/1 | innocent [2] 33/15 | 149/12 151/15 | 60/15 63/22 64/5 |
| 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 |
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| I | 114/19 114/22 | joint [5] 59/2 61/4 | 45/22 48/3 48/21 | 75/19 80/7 82/11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| e... [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 | $71 / 1571 / 2572 / 25$ $75 / 1675 / 2075 / 21$ | 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 | 57/22 59/16 67/1 | 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] | $144 / 19$ <br> itemizes [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { June [3] } 11 / 2 \\ & 24 / 2259 / 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 123 / 1 \quad 123 / 21 \quad 124 / 9 \\ & 124 / 9124 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | $56 / 2$ |
| it's [152] 5/1 5/5 | itemizes [1] $150 / 12$ | $\begin{array}{\|ll\|} \hline 24 / 22 & 59 / 8 \\ \text { jury [48] } & 15 / 1 \quad 19 / 9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 124 / 9 \text { 124/10 } \\ & 124 / 16 \text { 125/21 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \mid k n o w ~[132] ~ 6 / 9 ~ \\ 7 / 7 \\ 7 / 258 / 239 / 19 \end{array}$ |
| 6/4 6/22 6/22 7/24 | items [2] 126/6 | jury [48] <br> 28/19 28/21 29/4 | 128/13 129/13 | $9 / 2410 / 911 / 25$ |
| 8/15 8 | 151/25 | 29/5 29/7 29/10 | 129/18 131/23 | 14/2 14/16 15/10 |
| 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 | 143/8 143/12 | 46/25 47/12 48/19 |
| 46/18 47/2 47/25 | J | 44/15 44/17 47/2 | 144/22 145/3 149/5 | 49/9 50/16 52/3 |
| 49/11 51/6 51/24 |  | 47/6 47/14 47/14 | 149/22 150/8 151/7 | 54/10 54/19 55/22 |
| 54/5 57/18 57/23 | JAL | 48/9 50/2 50/3 | 151/9 152/2 152/25 | 56/9 57/13 58/14 |
| 64/8 65/19 66/2 | 3/12 | 50/12 50/14 50/18 | 153/24 154/18 | 58/19 59/4 59/4 |
| 66/12 66/16 66/18 | jammed [1] 8/14 | 50/21 51/3 51/12 | 156/9 156/16 | 61/12 61/17 61/23 |
| 66/25 66/25 67/2 | January [3] 10/21 | 52/5 53/11 53/22 | Justice [1] 63/6 | 64/3 64/9 64/12 |
| 68/1 69/5 69/5 69/6 | 10/23 64/14 | 62/19 | stification [1] | 64/15 64/23 65/4 |
| 69/9 72/8 74/2 74/3 | JEA [1] 102/17 | just [151] 4/17 7/1 | 116/20 | 65/9 66/4 66/20 |
| 76/12 76/13 76/14 | jealous | 10/11 | K | 67/1 67/11 69/2 |
| 77/5 78/15 81/14 |  |  |  | 69/21 72/15 80/5 |
| 81/20 83/10 83/11 | Jennife | 12/2 13/2 13/6 13/7 | KATHRYN [3] | 82/6 83/24 84/4 |
| 83/13 83/23 85/14 | 121/2 | 13/13 13/16 14/1 | 4/13 59/4 | 86/3 88/6 88/17 |
| 86/14 90/6 90/14 | jeopardy [1] 22/13 | 15/9 16/17 16/23 | keep [5] 11/18 | 90/13 90/13 91/7 |
| 91/7 91/7 91/8 | job [2] 67/10 89/24 | 19/20 20/16 21/4 | 86/4 100/11 144/23 | 91/17 91/19 91/19 |
| 91/20 91/23 93/12 | jobs [4] 22/17 | 21/15 21/24 22/2 | 154/14 | 92/7 93/18 95/7 |
| 94/7 94/9 97/1 97/3 | 22/24 23/3 68/15 | 23/9 23/15 30/3 | keeping [2] 87/2 | 95/9 95/15 96/2 |
| 97/4 98/11 99/6 | JOHN [7] 3/6 4/11 | 31/20 33/20 34/16 | 92/25 | 96/18 97/12 99/4 |
| 99/9 99/18 106/8 | 75/25 76/22 80/22 | 37/16 38/2 40/19 | keeps [1] 17/4 | 99/8 99/13 99/22 |
| 107/14 108/14 | 82/13 106/10 | 41/17 41/22 42/3 | KEITH [3] 2/14 | 100/14 101/5 |
| 109/10 109/ | JOHNALDRICHLA | 42/5 42/9 42/23 | 4/14 139/25 | 106/20 106/24 |
| 111/19 114/1 | WFIRM.COM [1] | 43/2 43/19 45/1 | KEITH.GREER [1] | 107/20 110/4 |
| 114/14 114/19 | 3/12 <br> joinder [1] 71/2 | 45/2 45/4 45/10 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 2 / 20 \\ \text { Keller [9] } 75 / 2 \end{array}$ | 111/24 112/12 |
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FRONT SIGHT MANAGEMENT LLC v.
LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT FUND LLC

| K | 138 | 102/8 120/17 | 30/10 128/17 | $23 / 6$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [38] | lasted [1] 91/18 | 142/11 150/15 | 128/24 129/4 | 23/7 25/18 27/22 |
| 113/13 119/17 | lastly [2] 33/19 | let's [11] 4/8 11/18 | 129/23 130/1 | 29/4 33/8 33/12 |
| 120/23 121/7 | 132/13 | 15/22 21/4 37/14 | 130/15 130/17 | 33/24 35/14 36/7 |
| 121/19 122/2 | late [3] 14/15 80/4 | 58/23 94/14 97/10 | 131/6 131/8 132/12 | 36/9 37/1 37/6 |
| 122/13 124/14 | 142/9 | 105/2 140/2 153/24 | 132/14 132/17 | 37/10 37/18 37/21 |
| 128/10 130/6 | later [10] 26/10 | letter [11] 18/24 | 135/9 135/20 137/1 | 38/2 38/5 38/9 39/6 |
| 131/23 133/4 | 33/21 44/18 47/7 | 19/4 19/11 19/11 | 137/17 137/21 | 40/7 41/7 41/20 |
| 134/12 134/12 | 47/20 70/13 74/14 | 23/1 38/11 39/23 | 137/24 138/1 | 42/16 43/22 44/6 |
| 134/16 134/21 | 100/25 152/10 | 103/10 104/3 104/4 | 142/23 143/2 143/7 | 44/14 44/19 45/7 |
| 136/13 137/16 | 152/12 | 139/12 | 143/10 145/18 | 47/1 48/11 48/13 |
| 138/2 138/20 139/1 | law [22] 3/5 12/15 | letterhead [1] | 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] | 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 | 69/2 | light [3] 31/25 | 142 | 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 |
| $98 / 2 \quad 155 / 21$ | least [6] 30/6 | 9/5 12/15 12/23 | litany [1] 34/18 | lodged [1] 150/19 |
|  | 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 [1] 83/15 | leave [1] 71/1 | 59/7 59/8 63/8 | litigants [1] 20/7 | logical [2] 47/15 |
| ladies [1] 121/2 | left [10] 41/8 42/7 | 63/12 66/10 66/12 | litigating [1] | 48/23 |
| laid [3] 18/21 | 42/12 42/20 42/21 | 79/22 93/16 100/14 | 122/16 | long [12] 10/19 |
| 19/19 127/24 | 43/22 44/23 44/24 | 105/12 108/5 109/6 | litigation [15] | 17/22 25/22 29/21 |
|  | 46/3 73/25 | 109/7 112/5 114/6 | 11/24 20/8 79/12 | 38/23 40/9 43/11 |
| $45 / 1548 / 848 / 10$ | Legacy [4] 76/1 | 114/10 114/22 | 79/25 80/21 80/22 | 51/15 68/25 83/22 |
| 49/25 53/20 115/5 | 76/23 81/4 82/14 | 115/7 117/14 120/5 | 83/9 84/3 85/24 | 91/8 91/17 |
| 115/11 | legal [3] 33/10 | 121/7 123/1 123/22 | 86/1 94/5 97/11 | longer [1] 72/16 |
| large [2] 120/18 | 48/22 50/11 | 129/18 130/24 | 112/2 113/2 148/3 | look [36] 27/20 |
| 132/14 | legitimate [2] | 134/23 136/10 | little [19] 18/22 | 39/16 44/5 53/17 |
| LAS [22] 1/12 3/9 | 143/25 144/3 | 136/24 138/10 | 54/1 63/13 64/22 | 55/22 57/16 62/1 |
| 3/17 19/2 19/17 | lend [4] 21/4 21/15 | 142/8 142/14 145/2 | 64/23 65/1 66/9 | 62/14 88/22 95/22 |
| 19/22 25/11 25/18 | 54/21 54/22 | 147/25 151/17 | 70/12 81/23 107/18 | 99/25 100/8 101/15 |
| 31/8 31/21 32/16 | lender [10] 4/22 | likely [1] 66/16 | 113/21 119/21 | 102/1 102/13 |
| 32/18 39/18 76/1 | 19/16 47/22 106/22 | limit [4] 69/23 | 120/1 128/4 141/16 | 120/15 120/17 |
| 76/25 81/8 82/17 | 121/3 121/4 130/19 | 81/24 93/4 149/12 | 142/12 143/13 | 121/22 128/12 |
| 93/9 106/14 107/24 | 130/20 130/25 | limitation [3] 93/2 | 149/10 151/1 | 129/14 129/15 |
| 110/13 112/22 | 131/1 | 141/4 143/18 | live [1] 69/25 | 135/15 137/23 |
| laser [2] 123/1 | lender's [1] 143/22 | limitations [2] | lives [1] 21/25 | 142/18 144/22 |
| $123 / 22$ | lenders [3] 20/4 | 93/6 144/9 | LLC [9] 1/9 1/12 | 145/24 147/24 |
| laser-like [1] | 131/1 147/5 | limited [8] 81/25 | 77/1 82/16 82/25 | 148/23 149/23 |
| $123 / 22$ | lending [1] 22/12 | 85/23 115/15 141/8 | 89/2 107/24 114/6 | 150/11 150/12 |
| last [15] 7/17 | lengthy [1] 38/10 | 141/9 141/10 147/3 | 114/8 | 150/16 151/5 151/8 |
| 24/16 77/11 82/20 | lent [1] 86/18 | 147/3 | lo [1] 56/1 | 151/12 155/15 |
| 99/3 108/17 111/10 | less [1] 143/3 | limits [2] 21/3 89/4 | Ioan [76] 18/25 | looked [8] 48/8 |
| 118/20 125/15 | let [12] 14/2 56/11 | Linda [3] 76/23 | 19/2 19/7 19/15 | 59/3 63/3 63/12 |
| 126/2 132/15 134/5 | 59/25 62/1 80/2 | 82/15 106/10 | 19/19 20/3 20/10 | 95/21 96/13 148/5 |
| 136/17 138/14 | 85/9 94/22 97/4 | line [36] 21/9 | 20/13 20/14 22/2 | 150/13 |
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| M | most [7] 68/20 | 57/18 58/1 67/9 | 12 | 131 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 |
| ying [1] | 151/2 | 76/9 77/25 78/11 | Mr. Dziubla [34] | 35/11 39/11 40/14 |
|  | mostly [2] 111/20 | 79/5 79/9 80/8 | 23/13 25/17 25/23 | 40/24 41/5 41/18 |
| $8 / 58 / 7152 / 21$ | 119/20 | 80/11 80/19 81/1 | 26/11 39/14 75/6 | 42/10 43/23 44/25 |
|  | motion [62] $4 / 19$ | 81/5 82/14 82/15 | 75/9 80/8 80/11 | 45/22 48/21 49/4 |
| monetary | 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 | 112/15 113/8 | Mr. Fleming [3] | 116/14 117/1 121/8 |
| 113/13 113/14 | 127/17 127/24 | 114/15 120/3 | 26/11 93/9 110/20 | 122/5 124/15 |
| 120/23 121/2 121/4 | 128/14 128/15 | 120/22 121/19 | Mr. Fleming's [2] | 125/21 127/25 |
| 121/15 121/18 | 138/25 139/16 | 123/18 126/15 | 81/5 82/15 | 128/14 128/16 |
| 122/13 130/3 | 139/18 139/21 | 126/20 130/4 | Mr. Greer [21] | 133/22 134/25 |
| monies [9] 21/17 | 140/1 140/22 141/3 | 133/25 134/8 134/9 | 23/22 23/24 24/19 | 135/18 138/9 |
| 23/5 31/12 32/11 | motion's [1] 80/4 | 135/4 135/24 | 25/8 31/5 39/2 | 138/11 138/21 |
| 106/13 106/14 | motions [13] 1/16 | 137/10 138/15 | 41/20 49/4 54/10 | 139/11 141/19 |
| 114/9 124/13 | 11/9 12/11 13/5 | 139/25 140/17 | 72/25 79/9 80/19 | 149/2 149/3 152/23 |
| 131/10 | 17/8 17/22 18/3 | 141/13 142/4 145/2 | 85/6 85/14 91/13 | 155/18 157/9 |
| month [4] 12/11 | 70/15 70/15 73/25 | 145/21 147/24 | 98/19 103/8 133/25 | 157/11 157/14 |
| 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 | yself [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 | $\begin{array}{ll}10 / 4 & 10 / 5 \\ 11 / 12 / 11 \\ 13 / 24 & 16 / 1\end{array}$ |  |  | N |
| Morales [9] 127/15 | $21 / 437 / 647 / 22$ | $15 / 2422 / 1430 / 1$ | 96/10 | Nam [1] 80/14 |
|  | 60/14 64/23 66/2 | 31/7 32/7 38/13 | Mr. Piazza [4] 32/6 | name [4] 92/23 |
| $4 / 7 \text { 135/21 }$ | 66/15 73/1 105/2 | 46/17 48/25 53/15 | 77/25 95/12 145/2 | 95/11 99/3 157/14 |
| $5 / 10146 / 4$ | 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 |  | 121/12 |
| 30/24 40/17 43/1 | 10/10 11/11 11/11 | 78/11 79/5 85/21 | Mrs [1] 121/17 | names [24] 77/22 |
| 46/12 52/11 58/11 | moving [1] $6 / 5$ | 86/21 90/1 95/25 | Ms. [6] 59/22 | 86/9 86/10 87/7 |
| 60/15 62/5 62/17 | Mr [2] 25/9 79/4 | 97/3 98/16 102/5 | 73/18 100/20 103/7 | 87/7 87/8 88/15 |
| 63/4 66/25 72/4 | Mr. [125] 4/19 | 108/19 114/15 | 125/10 151/11 | 89/3 90/12 90/18 |
| 72/5 73/8 76/16 | 10/6 10/14 11/16 | 120/3 121/19 | Ms. Holbert [6] | 92/14 93/3 97/19 |
| 87/24 87/25 113/21 | 15/24 22/8 22/14 | 123/18 126/15 | 59/22 73/18 100/20 | 97/19 97/24 98/8 |
| 122/25 123/17 | 22/22 23/8 23/13 | 126/20 135/4 | 103/7 125/10 | 98/15 98/17 98/20 |
| 125/4 125/5 12 | 23/22 23/24 24/19 | 137/10 138/15 | 151/11 | 98/21 99/17 100/3 |
| 143/3 145/24 | 25/8 25/17 25/23 | 139/25 140/17 | much [8] 26/17 | 126/15 126/16 |
| 147/23 153/3 | 26/11 26/11 30/1 | 141/13 142/4 | 72/4 81/1 91/19 | narrow [2] 88/3 |
| morning [1] | 31/5 31/7 32/6 32/7 | 145/21 147/24 | /14 109/16 | 151/24 |
| 134/13 | 38/13 39/2 39/14 | 148/21 150/19 | 130/6 138/2 | narrowed [1] |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { mortgagee [1] } \\ & 121 / 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41 / 2046 / 1748 / 25 \\ & 49 / 453 / 1554 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | 151/6 154/22 <br> Mr. Aldrich's [1] | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { must [1] } 44 / 2 \\ \text { my [92] } 5 / 15 / 5 \end{array}$ | 88/20 <br> narrowly [10] <br> 80/17 81/11 81/22 |
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| N | $120 / 16 \text { 137/16 }$ | 150/15 150/19 | 52/9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n |  | No. | 52/15 59/8 59/17 |  |
| 85/4 85/22 85/25 | next [16] 8/2 8/9 | No. 27 [1] 146/7 | 61/16 64/20 68/23 | 32/17 33/8 55/ |
| 87/24 87/25 88/12 | 8/16 41/5 61/8 73/8 | No. 3 [2] 126/10 | 70/15 71/1 71/21 | 07/11 |
| 92/2 | 73/9 73/15 74/18 | 143/9 | 72/9 72/24 73/3 | obtain [3] 134/2 |
| nation [1] 34/19 | 81/17 82/10 105/2 | No. 4 [4] 78/ | 73/25 74/10 77/17 | /6 136/25 |
| nature [3] 83/7 | 105/4 129/2 149/22 | 126/10 143/9 | 81/23 83/1 83/20 | [2] |
| 124/16 137/19 | 150/ | 150/15 | 88/17 90/12 95/2 | 135/20 137/3 |
| necessarily [4] |  |  |  |  |
| 16/18 55/6 87/11 |  | noise [1] 100/8 | 105/21 108/1 | 106/ |
| 141/25 | [1] 139/ | non [2] | 111 | obvious [1] 46/2 obviously [2] |
| necessary [2] | nine [1] Ninety [1] 118/1 | 95/12 | 127/12 127/14 | 9/11 131/9 |
| 93/12 142/1 | no [107] 1/1 6/16 | non-jury [1] 50/3 | 131/17 131/19 | occasions [1] |
| need [67] 7/11 | 7/1 10/12 12/17 | None [2] 106/7 | 138/2 143/11 | 142/4 |
|  | 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 [ | NRCP [1] 58/22 | 111/11 |
| 26/13 33/14 40/21 | 23/7 23/15 24/20 | 40/4 81/19 | nullification [1] | OCTOBER [9] 1/21 |
| 54/1 54/21 59/14 | 30/25 31/20 31/24 | nonissue [1] 12/1 | 34/24 | 4/1 10/25 11/3 |
| 64/7 66/19 68/17 | 32/14 32/15 32/17 | nonjudicial [1] | number [15] 62/1 | 18/24 22/6 24/1 |
| 69/3 71/5 71/15 | 37/16 42/19 43/7 | 20/12 | 64/20 69/21 75/22 | 24/3 25/22 |
| 72/5 74/11 84/25 | 43/8 43/17 46/15 | nonrelevant [1] | 83/2 83/9 89/8 | October 2016 [1] |
| 86/4 86/9 86/10 | 46/16 46/16 49/17 | 129/1 | 91/12 94/18 107/20 | 18/24 |
| 87/7 87/7 87/8 88/8 | 49/17 50/22 53/5 | normally [2] 51/ | 107/25 107/25 | [15] |
| 90/18 90/18 92/14 | 53/5 53/5 57/3 | 114/3 | 111/15 111/16 | off [15] 8/10 9/18 |
| 95/5 95/7 95/9 | 60/21 74/14 77/9 | not [165] | 112/11 | 6/20 17/6 39/15 |
| 96/24 97/18 97/18 | 80/19 81/22 81/23 | note [4] 10/18 | numbering [3] | 42/10 45/12 57/15 |
| 97/19 97/21 98/14 | 83/11 85/19 86/8 | 22/14 24/16 85/8 | 128/3 149/9 153/23 | 79/25 80/5 84/16 |
| 98/17 98/20 98/20 | 86/10 88/24 89/22 | noted [1] 147/9 | Numbers [1] | 97/13 99/9 103/23 |
| 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 | 153/12 |
| 130/21 131/23 | 100/21 101/5 106/4 | 63/7 99/14 116/22 | 146/13 | offering |
| 132/25 136/12 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 137/11 139/20 | 109/21 116/20 | 138/24 140/11 | o'clock [1] 14/19 | 46/20 149/21 |
| 140/9 141/16 150/2 | 116/21 116/21 | 140/17 143/2 143/3 | 000 [4] 31/3 31/4 | 157/14 |
| 155/8 155/13 156/9 | 119/19 121/6 | notice [15] 17/11 | 74/16 74/17 | officer [3] 75/24 |
| needed [2] | 121/22 123/10 | 18/1 19/21 19/22 | obfuscate [1] 94/7 | 76/20 90/24 |
|  | 124/8 127/10 135/7 | 58/22 59/24 60/2 | object [7] 78/25 | officers [1] 89/ |
| 50/6 76/13 84/23 | 135/13 136/20 | 60/15 61/11 67/20 | 81/16 102/8 102/9 | offices [3] 100/13 |
| $156 / 15$ | 138/14 139/6 | 67/21 85/9 107/20 | 149/23 151/21 | 144/20 145/2 |
| negative [1] 12/14 | 139/10 139/21 | 134/14 148/10 | 153/20 | often [2] 62/14 |
| negligent [1] 27/1 | 140/18 140/19 | notices [2] 127 | objected [2] 84/21 |  |
| neither [1] 44/9 | 141/4 141/9 142/20 |  |  | oftentimes [1] |
| NES [2] 107/23 | 143/15 144/4 144/5 | [1] $62 / 11$ | 12/17 16/5 60/16 |  |
| 112/2 | 144/6 144/12 | November [3] 5/4 | 79/23 81/20 83/17 | okay [85] 7/3 7/14 |
| network [1] 93/24 | 144/13 145/5 145/7 | 5/15 65/5 | 85/8 93/7 113/5 | 10/1 12/19 12/25 |
| NEVADA [11] $1 / 7$ | 145/15 146/1 148/2 | November 5 [1] | 113/7 115/25 | 14/12 16/10 18/15 |
| 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 | 8/18 58/23 |
| 29/25 70/10 80 | 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 |
| new [5] 31/19 | 143/9 143/9 146/7 | 40/20 47/20 47/20 | objections [6] <br> 94/9 116/13 116/14 | 74/18 75/4 79/7 |
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| 0 | 118/16 118/17 | or [141] 4/21 5/7 | 78/3 78/12 78/17 | /13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 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 | 113/23 120/15 | 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 | 146/21 148/22 |
| 110/12 111/5 | 144/18 146/23 | 57/16 58/20 59/20 | ordered [5] 40/15 | 149/19 152/19 |
| 115/22 116/2 | 146/23 147/13 | 60/25 62/20 63/15 | 79/16 79/17 105/22 | outlined [1] 27/11 |
| 116/12 116/20 | 148/2 150/13 | 65/5 68/5 68/7 70/7 | 109/14 | outside [5] 79/12 |
| 116/22 118/12 | 150/17 150/17 | 70/15 71/10 72/12 | orders [2] 79/10 | 81/6 84/3 94/5 |
| 119/1 119/23 | 150/19 151/1 151/5 | 72/12 73/9 74/13 | 79/16 | 145/20 |
| 123/11 125/25 | 151/9 152/2 152/25 | 75/23 75/25 76/9 | organization [1] | over [20] 31/21 |
| 129/21 131/19 | 154/16 | 76/21 77/12 79/12 | 114/9 | 32/15 39/19 40/9 |
| 133/12 136/2 13 | ones [11] 33/14 | 80/18 82/5 82/8 | other [49] 12/9 | 40/15 40/24 45/16 |
| 138/13 138/16 | 80/14 147/6 147/6 | 82/12 82/21 84/17 | 20/25 24/23 25/15 | 46/5 46/12 46/16 |
| 138/24 140/21 | 148/5 148/21 | 85/8 88/9 88/9 | 30/17 47/8 48/3 | 46/17 46/19 47/8 |
| 141/12 141/20 | 148/22 149/9 | 88/18 88/18 90/24 | 52/9 53/10 53/11 | 72/9 102/9 108/10 |
| 143/15 148/6 | 149/13 149/23 | 92/18 93/19 93/19 | 54/24 55/16 62/9 | 116/9 122/13 |
| 149/14 152/5 | 151/20 | 93/25 94/14 98/8 | 62/15 64/15 67/12 | 144/22 149/21 |
| 152/11 152/16 | ongoing [2] 31/7 | 99/14 99/18 100/13 | 80/16 80/23 84/6 | overbroad [8] 76/6 |
| 152/17 154/7 | 40/9 | 100/14 101/16 | 84/15 85/6 86/6 | 77/2 87/15 93/5 |
| 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 |
|  | 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 | 111/25 112/13 | 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 |
| $36 / 236 / 3$ 39/12 | 13/4 13/5 79/21 | 126/16 127/20 | 153/2 | 76/7 |
| 39/18 41/13 41/22 | 91/8 99/24 105/5 | 128/4 128/23 129/3 | our [22] 4/8 7/21 | own [3] 21/2 87/1 |
| 43/4 43/17 48/3 | 107/11 112/9 | 129/10 129/14 | 16/12 18/20 18/21 | 137/25 |
| 48/4 49/7 49/11 | 112/11 123/15 | 129/14 130/16 | 27/6 29/8 41/16 | wner [2] 25/9 |
| 51/23 52/5 52/10 | opening [1] | 130/16 130/22 | 49/13 51/7 55/21 | 110/16 |
| 62/1 62/15 63/6 | 124 | 132/7 132/ | 94 | [1] |
| 64/20 68/4 69/21 | opera $149 / 6$ | $\begin{array}{lll}132 / 21 & 134 / 11 \\ 135 / 8 & 136 / 13\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 119 / 5127 / 15 \\ & 127 / 23129 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | P |
| 71/10 71/23 76/15 | operations [1] | $136 / 23138 / 5$ | 9/19 133/9 | [1] 4/2 |
| $76 / 1677 / 777 / 11$ $80 / 981 / 182 / 8$ | $31 / 17$ | $138 / 21142 / 16$ | $135 / 16140 / 19$ | $\text { page [2] } 135 / 5$ |
| $80$ | opinion [1] 66/21 | 143/6 143/16 144/7 | out [58] 5/16 | 139/12 |
| 83/9 85/6 86/5 89/8 | opinions [1] 70/7 | 144/14 145/1 145/2 | 10/13 12/5 18/21 | page 13 [1] 135/5 |
| 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 | 56/20 57/1 58/15 | 106/23 117/1 121/9 |
| 113/11 114/24 | 7/18 16/13 16/16 | 5/13 6/10 6/14 6/20 | 67/2 74/6 78/13 | 121/10 131/22 |
| 116/18 116/19 | 16/19 74/4 116/17 | 7/8 31/13 50/24 | 80/23 84/25 88/25 | 131/24 |
| 116/19 118/7 118/8 | 140/3 | 63/17 67/13 70/15 | 90/8 95/17 97/7 | paid-in-place [1] $21 / 23$ |
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| P | 107/10 112/1 113/2 | $\mathbf{p e}$ | 54/24 | pre-history [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| paired [1] 118/21 | $145 / 13145 / 13$ | 76/2 81/10 89/1 <br> pertains [1] | point [34] 10/13 <br> 20/17 21/9 21/14 | clude [1] 122 |
| Pandora's [1] | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} 145 / 13 \\ \text { past [5] } 21 / 521 / 13 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { pertains [1] } \\ 123 / 23 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20 / 17 \text { 21/9 21/14 } \\ & 21 / 1721 / 2426 / 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { clude [1] } 122 / 4 \\ & \text { fer [1] } 67 / 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| $124 / 10$ | $77 / 20 \text { 86/2 95/15 }$ | pertinence [1] | 31/20 31/24 32/5 | ejudice [4] |
| $4 / 15$ | patient [1] 125/20 | 146/12 | 32/23 35/11 37/25 | 52/17 58/6 124/4 |
| papers [2] 18/ | pause [5] 18/16 | pet [1] | 43/23 45/22 49/13 | 126/3 |
|  | 99/19 125/17 | philosophical [1] | 56/20 60/8 62/13 | prejudicing [1] |
| paperwor | 125/24 148/1 | 13/3 | 66/12 67/15 70/3 | 40/13 |
| $23 / 15$ | pay [9] 21/22 32/3 | ph | 80/3 84/11 87/22 | preliminary [9] |
| par | 33/8 33/11 55/1 | photographs [1] | 95/24 100/11 | / 15/13 17/14 |
| 117/12 117/13 | 55/4 55/14 56/15 | 132/7 | 115/13 119/8 | /11 63/16 66/1 |
| paragraph 12 [1] | 84/16 | phrased [2] 77/19 | 119/18 131/9 | 67/5 67/13 72/8 |
| 117/12 | paying [3] |  | 131 |  |
| paragraph 13 [ | 97/14 97/15 | Piazza [18] 26/6 | 133/22 | 73/24 135/3 |
| 117/13 | payment [5] 19/2 | 26/9 32/6 77/25 | pointed [2] |  |
| paragraphs [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24/1 24/3 32/12 } \\ & 126 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | 78/10 78/15 79/13 79/15 95/12 98/13 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 148/22 } \\ \text { points [6] } 80 / 2 \end{array}$ | 106/19 <br> prepare [3] 70/20 |
| 120/20 | 126/12 payme | $108 / 16108 / 16$ | $\begin{array}{\|cc\|} \hline \text { points [6] } 80 / 2 \\ 83 / 8106 / 18121 \end{array}$ | $103 / 13104 / 1$ |
| pardon [1] 54 | 21/19 33/2 33/3 | 111/10 121/23 | 143/14 145/22 | prepared [3] 15/ |
| PARKWAY [1] 2/5 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 57/1 | peeled [1] 57/15 | 145/2 | portion [2] 132/16 | prepayment [1] |
|  | PEGGY [3] 1/24 | Piazza's [3] 22/8 | 132/19 | 84/17 |
| 104/7 104/8 104/ | 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 | 23/20 27/6 29/8 | 82/18 108/2 |
| 143/22 146/9 | 9/3 15/12 35/12 | piece [5] 25/ | 41/16 41/23 42/ | esentation |
| parte [1] 4/19 | 72/9 73/25 | 49/4 134/25 138/ | 49/13 50/7 50/15 | 41/21 120/22 |
| particular [4] | penny [1] 69/ | 141 | 54/5 55/8 55/ | esented |
|  | 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] |
| particula | 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 | etrial [1] 12 |
| particularly [3] | 111/15 | placing [1 | 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] 1 | 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 | 127/17 140/2 | 76/19 77/12 80/18 | primary [2] 25/ |
| 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 |
| 86/3 100/1 112/13 | 46/15 | plan [3] 71/6 73/7 | 120/8 143/22 | 75/25 76/21 90/2 |
| 113/6 116/10 | performed [1] |  | 144 | principals [2] |
| 119/25 127/4 | /9 | planning [2] 15/11 | possibility [1] | 20/21 89/2 |
| 127/18 129/23 | perhaps [4] 20/13 | 146/6 | 78/1 | rior [8] 23 |
| 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 |  | 28/15 | 95/13 107/3 131/ |
| partners [2] 80/12 | $108 / 1 \text { 108/1 }$ |  | posture [2] 11/22 | 142/8 |
| 122/12 | person [2] 80/23 | pleadings [2] | potential [4] | 86/24 98/10 123/4 |
| partnership [1] | $110 / 17$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { pleadings [2] } \\ 23 / 2081 / 15 \end{array}$ | $77 / 486 / 2587 / 17$ | private [1] 107/2 |
| $114 / 6$ | personal [1] | please [3] 40/12 | potentially [8] 5/7 | privilege [5] 77/ |
| $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{p a} \\ 80 \end{gathered}$ | 121/11 | 73/4 107/22 | 53/12 73/12 77/3 | 89/16 116/20 127/7 |
| $82 / 1382 / 1582 / 16$ | 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 | $\begin{aligned} & 57 / 2262 / 17100 / 19 \\ & 110 / 25114 / 23 \end{aligned}$ | PMK [1] 85/13 <br> pocket [2] 54/20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { practical [1] 66/3 } \\ & \text { pre [1] } 90 / 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} 87 / 17132 / 10 \\ \text { privileges [1] } 77 / 3 \end{array}$ |
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| P | productions [1] | 96/ | $3 / 20$ | reach [2] 54/23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| pro [2] 2/12 147/22 | program [1] 84/13 | protections [1] $105 / 16$ | qualify [1] 141/7 <br> quash [16] 17/9 | $\begin{array}{\|lll} 90 / 8 \\ \text { read [6] } & 30 / 12 \end{array}$ |
| probably [19] 6/17 | program [1] 84/13 | 105/16 | quash [16] 17/9 17/22 18/3 74/4 | read [6] 30/12 $51 / 1565 / 25101 / 1$ |
| 14/15 28/18 29/20 | progress [5] $21 / 19$ $33 / 2$ 121/5 125/12 | protective [8] $70 / 1578 / 1278 / 17$ | 17/22 18/3 74/4 | 51/15 65/25 101/1 $149 / 12$ 151/9 |
| 39/8 42/13 42/23 $50 / 651 / 852 / 25$ | 144/25 | 79/10 104/14 | 87/18 88/23 104/13 | reading [1] 65 |
| 72/18 82/4 95/4 | project [44] 22/5 | 104/15 104/19 | 123/14 127/14 | ready [6] 18/1 |
| 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 | real [8] 20/14 |
| problem [11] 8/18 | 81/25 82/22 82/24 | protocols [1] | 87/23 | 43/11 66/22 71/23 |
| 10/12 22/21 25/20 | 83/3 83/4 88/10 | 52/13 | quashing [2] 104/8 | 83/8 130/2 136/7 |
| 67/25 75/16 76/15 | 89/5 89/12 90/15 | prove [1] 143/24 | 123/21 | 137/5 |
| 95/1 100/6 100/21 | 91/15 92/12 93/23 | provide [12] 65/3 | question [24] 5/5 | realize [3] 72/8 |
| 115/17 | 96/4 96/17 96/19 | 75/22 77/12 107/22 | 5/21 15/9 28/8 | 115/3 142/9 |
| problems [2] | 130/7 131/12 | 109/3 118/6 118/18 | 28/21 36/3 41/5 | really [46] 9/3 |
| 77/25 139/13 | 131/22 131/23 | 127/2 130/25 | 41/18 43/9 43/16 | 11/18 12/1 12/6 |
| procedural [3] | 132/7 143/12 145/1 | 132/18 152/7 153/7 | 44/3 44/25 45/13 | 16/6 22/11 30/20 |
| 11/21 51/17 56/25 | 145/12 145/19 | provided [11] | 45/23 46/2 47/19 | 30/21 35/2 41/12 |
| procedurally [5] | 146/12 146/14 | 83/14 83/16 83/19 | 49/23 50/4 60/13 | 42/7 44/2 47/15 |
| 6/23 38/21 50/2 | 146/24 147/1 147/2 | 94/16 112/16 117/3 | 75/22 92/4 100/15 | 59/15 60/9 61/18 |
| 52/12 80/4 | 147/3 147/6 147/10 | 118/9 127/2 130/9 | 127/11 138/9 | 64/12 65/18 69/6 |
| proceed [3] 35/6 | 147/17 147/19 | 134/16 134/17 | questions [7] | 87/9 88/8 90/5 96/2 |
| 50/2 132/25 | projects [3] 63/7 | provides [1] 63/14 | 30/24 34/20 50/11 | 96/7 102/16 107/9 |
| proceedings [9] | 88/7 146/10 | providing [5] | 79/5 85/18 131/25 | 107/13 111/20 |
| 18/16 99/19 105/20 | prolonged [1] | 108/25 109/7 109/7 | 132/15 | 113/3 113/5 115/2 |
| 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 | 122/3 123/3 124/1 |
| proceeds [2] 38/2 | promote [1] | 62/15 63/3 84/17 | quickly [7] 9/6 | /6 129/13 |
|  | 105/25 | provisions [2] 19/6 | 12/24 20/5 20/10 | 136/13 137/12 |
| process | 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/ | quite [1] 41/2 | ealty [4] 76/ |
| 65/14 66/17 69/5 | proper [4] 85/4 | pull [3] 39/16 | quo | 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] 4/2 |
| 104/22 140/15 | $\mathbf{p r}$ |  | R | 7/4 11/17 2 |
| 143/25 144/3 |  |  |  | 5/3 32/13 43/3 |
| processes [1] | property [3] 75/12 | purposes [4] 59/10 |  | /21 61/25 67/2 |
| 140/8 | 130/4 133/3 | 59/19 124/19 | raise [4] 26/13 | 76/13 86/24 95/7 |
| procuring [1] | proposed [2] | 124/21 | 55/22 56/17 111/14 | 98/21 106/4 109/1 |
| 106/20 | 20/13 121/21 | pursuant [2] 33/24 | raised [8] 21/12 | 115/24 126/19 |
| produce [6] 98/15 | proposition [1] | 48/10 | 30/3 56/11 76/3 | 127/4 144/17 |
| 115/16 115/17 | 51/25 | push [1] 65/4 | 89/5 89/13 113/7 | 155/18 |
| 119/4 124/1 126/14 | proprietary [16] | pushing [1] 47/20 |  | asonable [1] |
| produced [10] | 77/22 83/6 83/10 | put [24] 7/1 10/3 | raising | 65/2 |
| 68/16 87/11 98/6 | 87/16 90/11 92/24 | 10/8 15/2 15/2 | 75/11 80/23 93/22 | reasons [2] 52/1 |
| 99/24 105/24 106/3 | 93/3 93/12 95/1 | 15/19 15/22 21/8 | Rank [14] 127/22 | 124/23 |
| 109/16 119/16 | 96/14 96/19 97/2 | 21/20 29/10 33/19 | 128/15 128/19 | recall [5] 80/8 |
| 19/20 126/19 | 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 | 115/23 116/2 |
| 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 | cceived [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] 5 | 33/21 |
| 124/9 125/1 131/17 | protected [3] | 32/25 33/13 | rate [1] 134/18 | ceiver [5] 9/ |
| $133 / 10 \quad 133 / 13$ | 33/14 86/14 105/19 protecting [1] |  | 117/24 119/10 | $\begin{aligned} & 15 / 12 ~ 15 / 18 ~ 15 / 22 \\ & 16 / 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 133/22 138/17 |  | qualified [1] 56/21 | 151/22 |  |
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| R | 150 | $27$ | 1] | $15$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| receivership [1] | regard [15] 25/ |  |  |  |
| 114/4 | 55/20 85/2 86/17 | released [2] 21/21 $32 / 11$ | 55/8 |  |
| receiving [1] 113/9 | 87/19 112/9 114/2 | releasing [1] | repeat [1] 90/6 | requesting |
| recent [2] 131/17 | 114/14 121/1 | 106/16 | repeatedly [1] | 151/ |
|  | 124/22 130/1 | relevance [5] | 139/14 | requests |
| Recess [2] 31/3 | 146/16 | 75/13 76/11 87/13 | repercussions [2] | 87/24 111 |
| $74 / 16$ | regarding [26] | 89/23 100/16 | 86/25 87/5 | 111/25 117/15 |
| recognize [2] | 17/14 34/18 34/2 | relevant [42] 9/3 | repetitive [3] | 20/16 120/19 |
| 50/12 112/3 | 57/7 59/25 60/1 | 76/7 82/1 82/19 | 116/13 116/14 | 128/1 128/1 128/2 |
| recollection [3] | 64/6 68/21 73/21 | 90/14 90/16 92/5 | 141/20 | 28/5 128/12 |
| 51/15 115/5 120/5 | 75/8 77/13 82/22 | 94/19 94/24 100/15 | report [14] 23/8 | 129/24 130/11 |
| recommended [1] | 102/25 106/5 106/9 | 105/20 106/7 107/5 | 31/23 40/18 40/19 | 141/5 142/9 149/2 |
| 61/19 | 106/10 121/3 | 108/13 108/14 | 59/2 59/19 61/1 | 151/22 153/8 156/7 |
| 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] | 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 | requirements |
| 149/1 149/13 | 25/11 31/14 49/6 | 130/13 131/3 131/6 | REPORTER'S [2] | 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/ | 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 | 27/1 |
| 132/7 | regular [1] 24/ | 148 | 134/11 150/3 | sio |
| records [16] 40/14 | regulated [1] | relied [7] | reports [3] 68 | 28/13 28/15 42 |
| 40/22 108/22 | 86/20 | 37/9 128/23 135/8 | /21 148/1 | search [3] 65/ |
| 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 | representation [1] | 20/15 108/6 |
| 138/18 143/19 | related [28] 17/12 | 20/11 122/24 | 120/ | solve [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 | solved [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 | sorts [1] 62 |
| 153/21 | 111/25 113/1 113/6 $113 / 9$ 113/23 | remain [1] 47/10 | represented [3] <br> 80/8 80/12 80/13 |  |
| redact [2] 94/15 | 113/9 113/23 | remainder [1] | 80/8 80/12 80/13 | sources [2] |
| 100/3 | $\begin{aligned} & 120 / 19132 / 11 \\ & 139 / 27 \\ & 139 / 23 \end{aligned}$ | remaining [1] 28/7 | reputable $42 / 20$ | 31/14 31/15 <br> 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 $99 / 17100 / 2126 / 17$ | 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 |
| $98 / 15$ | relates [12] 17/17 | remember [23] | 88/12 93/5 107/18 | respects [1] |
|  | 38/4 42/15 44/19 | 5/14 19/11 22/5 | 107/21 109/8 | 109/19 |
| 99/23 | 48/9 50/2 53/22 | 28/14 28/16 29/21 | 111/18 112/9 | respond [2] 7/20 |
| $\text { refer [3] } 129 / 3$ | 60/17 111/5 112/1 | 36/5 39/14 40/12 | 115/16 116/1 116/6 | 117/24 |
| $143 / 6 \text { 144/14 }$ | 120/8 123/25 | 43/4 57/7 62/13 | 117/4 117/9 118/12 | responded [1] |
| referring [1] 144/7 | relating [10] 19/7 | 82/6 87/1 110/13 | 118/20 123/23 | 138/17 |
| reflect [2] 144/5 | 45/16 88/15 126/10 | 111/16 114/16 | 124/8 124/25 | response [8] 72/ |
| 154/23 | 131/8 143/16 | 116/9 120/3 120/6 | 128/20 128/22 | 116/19 117/16 |
| reflected [2] 63/13 | 144/19 145/18 | 120/14 131/15 | 133/9 133/13 | 118/3 119/5 134/24 |
| 122/8 | 147/16 150/25 | 139/7 | 133/22 135/7 | 135/13 139/23 |
|  | relationship [5] | remind [8] 13/25 | 138/16 142/2 142/8 | responses [6] |
| 131/12 143/16 | 33/5 76/9 146/3 | 14/7 40/11 64/24 | 142/20 143/4 145/5 | 124/25 133/22 |
| 144/8 145/8 145/16 | 146/17 147/21 | 139/11 152/21 | 145/7 150/15 | 138/21 139/11 |
| 146/2 147/14 | relationships [2] | 152/23 156/6 | 151/13 154/7 154/9 | 139/14 139/15 |
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| S | 93/11 93/18 98/12 | six-ish [1] 118/10 | somewhat [2] |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 105/24 106/17 | slightly [4] 55/21 | 52/11 54/12 | 24/9 28/ |
| 4/20 5/1 5/13 6 | 106/19 106/20 | 114/19 114/20 | son [1] 113/10 | /14 66/22 69/15 |
| 6/14 6/20 7/9 | 106/23 121/18 | 115/3 | soon [3] 71/11 | 75/9 83/20 136/17 |
| SHORTHAND [1] | 129/12 129/14 | smoking [1] 26/8 | 17 150/10 | andard [1] 70/6 |
| 157/4 | 129/15 130/9 |  | sooner [5] 5/19 | standing [3] 41/11 |
| shortly [2] 111/11 | 130/18 130/23 |  | 5 11/3 11/5 |  |
| 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 |
| $22$ | 144/23 145/17 | soliciting [1] 90/20 | 128/14 128/21 | starred [1] 155/3 |
| 30/21 30/2 | 146/9 147/1 147/15 | some [63] 7/7 12/5 | 142/22 149/5 | start [11] 6/5 9/23 |
| 37/25 41/17 | 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 | 50/16 52/19 54/19 | source [5] 86/14 | starting [2] 8/ |
| 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/ | 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/ | 140/ |
| 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 | 68/20 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 |
| 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 | 07/12 107/22 |
| 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] | 42/20 143/18 |
| 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 | single [5] 19/18 | 94/14 136/22 | 135 | 2/20 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 |
| 21/7 21/16 21/22 | 16/22 23/18 30/25 | 70/12 72/12 98/14 | 121/8 121/9 | stays [2] 101/17 |
| 21/22 22/15 22/24 | 53/17 57/3 75/3 | 100/2 100/14 | spending [1] 32/18 | 101/18 |
| 23/25 25/21 26/1 | 85/19 103/5 107/16 | 101/13 108/5 112/5 | spent [12] 12/7 | stem [1] 42/14 |
| 31/12 31/23 31/24 | 123/25 126/1 | 117/9 122/23 124/4 | 32/15 32/16 34/12 | STENOTYPE [2] |
| 32/11 32/15 32/17 | 138/14 145/25 | 125/8 132/2 132/5 | 46/6 46/7 46/11 | 157/5 157/8 |
| 32/20 32/22 33/1 | 153/4 154/23 | 132/8 134/11 136/9 | 46/17 47/10 62/5 | step [3] 65/13 |
| $33 / 133 / 746 / 8$ | sit [5] 11/23 35/3 | 141/15 155/19 | 124/14 131/11 | 140/8 152/1 |
| 46/10 46/15 46/19 | 53/16 69/2 154/23 | Sometime [1] | sponte [1] 6/5 | still [22] 11/4 |
| 47/11 47/13 69/7 | sitting [1] 94/11 | 10/ | squash [2] 9/12 | 24/20 25/14 33/8 |
| 75/1 75/7 77/13 | situation [3] 21/23 | sometimes [ | 99/8 | 33/21 35/12 35/13 |
| 77/15 77/20 78/1 | 23/11 33/17 | 10/16 14/17 | squeeze [1] 97/13 | 40/13 46/4 47/9 |
| 82/22 82/24 84/16 | six [3] 51/8 116/10 | someway [1] | stack [1] 111/13 | 57/16 57/17 57/18 |
| 90/10 90/16 91/5 | 118/10 | 31/23 | stamped [1] 7/10 | 64/13 64/24 69/4 |
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| S | 127/21 140/22 | 150 | tell [7] 32/17 48/5 | 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| still... [6] 70/14 | SUBSCRIBED [1] | 154/22 | 65/16 83/20 113/18 | 136/15 137/12 |
| $73 / 2 \text { 97/14 102/10 }$ | 157/13 | surviving [1] | 138/8 154/4 | 139/13 142/15 |
| 129/12 138/19 | substance [1] 95/3 | 35/24 | telling [4] 41/11 | 144/19 144/24 |
| stip [2] 151/22 | substantive [1] | suspect [2] 82/2 | 94/6 112/15 150/20 | 146/17 |
| 151/24 |  |  | ten [3] 7/21 7/23 | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \\ & 27 \end{aligned}$ |
| stipulate [1] | 21/19 22/17 37/5 | $\begin{gathered} \text { suspic } \\ 137 / 5 \end{gathered}$ | tend [2] 143/24 | 20/4 31/21 36/20 |
| stipulation [1] | 99/21 | T | 144/1 | 40/4 47/8 54/14 |
| 121/21 |  |  | tens [3] 25/25 | 65/2 69/2 69/24 |
| stopped [2] 25/24 | 86 |  | 93/22 113/17 | 71/23 74/24 78/2 |
| 32/22 | suffers [1] 76/1 sufficiently [1] | 69/7 | terms [3] 48/15 | 78/3 78/18 79/6 |
| straight [2] 7/24 | suffic 92/1 | 80/17 81/12 81/22 | test [2] 142/15 | 85/9 85/12 87/21 |
|  | suggest [1] | 85/5 85/22 85/25 | 142/16 | 92/13 93/25 94/16 |
| strip [1] 62/8 | suggestion [2] | 87/24 88/1 88/12 | testified [7] 81/1 | 97/10 97/20 97/23 |
|  | 101/12 153/5 | 92/1 92/2 93/1 | 96/15 108/16 | 98/14 98/14 98/18 |
| structures [1] | SUITE [3] 2/6 2/16 | 122/24 132/23 | 111/10 111/12 | 98/22 99/6 99/24 |
|  | 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 |
|  | 58/20 59/19 60/10 | taking [7] 10/19 | 46/13 46/13 59/16 | 129/13 132/13 |
| subdivision | 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 | 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] |
| 68/11 68/14 154/18 | supports [2] 15/18 | talked [15] 24/19 | 148/21 152/10 | 98/10 144/21 |
| subpoena [12] | $23 / 16$ | 27/6 40/13 85/3 | 152/13 153/2 | then [84] 5/12 8/8 |
| 17/22 85/12 88/23 | supposed [3] | 116/14 | Thank [15] 15/8 | 9/22 13/13 15/10 |
| 101/13 103/5 104/5 | 84/12 84/13 118/24 | 111/10 116/14 | 17/1 18/10 23/18 | 17/25 18/1 25/23 |
| 104/9 104/11 109/9 | supposedly [1] | 134/5 136/18 | 31/1 60/23 73/19 | 28/2 28/3 31/22 |
| 120/11 135/5 | 80/23 | 136/24 137/6 137/7 | 79/8 85/20 107/16 | 31/23 32/11 33/1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1 \angle 0 / \\ & 138 / \end{aligned}$ | Supreme [5] 51/8 | 138/12 142/14 | 129/21 133/8 | 36/19 42/25 44/3 |
| subpoenaed [3] | 51/17 51/21 63/4 | talking [9] 66/20 | 133/20 156/3 156/5 | 44/5 44/14 46/3 |
| $78 / 23116 / 23$ | 115/8 | 91/25 92/1 94/18 | Thanksgiving [1] | 46/5 46/14 47/4 |
| 128/20 | sure [35] 5/9 5/25 | 95/17 111/2 137/19 | 94/1 | 48/18 49/1 49/25 |
| subpoenaing [5] | 10/21 11/7 13/13 | 139/22 140/22 | that [771] | 52/23 52/25 53/8 |
| 108/21 112/17 | 14/24 15/7 23/21 | talks [1] 84/15 | that's [161] | 53/10 54/23 56/14 |
| 114/8 121/8 122/6 | 28/6 32/1 34/10 | targeted [1] | their [31] 22/18 | 56/18 58/21 59/13 |
| subpoenas [19] | 34/16 34/22 35/3 | 121/15 | 23/12 30/15 32/25 | 60/11 65/1 65/20 |
| 17/9 17/22 40/13 | 49/19 55/25 58/7 | tax [4] 79/21 115/7 | 46/6 69/24 78/7 | 65/25 66/4 66/25 |
| 74/6 75/1 75/16 | 58/8 63/23 69/3 | 143/19 144/10 | 87/1 87/3 87/3 87/4 | 69/15 71/4 71/5 |
| 75/19 85/4 85/16 | 73/13 85/7 96/6 | team [1] 31/15 | 90/12 94/17 107/4 | 72/13 73/5 74/5 |
| 105/11 105/15 | 96/8 103/7 123/18 | tecum [1] 135/6 | 107/5 107/11 | 77/11 79/20 79/23 |
| 113/8 123/14 | 132/22 140/15 | telephonic [1] | 107/12 126/12 | 81/20 86/20 89/4 |
| 123/21 127/15 | 141/14 142/1 | 14/13 | 130/24 131/15 | 90/25 91/24 93/6 |
| 127/18 127/20 | 149/13 150/12 | telephonically [1] $14 / 1$ | 131/16 131/17 | 95/5 96/12 97/12 |
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| T | 137/22 138/4 | 98/7 98/13 98/17 | 64/20 69/7 77/3 | $2 \text { 147/9 }$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| then... [25] 98/16 | 138/16 138/20 | 105/15 105/16 | 78/18 79/22 80/9 | 148/10 149/8 |
| 98/21 100/22 101/4 | 139/8 140/9 140/17 | 106/8 111/15 | 82/6 94/2 94/12 | 149/19 150/15 |
| 101/12 102/20 | 141/15 145/24 | 111/25 113/8 | 95/18 112/10 | 150/17 151/1 |
| 104/3 108/15 | 146/11 147/2 | 113/25 114/20 | 117/19 117/22 | 151/13 152/17 |
| 111/17 112/12 | 147/13 147/21 | 122/8 124/14 128/2 | 117/24 122/13 | 153/1 155/8 |
| 112/18 112/24 | 148/13 148/22 | 128/5 128/12 129/8 | 123/13 124/14 | thinking [1] 99/ |
| 115/14 127/4 129/2 | 149/2 149/11 | 129/12 129/16 | 133/24 137/11 | third [13] 17/9 |
| 131/10 132/18 | 149/15 149/16 | 129/22 130/11 | 143/24 145/3 | 33/15 33/18 77/4 |
| 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 11/811/20 | 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 |
| 17/21 21/4 21/10 | 28/2 29/5 31/19 | they're [55] 25/6 | 38/12 38/13 39/2 | 17/22 23/21 26/18 |
| 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 |
| 23/6 24/11 25/4 | 34/15 34/25 43/7 | 28/18 33/14 33/15 | 42/10 42/13 43/15 | 35/4 39/25 40/6 |
| 25/4 25/5 26/9 | 46/4 46/9 48/12 | 34/17 40/20 48/18 | 45/15 47/17 47/25 | 40/8 41/3 42/12 |
| 26/20 27/1 27/21 | 50/13 52/6 54/2 | 48/18 50/11 53/9 | 48/4 48/23 49/22 | 42/24 43/1 46/22 |
| 28/7 28/19 29/10 | 56/21 61/25 61/25 | 53/10 53/24 62/11 | 50/17 50/19 50/21 | 48/21 51/23 52/3 |
| 29/17 32/8 32/14 | 62/19 63/7 67/23 | 71/20 73/5 85/4 | 51/6 51/16 51/19 | 52/25 53/1 54/12 |
| 34/17 35/13 35/23 | 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 |
| 35/24 36/5 36/5 | 79/15 84/15 85/8 | 88/2 88/19 90/22 | 53/16 53/24 54/1 | 60/13 61/15 61/23 |
| 36/13 3 | 86/8 86/10 86/25 | 93/24 96/19 99/7 | 54/7 55/7 55/7 | 63/25 64/25 69/13 |
| 36/25 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/ | 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 | 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 | 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 |
| 83/4 84/10 84/11 | 142/16 149/10 | 146/21 155/6 | 72/19 73/3 78/15 | though [7] 36/11 |
| 84/13 84/13 84/17 | 150/14 150/18 | they've [3] 29/10 | 84/7 85/15 85/15 | 38/7 53/4 56/8 83/3 |
| 86/22 86/24 89/24 | 150/22 153/23 | 83/13 109/8 | 86/21 87/15 88/16 | 100/22 102/7 |
| 92/17 92/17 92/24 | 155/19 | thing [26] 7/20 | 89/25 91/2 91/2 | thought [7] 32/1 |
| 93/20 94/23 94/23 | thereabouts [1] | 39/18 41/10 46/8 | 92/6 93/17 93/20 | 34/4 45/4 48/3 63/2 |
| 96/15 99/13 99/13 | 10/21 | 55/6 60/9 69/3 77/9 | 95/16 95/25 100/14 | 117/15 147/11 |
| 99/14 99/16 100/2 | thereafter [2] | 80/16 82/8 82/10 | 102/4 102/9 105/11 | thoughts [7] 45/3 |
| 101/10 105/10 | 108/16 157/7 | 84/6 85/6 87/13 | 110/21 114/1 | 45/10 48/21 51/23 |
| 106/4 106/12 107/3 | therefore [1] 47/2 | 87/23 93/15 94/9 | 114/19 114/24 | 52/9 63/25 113/25 |
| 108/20 108/20 | these [72] 11/8 | 108/9 112/25 117/7 | 117/17 117/18 | thousand [2] |
| 112/3 112/10 | 21/9 22/12 28/5 | 131/1 134/13 137/9 | 117/22 118/24 | 117/1 118/10 |
| 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 | 122/23 123/3 123/8 | 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 |
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| T | 118/7 118/8 118/16 | track [1] 111/22 | 77/20 78/2 84/21 | unclean [1] 33/17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| three... [3] 146/19 | 118/17 124/25 | trade [2] 83/12 | 87/1 111/22 131/19 | unconscionabil |
| 146/20 146/25 | 134/5 134/8 136/18 |  | 135/3 141/6 146/21 | [1] 51/18 |
| threw [2] 94/15 | 39/20 | tio | esday [3] 8/6 | ontrollably [1] |
| 94/16 | 141/24 142/1 147/3 | 20/8 114/23 | 8/8 8/9 | 14 |
| through [35] | 147/24 155/25 | transactional | [1] | [15] 51/12 |
| 21/13 25/21 27/5 | 157/7 | 9/21 119/25 | turnaround [1] | 52/21 62/15 |
| 27/18 28/5 30/12 | timely [1] 87/ | TRANSCRIBED | 153/2 | $270 / 576 / 12$ |
| 34/18 39/13 39/13 | times [3] 52/12 | 157/8 | turns [2] 27/14 | 78/24 84/12 84/18 |
| 40/6 42/22 45/21 | 69/22 117/14 | transcript [3] 1/15 | 39/16 | 87/19 132/3 137/16 |
| 47/23 57/24 66/16 | $\operatorname{timing}_{87 / 19}[2] 7 / 21$ | 103/16 157/10 | tweaked [1] 14 | 150/15 157/9 |
| 74/23 76/4 77/15 | TIMOTHY [1] $1 / 18$ | transf | 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 |
| $128 / 13128 / 13$ $129 / 7$ 129/18 | 15/21 16/24 17/7 | trial [49] 8/18 9/20 | 21/9 21/24 24/18 | undermine [1] |
| 135/21 | 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 | 50/14 51/3 51/12 | 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 | 53/22 58/12 59/7 | type [13] 10/11 | 70/8 108/19 109/12 |
| thus [3] 69 | 60/5 61/15 65/7 | 60/14 62/20 63/17 | 20/7 70/7 76/20 | 109/14 116/11 |
| 106 | 80/10 100/13 102/1 | 64/9 64/15 65/21 | 89/15 122/11 | 124/3 135/14 |
|  | 136/14 146/18 | 66/6 66/13 72/24 | 122/11 130/25 | 138/10 139/17 |
| ties [1] 15/17 | told [3] 63/ | 72/25 119/8 124/20 | 131/1 141/11 | 148/8 149/18 |
| time [96] $4 / 20$ | 125/21 139/14 | 152/22 | 146/12 147/22 | 149/25 151/3 |
| 5/13 6/10 6/14 6/21 | tomorrow [1] | trials [2] 27/8 | 153/9 | 151/10 152/17 |
| 7/9 7/20 8/3 8/4 | 34/12 | 46/22 | types [4] 35/4 46/9 | 155/14 |
| 10/20 12/7 13/6 | too [18] 12/2 12/4 | tried [12] | 46/21 55/2 | understanding |
| 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 | 122/11 137/2 | nderstands [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 | od [4] |
| 43/21 47/6 48/1 | top [16] 23/13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { truly [4] } 12 / 635 / 2 \\ & 96 / 3124 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | typos [3] 149/10 | $\begin{aligned} & 30 / 258 / 17141 / 14 \\ & 152 / 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| 49/14 51/15 61/16 | $\begin{aligned} & 42 / 10127 / 22 \\ & 128 / 15128 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | 96/3 124/11 <br> trust [4] 4/21 | 153/18 154/17 | $\begin{aligned} & 152 / 6 \\ & \text { unfair [1] } 117 / 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| 62/5 65/3 65/6 | $\begin{array}{ll} 128 / 15 & 128 / 19 \\ 128 / 21 & 128 / 22 \end{array}$ | 13/23 94/14 139/3 | U | unique [5] 11/20 |
| 65/11 66/3 66/5 66/12 66/16 67/15 | 135/6 145/9 145/17 | truth [1] 94/6 | ultimate [4] 28/22 | 11/21 11/21 51/11 |
| 68/25 72/4 73/1 | 146/3 147/15 149/6 | try [18] 10/20 | 43/15 70/21 138/9 | 51/13 |
|  | 150/15 150/18 | 27/16 36/12 39/9 | ultimately [10] | United [2] 51/7 |
| 82/1 82/5 82/19 | 150/24 | 41/4 41/17 41/25 | 34/6 42/10 57/23 | 51/16 |
| 83/5 83/22 87/22 | topic [1] 89/19 | 43/10 43/22 53/5 | 58/13 70/3 73/6 | niverse [1] 133/4 |
| 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 | 139/5 152/13 | Um [2] 43/13 | nless [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 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { Um-hum [2] } 43 / 13 \\ 154 / 24 \end{array}$ | 79/4 105/20 |
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| U |  | voidable [1] 5 | wasn't [7] 7/3 | $80 / 17 \text { 81/14 82/5 }$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| unlike [1] 142/19 | 135/19 151/ | voir [1] 34/15 | 37/23 44/14 46/11 | 83/9 84/2 84/10 |
| unmanageable [1] | using [1] 136/13 <br> utilize [1] $84 / 2$ | W | 124/19 136/16 | 84/21 84/24 85/5 |
|  |  |  | waste [2] 27/4 |  |
| unnecessary [1] | V | waiting [2] 40/17 | [2] 27 | 98/11 104/1 104/8 |
|  | vacation [1] 88/19 | 72/11 | water [1] 17/2 | 104/11 105/4 |
| $13$ | valid [2] 136/10 | waive [1] 33/22 | way [41] $6 / 23$ 7/4 | 111/22 112/10 |
|  | 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 |
|  | 87/12 92/22 | 50/15 | 22/23 39/22 40/25 | 125/7 125/12 |
|  | various [1] 75/10 | waiver [12] 29/5 | 45/21 47/15 48/4 | 125/13 125/18 |
| 13/5 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 | /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 | 0/13 112/23 | 27/18 28/5 30/11 | 152/13 154/15 | 36/11 52/12 64/24 |
| 54/18 56/12 56/13 | vehicle [1] 98/4 | want [68] 5/7 5/7 | 154/19 | 71/22 77/20 79/19 |
| 60/14 61/8 64/23 | vendors [1] 113/ | 5/8 5/15 5/25 5/25 | ways [2] 102/16 | 84/22 84/24 85/2 |
| 78/8 85/10 93/16 | verify [1] 112/18 | 6/3 10/3 10/13 | 108/20 | 104/19 105/14 |
| 96/23 107/11 | 30/17 | 10/18 11/7 13/13 | we [335] | 105/14 109/1 |
| 111/15 111/16 | ] 154/25 | 14/3 16/11 28/6 | we'd [3] 9/5 12/23 | 110/16 110/20 |
| 115/14 117/22 | 1 22/9 | 34/16 34/21 | 94/22 | 113/19 126/3 |
| 118/21 124/10 | 54] $11 / 20$ | 52/23 56/10 58/6 | we'll [41] $8 / 18$ | 127/23 132/11 |
| 130/5 138/24 | 11/21 11/25 14/5 | 59/7 59/11 59/13 | 10/8 10/9 10/2 | WEDNESDAY [3] |
| 145/22 148/14 | 21/24 21/25 33/4 | 73/23 85/6 85/21 |  | 1/21 4/1 152/12 |
| 153/10 153/24 | 33/4 34/14 34/24 | 90/13 93/18 95/19 | 14/7 14/23 15/2 | 150/8 |
| 154/17 | 35/7 38/2 38/10 | 100/8 101/1 102/11 | 15/2 15/3 15/6 15/6 | weeks [6] 5/ |
| 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 |
| $1 / 2$ | 78/9 85/14 86/14 | 115/15 121/19 | 73/13 74/13 74/13 | well [47] $5 / 216 / 16$ |
| 143/1 151/14 | 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 |
| $155 / 15 \text { 156/9 }$ | 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 | $137 / 19144 / 12$ | 155/19 | 26/14 31/25 32/1 | 109/10 109/19 |
| use [13] 15/6 75/7 | vet [1] 52/19 | $60 / 1060 / 1263 / 8$ | 37/15 40/13 40/22 | $136 / 21139 / 18$ |
| 78/18 79/25 94/4 | vetted [1] 34/9 | 94/3 115/6 120/23 | $\begin{aligned} & 37 / 1540 / 1340 / 22 \\ & 41 / 2443 / 1747 / 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 136 / 21 & 139 / 18 \\ 140 / 21 & 141 / 25 \end{array}$ |
| 97/5 97/6 97/17 | VIA [1] $2 / 15$ | 141/18 154/19 | 49/1 55/19 57/25 | 144/4 |
| $117 / 23128 / 10$ | viable [1] 38/23 | wanting [1] | 58/10 58/12 59/14 | Wells [9] 105/12 |
| used [11] 23/3 | VICE [1] 2/12 | 141/14 | 60/3 60/4 61/12 | 05/21 106/2 107/7 |
|  | video [1] 132/7 | wants [6] 27/10 | 64/2 64/8 64/13 | 112/14 112/17 |
|  | Viet [1] 80/14 | 54/19 59/15 84/1 | 66/2 66/20 69/4 | 113/16 113/21 |
| 115/12 128/23 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { visit [1] } 70 / 12 \\ \text { void [2] } 27 / 1454 / 7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} 96 / 2129 / 7 \\ \text { was [166] } \end{array}$ | 70/8 71/9 71/13 | 123/17 |
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| W | 9/19 9/20 13/4 | 15 | 35/5 | 71/8 78/14 84/21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 18/17 21/21 26/6 | 36/4 36/18 38/5 | 36/22 38/2 38/3 | 92/13 95/14 102/22 |
| we | 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] | 77/24 81/17 91/22 | 110/16 119/11 | 97/17 97/17 97/25 | 96/20 125/18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { were } 21 / 1721 / 1823 / 11 \\ & 21 / 3 \end{aligned}$ | 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 | orry [3] 9/24 |
| 87/10 91/22 93/21 | 155/21 | 58/ | 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/ | 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] | 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 | $33 / 1833 / 2534 / 5$ | who's [4] 28/4 | win [3] 65/2 | 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] | 37/25 39/5 39/8 |
| 146/11 147/5 149/2 | 57/4 58/5 59/22 | whoever [1] 153 | winding [1] 20/11 | 41/23 41/23 41/24 |
| 156/20 157/8 | 63/24 65/8 66/1 | whole [13] 7/20 | winds [1] 44/1 | 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 | whose [1] 110/14 | 73/8 73/9 79/12 | 54/2 54/5 54/6 54/6 |
| 80/8 80/20 82/12 | 121/9 121/19 | why [51] 4/24 6/7 | 150/9 | 61/8 66/25 67/6 |
| 85/4 89/2 89/5 | 122/12 122/13 | 8/15 8/23 11/17 | without [14] 6/12 | 67/8 67/18 67/24 |
| 89/11 89/13 91/22 | 129/24 131/19 | 13/1 23/7 28/20 | 52/16 53/19 53/22 | 68/21 69/15 75/13 |
| 102/25 104/2 | 139/16 145/6 154/7 | 34/17 37/5 37/21 | 58/6 68/22 88/10 | 76/6 76/7 76/11 |
| what [168] | whereas [2] 19/14 | 40/14 41/16 43/3 | 99/25 108/21 124/4 | 78/8 78/25 83/24 |
| what's [16] | 38/9 | 43/17 44/2 48/6 | 126/3 140/14 | 86/13 87/11 87/12 |
| 39/9 41/8 42/7 | WHEREO | 52/10 52/13 52/18 | 143/17 144/9 | 87/22 87/25 88/16 |
| 42/12 46/3 51/13 | 157/13 | 53/17 57/12 62/1 | WITNESS [1] | 88/18 89/14 90/6 |
| 59/16 59/23 69/24 | whether [33] 29/3 | 63/21 65/10 67/24 | 157/13 | 90/7 90/9 90/10 |
| 87/6 89/7 89/22 | 34/7 42/21 44/5 | 81/21 83/11 86/9 | witnesses [2] | 90/16 91/2 91/2 |
| 95/22 119/12 13 | 44/12 52/4 52/5 | 86/10 87/7 87/7 | 73/15 73/16 | 91/22 92/21 93/2 |
| whatever [20] | 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 |
| 10/25 27/14 34/8 | 62/19 68/6 68/10 | 93/19 93/20 99/1 | 15/23 26/17 30/12 | 96/1 98/25 100/7 |
| 42/13 42/21 57/16 | 82/7 84/16 84/16 | 108/24 109/11 | 51/3 98/1 125/1 | 103/1 103/9 103/18 |
| 70/7 98/7 99/23 | 88/9 99/18 109/2 | 113/11 115/24 | 136/23 | 104/7 106/2 106/4 |
| 101/16 109/16 | 111/21 112/4 123/4 | 116/24 122/7 | wondering [2] | 106/4 106/7 107/1 |
| 109/20 113/1 | 128/9 130/16 | 124/24 128/19 | 99/23 114/23 | 108/3 108/4 109/3 |
| 113/23 117/14 | 130/22 132/20 | 137/4 141/13 | word [6] 94/17 | 109/10 113/9 114/3 |
| 142/1 144/25 | 136/13 136/13 | 141/18 151/3 | 138/14 138/15 | 4/3 124/10 127/6 |
| $153 / 10155 / 18$ | 138/4 138/5 142/16 | 153/22 | 153/7 153/14 | 127/8 130/24 131/2 |
| wheel [1] 14/ | $148 / 17 \text { 148/18 }$ which [42] 7/25 | WIGWAM [1] 2/5 will [57] 10/11 | $\begin{array}{ll} 153 / 16 \\ \text { work [21] } 9 / 8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} 134 / 20 & 135 / 7 \\ 143 / 21 & 143 / 23 \end{array}$ |
| when [54] 5/14 $5 / 167 / 87 / 117 / 12$ | $8 / 29 / 2310 / 21$ | $22 / 14 \text { 24/16 28/19 }$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { work [21] } 9 / 8 \\ 15 / 2040 / 147 / 15 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 143 / 21143 / 23 \\ & 143 / 24144 / 1 \end{aligned}$ |
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## RPLY

John P. Aldrich, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 6877
Catherine Hernandez, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 8410
Matthew B. Beckstead, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 14168
ALDRICH LAW FIRM, LTD.
7866 West Sahara Avenue
Las Vegas, NV 89117
Telephone: (702) 853-5490
Facsimile: (702) 227-1975
Attorneys for Plaintiff

## EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

FRONT SIGHT MANAGEMENT LLC, a Nevada Limited Liability Company,

Plaintiff,
vs.

LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT FUND LLC, a Nevada Limited Liability Company; et al.,

Defendants.

AND ALL RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.

COMES NOW Plaintiff FRONT SIGHT MANAGEMENT, LLC (‘Plaintiff' or 'Front Sight'), by and through its attorneys, John P. Aldrich, Esq., Catherine Hernandez, Esq., and Matthew B. Beckstead, Esq., of the Aldrich Law Firm, Ltd., and hereby submit its Reply to Opposition to Motion for Sanctions.

CASE NO.: A-18-781084-B DEPT NO.: 16

## REPLY TO OPPOSITION TO

 PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FORSANCTIONS

This Reply is made and based on the attached memorandum of points and authorities and supporting documentation, the papers and pleadings on file in this action, and any oral argument this Court may allow.

DATED this $18^{\text {th }}$ day of October, 2019.

ALDRICH LAW FIRM, LTD.<br>/s/ John P. Aldrich<br>John P. Aldrich, Esq.<br>Nevada Bar No. 6877<br>Catherine Hernandez, Esq.<br>Nevada Bar No. 8410<br>Matthew B. Beckstead, Esq.<br>Nevada Bar No. 14168<br>7866 West Sahara Avenue<br>Las Vegas, Nevada 89117<br>Telephone: (702) 853-5490<br>Facsimile: (702) 227-1975<br>Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counterdefendants

## MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

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.

In the Motion, Plaintiff:
...moves the Court for an order of sanctions against Defendant EB5 Impact Advisors LLC and its officers and members (collectively 'EB5IA') for Defendant 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.'

Plaintiff then requests the following relief:
[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 produced would support Front Sight's claims of fraud, misrepresentation, concealment, conversion, breach of contract, and civil conspiracy.

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 $\mathbf{\$ 1 4 4 , 5 7 4 . 2 7}$. 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, 1s. 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 not 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.
5. 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.
6. 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, $\underline{\text { a hotel receipt }}$ 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.
Separate amounts for charges such as lodging, meals, and telephone calls.
A restaurant receipt is enough to prove an expense for a business meal if it has all of the following information.

The name and location of the restaurant.
The number of people served.
The date and amount of the expense.
If a charge is made for items other than food and beverages, the receipt must show that this is the case.

Canceled check.
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 without other evidence to show that it was for a business purpose." (Emphasis in original.)
(Exhibit 4, pp. 4-5.)
After a brief reference to Mr. Dziubla's evidentiary hearing testimony, Mr. Winters
provides the following analysis:
In my opinion, EB5IA has produced documents to support $\$ 113,650.73$ of expenses.

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 WF bank statements that were not listed on Exhibit C.
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 $\$ 44,500$ was deposited into WF and that $\$ 76,850$ was paid out, for a net decrease of $\$ 32,550$.

The $\$ 76,850$ was paid to Kenworth Capital $\$ 56,975$; Legacy Realty Capital Inc. $\$ 17,875$; and Robert Dziubla $\$ 2,000$.
(Exhibit 4, p. 6.)
Finally, Mr. Winters provided the following opinion:

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 electronic backup 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 vague and ambiguous as to "backup;" it is burdensome, oppressive 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 trade secret, confidential, proprietary, commercially sensitive, or information that is protected by rights of privacy.
(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 not 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. Defendant Dziubla's Claim That Defendant EB5IA Had a Company Document Destruction Policy Is Bogus

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, 1s. 23-25; p. 51, 1. 1; p. 56, 1s. 4-7.) This alleged "policy" was nothing more than Defendant Dziubla's blatant and nefarious decision to destroy the evidence of fraud.

## 2. Defendants EB5IA and Dziubla Had Multiple Duties - Contractual, Common law, Statutory, and Regulatory - to Keep the Records Defendant Dziubla Tossed

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 reimburse 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 reimbursed at the time this Agreement terminates, the Company shall promptly reimburse 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 clear contractual duty 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, 1s. 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, 1s. 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 statutory 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 regulatory 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 ( $7^{\text {th }}$ 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, 1s. 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, 1s. 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 $\mathbf{\$ 1 4 4 , 5 7 4 . 2 7}$. 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.

## III.

## 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 $\mathbf{\$ 1 4 4 , 5 7 4 . 2 7}$.

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

DATED this $18^{\text {th }}$ day of October, 2019.
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