IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

NUVEDA, LLC, A NEVADA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY; SHANE M. Flectronically Filed TERRY, A NEVADA RESIDENT; AND JENNIFER M. GOL 7 11:29 a.m. NEVADA RESIDENT, Appellants, Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

v.

PEIMAN BADY; AND POUYA MOHAJER, Appellees.

Supreme Court Case No. 69648 District Court Case No. A-15-728510-B, Department XI (Elizabeth Gonzales)

JOINT APPENDIX VOLUME 6

ERIKA PIKE TURNER
Nevada Bar No. 6454
eturner@gtg.legal
DYLAN T. CICILIANO
Nevada Bar No. 12348
dciciliano@gtg.legal
650 White Drive, Suite 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
Tel: (725) 777-3000

Fax: (725) 777-3112 Attorneys for Appellant Shane Terry

Appendix

Description	Volume	Doc #s
Amended Notice of Appeal		JA001792- JA001796
Application for Order Shortening Time	1	JA000137- JA000142
Complaint	1	JA000001- JA000041
Defendant's Exhibit 101 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing		
Defendant's Exhibit 103 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	9	JA001542- JA001544
Defendant's Exhibit 104 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	9	JA001545- JA001550
Defendant's Exhibit 105 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	9 JA00155 JA00155	
Defendant's Exhibit 106 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	9	JA001553- JA001556
Defendant's Exhibit 107 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	In 107 to Preliminary Injunction 9 JA001 JA001	
Defendant's Exhibit 109 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	9	JA001560- JA001564
Defendant's Exhibit 111 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	9	JA001565- JA001569
Defendant's Exhibit 112 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	ibit 112 to Preliminary Injunction 9 JA001570- JA001574	
Defendant's Exhibit 113 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	- '	
Defendant's Exhibit 114 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	9	JA001578- JA001582

Description	Volume	Doc #s
Defendant's Exhibit 115 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		JA001590- JA001593
		JA001594- JA001599
Defendant's Exhibit 118 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	9	JA001600- JA001605
Defendant's Exhibit 119 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	9	JA001606- JA001609
Defendant's Exhibit 120 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	9	JA001610- JA001613
Defendant's Exhibit 121 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	9	JA001614- JA001634
Defendant's Exhibit 122 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	10	JA001635- JA001686
Defendant's Exhibit 123 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	10	JA001687- JA001735
Defendant's Exhibit 201 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	10	JA001736- JA001739
Defendant's Exhibit 202 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	10	JA001740
Defendant's Exhibit 203 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	10 JA001741 JA001756	
Defendant's Exhibit 204 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	ninary Injunction 10 JA001757	
Defendant's Exhibit 206 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	10 JA001758- JA001763	
Defendant's Exhibit 207A to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	10	JA001764- JA001765

Description	Volume	Doc #s
Defendant's Exhibit 208 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	10	JA001766
Defendant's Exhibit 209 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
* * *		JA001770- JA001774
Notice of Appeal	10 JA001775 JA001783	
Notice of Entry of Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law Denying Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction, Denying Defendant's Countermotion for Preliminary Injunction and Joinder, and Entering Provisional Remedy Pursuant to N.R.S. 38.222	10 JA001784 JA001791	
Notice of Entry of Order Shortening Time and Notice of Hearing	1 JA0001 JA0001	
Notice of Posting Bond	2 JA00031 JA00031	
Pejman Bady's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction and Application on Order Shortening Time and Countermotion for Preliminary Injunction	2 JA000151- JA000306	
Plaintiff's Exhibit 01 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	8 JA001185- JA001212	
Plaintiff's Exhibit 02 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	8 JA001213- JA001214	
Plaintiff's Exhibit 03 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	on 8 JA001215- JA001218	
Plaintiff's Exhibit 04 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	8 JA001219- JA001231	
Plaintiff's Exhibit 05 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	8 JA001232- JA001233	

Description	Volume	Doc #s
		JA001234- JA001236
Plaintiff's Exhibit 07 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing 8		JA001237- JA001241
		JA001242- JA001251
Plaintiff's Exhibit 13 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing		
		JA001256- JA001261
Plaintiff's Exhibit 15 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	on 8	
Plaintiff's Exhibit 16 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	inary Injunction 8 JA	
Plaintiff's Exhibit 17 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	8	JA001280- JA001283
Plaintiff's Exhibit 19 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	's Exhibit 19 to Preliminary Injunction 8	
Plaintiff's Exhibit 20 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	8	JA001287- JA001301
Plaintiff's Exhibit 21 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	Exhibit 21 to Preliminary Injunction 8	
Plaintiff's Exhibit 22 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	8 JA001300 JA001340	
Plaintiff's Exhibit 23 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing		
Plaintiff's Exhibit 24 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	8	JA001356- JA001406
Plaintiff's Exhibit 29 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	9 JA001407- JA001445	

Description	Volume Doc #s	
Plaintiff's Exhibit 30 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Plaintiff's Exhibit 31 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
Plaintiff's Exhibit 32 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
Plaintiff's Exhibit 33 to Preliminary Injunction Hearing	9	JA001500- JA001512
Plaintiff's Reply to Pejman Bady's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction and Opposition to Countermotion for Preliminary Injunction	3	JA000318- JA000454
Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction and Application on Order Shortening Time	1	JA000042- JA000136
Pouya Mohajer, MD's Joinder to Pejmon Bady's Countermotion for Preliminary Injunction	2	JA000307- JA000309
Pouya Mohajer, MD's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction and Application on Order Shortening Time	2	JA000310- JA000312
Pouya Mohajer's Supplemental Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction	3	JA000455- JA000464
Second Amended Notice of Appeal	10	JA001797- JA001808
Temporary Restraining Order	2 JA000313 JA000315	
Transcript of Proceedings Day 1	4 JA000465- JA000675	
Transcript of Proceedings Day 2	5 JA000676- JA000896	
Transcript of Proceedings Day 3	6 JA000897- JA000999	

Description	Volume	Doc #s
Transcript of Proceedings Day 4	7	JA001000- JA001184

Alun D. Column

CLERK OF THE COURT

DEPT. NO. XI

TRAN

DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
* * * * *

NUVEDA LLC, et al.

Plaintiffs . CASE NO. A-728510

VS.

PEJMAN BADY, et al. .

Defendants . Transcript of Proceedings

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELIZABETH GONZALEZ, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION HEARING - DAY 3

THURSDAY, JANUARY 7, 2016

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: ERIKA A. PIKE-TURNER, ESQ.

FOR THE DEFENDANTS: ALVIN W. MAUPIN, ESQ.

JOHN M. NAYLOR, ESQ,

VINCENT J. AIELLO III, ESQ. MATTHEW T. DUSHOFF, ESQ.

COURT RECORDER: TRANSCRIPTION BY:

JILL HAWKINS FLORENCE HOYT

District Court Las Vegas, Nevada 89146

Proceedings recorded by audio-visual recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, THURSDAY, JANUARY 7, 2016, 9:42 A.M. 1 (Court was called to order) 2 3 THE COURT: Mr. Maupin, do you have any additional evidence that you would like to present at this time? 4 5 MR. MAUPIN: I sure do. 6 THE COURT: You do? MR. MAUPIN: Yes, I do. Okay. 8 THE COURT: 9 MR. MAUPIN: We'll call Mr. Kennedy to the stand. Mr. Kennedy, if you'd come forward, 10 THE COURT: 11 please. And we're going to swear you in once you get up 12 there, sir. 13 JOSEPH E. KENNEDY, DEFENDANT MOHAJER'S WITNESS, SWORN 14 Thank you. Please state and spell your THE CLERK: 15 name for the record. Joseph E. Kennedy, J-O-S-E-P-H 16 THE WITNESS: 17 K-E-N-N-E-D-Y. Sir, you will notice there is water 18 THE COURT: there, there are M&Ms in the dispenser, and if you would like 19 some coffee, the marshal would be happy to help you with that. 20 21 Thank you, ma'am. THE WITNESS: 22 THE COURT: And since you're the witness, if at any 23 time you need to have a break to use the restroom or get up 24 and walk around, let me know, and we will be happy to take a 25 break for your convenience. The lawyers don't get that same

1	luxury.	
2		THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.
3		DIRECT EXAMINATION
4	BY MR. MA	UPIN:
5	Q	Good morning.
6	А	Good morning.
7	Q	If we could start with your description of your
8	position	with NuVeda.
9	А	I'm a 1 percent owner and member of the LLC.
10	Q	And what is your outside of NuVeda what's your
11	current o	ccupation?
12	А	I'm an industrial building developer and landlord.
13	Q	And what kind of a developer or what kind of
14	developme	ents are you involved in?
15	А	Mostly warehouses.
16	Q	What is the general value of this business?
17	А	About \$20 million.
18		THE COURT: And you're referring to his industrial
19	developme	ent business, not NuVeda?
20		MR. MAUPIN: Oh, absolutely.
21		THE COURT: I'm just making sure.
22	BY MR. MA	UPIN:
23	Q	How many investments in limited liability companies
24	have you	made over the course of your adult life?
25	А	Probably in the range of a hundred.

Q So you've been involved in very complex financing deals and property acquisitions and the like in your participation in these limited liability companies?

A I try to make them as less complex as I can, but sometimes they're more complex, yes.

Q You have been involved in a myriad of aspects of development, which would include financing, accounting, marketing, and all of that business?

A Absolutely.

Q Now, yesterday Mr. Terry testified that Pej has an option to repurchase 50 percent of the 2113 limited liability company for a dollar. Did you hear that -- well, you weren't here to hear the testimony. But is that true?

A Well, it was true at one time. That was because we thought that Pej was going to be responsible for 50 percent of the financing of 2113 for the two properties for NuVeda. But what happened was that the bank decided that they couldn't be involved because it was a medical marijuana business, and I pledged properties that my wife and I own, and we've paid -- and so when we -- when we paid off all of the loans outstanding and made new loans for the NuVeda properties, Pej -- we rescinded that agreement. And that was in August.

Q Of?

A of 2015.

Q Now, are you presently enrolled as an -- are you

presently an enrolled IRS agent?

A I am.

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q What does that mean?
- A That means that I'm admitted to defend for audits and before the IRS in tax court and in Federal District Court.
- Q And what kind of background in tax do you need to be an enrolled agent?
 - A You need to pass a series of examinations.
- Q What are those examinations like? What do they entail?
- A Well, they entail a knowledge of the Tax Code for personal -- there are three sections. There's the personal tax returns, the business tax returns, and the ethics section.
 - Q And how long have you served in that capacity?
- 15 A About five years.
 - Q Now, you issued the K-1s on the loss allocations for NuVeda that they've been talking about; correct?
 - A The K-1 is part of a 1065 return, yes.
 - Q And what's a 1065 return?
 - A It's an informational return for an LLC that -- or general partnership that advises the IRS on the financial activities of the LLC or partnership and then allocates the profits or losses to the members.
 - Q All right. Now, there was an allocation of loss shifted from Dr. Mohajer to Dr. Bady; correct?

- A No. That's not exactly --
- Q All right.

- A It may have been in that result, but that's not how it was calculated.
 - Q All right. So how did that come about?
- A Initially this was the first time that NuVeda was filing a tax return, the 2014 tax year.
- THE COURT: So it was the first return being filed by the business?
- 10 THE WITNESS: It was.
- 11 THE COURT: Okay.
 - THE WITNESS: And so some decisions had to be made when the return was being prepared. So I met with the bookkeeper for NuVeda, and the first thing we did was tie the records to cash. Which means that we took the transactions and we took each of the bank statements and made sure that all the transactions were accounted for. Then we made the decision that the company would be on a cash basis, as opposed to being on an accrual or hybrid basis. I would say 90 percent of the LLCs that I've ever seen were on a cash basis, so it was pretty typical.
 - Then the question became, because the company had zero income and huge loses, how would we allocate those losses. On the 1065 form there are three lines for members' percentages. One line is for their equity percentage, one

line is for their profit percentage, and one line is for their loss percentage. And these lines are typically dynamic. They will change over the years as the returns are filed. But on the initial return the decision was made -- and I did poll the appropriate members, being Dr. Bady, Dr. Mohajer, and Shane Terry, and the decision was made that there would be an allocation only to those who contributed to the loss on a cash basis. So most of the members received --

BY MR. MAUPIN:

- Q What do you mean by contributed to the loss?
- A They paid -- they paid into the company the cash that was then used to finance these losses.
 - Q All right. So go ahead the rest of the answer.
- A So initially I was told to do it 40 percent for Dr. Mohajer, 40 percent for Dr. Bady, and 20 percent for Mr. Terry. I issued the 1065, I filed it with the IRS, and about a month later Dr. Mohajer came back and said, I didn't make -- that cash contribution wasn't mine so I want the 1065 amended to reflect that I didn't make the cash contribution, that somebody else did.
- So I spoke with Dr. Bady and Shane Terry. Shane
 Terry said that he was comfortable with his allocation of
 20 percent, and so I allocated 80 percent to Dr. Bady and zero
 percent to Dr. Mohajer, and then refiled an amended return
 without altering the 1065 itself, only -- the only changes

1 were on the K-1s. So, again, why is it that Dr. Mohajer felt that he 2 had to reallocate his -- or shift his loss over to Dr. Bady or anyone else in the company? 5 MS. PIKE-TURNER: Objection. Hearsay and calls for speculation. 6 7 THE COURT: Sustained. MR. MAUPIN: I'm sorry? 8 Sustained. It calls for speculation. 9 THE COURT: 10 BY MR. MAUPIN: Well, you were -- what were your instructions from 11 Q Dr. Mohajer? 12 13 MS. PIKE-TURNER: Objection. Hearsay. 14 THE COURT: Overruled. My instructions were that he didn't 15 THE WITNESS: contribute the cash so he wanted a new K-1 that gave him zero 16 percent of the loss. 17 18 BY MR. MAUPIN: What was his concern that led him to do that? 19 Q I think he was getting ready to prepare his taxes 20 Α and he looked at -- he finally looked at the K-1, which is 21 sort of difficult, and realized that it was showing a loss 22 23 that he hadn't actually financed himself. 24 So with all of this in hand, there's also been Q

testimony about how complex the rules regarding these

allocations are. Are they complex?

A Well, there are certain decisions that have to be made. It's like a pathway where you make decisions as you're going down them. You have several options. One of them is you can simply allocate based on the percentage of interest in the LLC, and the other is that you can allocate based on cash contributions that were made. The reason that those --

Q But the allocations based on interest is in the operating agreement, and that's one formula for allocating the losses; is that correct?

A That's a potential formula which we decided not to follow in this case. Because once a 1065 is issued, that's it for the year. It's not like a corporation where the losses carry over year to year. So in this case it was decided it would be much better to allocate them to the people who actually contributed to those losses, because the cash was gone. And the losses had been incurred by the LLC and it made a lot more sense than giving losses to people who never contributed anything to it.

Q Now, as an enrolled agent is it -- would it be reasonable for Dr. Mohajer to make this request based upon his own concerns about his tax liability?

A Well, just as an individual if he didn't think it was right he had an obligation to request a change.

Q So this grandiose claim of tax fraud that's been

made in the courtroom here, and it has been made, is this tax fraud in any respect? MS. PIKE-TURNER: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion. Lack of foundation. 4 5 THE COURT: Overruled. 6 THE WITNESS: No. BY MR. MAUPIN: And why is that? 8 0 Because the losses that were reported to the 9 Α Internal Revenue Service were correct, they were tied to cash, 10 and the allocation of the losses was something that was a 11 decision for the members to make. And when they decided on 12 13 distributing them by the cash basis we simply followed what 14 the rules are. 15 Are you familiar with Section 5.1 of the operating Q agreement of NuVeda? 16 17 Α No. 18 All right. I think it's in front of you right Q It's Exhibit 1 I think in the black --19 You want to go in the black book to 20 THE COURT: 21 Exhibit 1. 22 5.1, yes. THE WITNESS: 23 BY MR. MAUPIN: 24 That talks about the allocation of losses; Right. Q 25

correct?

A It does, apparently.

- Q And could you read it into the record, please.
- A "Subject to the applicable law and any limitations elsewhere in this agreement, profits and losses after deducting guaranteed payments shall be allocated amongst members in proportion to their percentage ownership interest."
 - Q Is there anything else that it says?
- A "Any special allocations necessary to comply with the requirements set forth in Internal Revenue Code Section 704 and the corresponding regulations, including, without limitation, the qualified income offset and minimum gain chargeback provisions contained therein, shall be made if the voting members deem these actions to be appropriate.
- Q Do you have an opinion as to whether or not the allocation of losses in this case complies with that provision in the IRS Code?
 - A I believe -- oh, it certainly does.
- Q Now, predictably, Mr. Terry has indicated that you are not a vested member. Is that correct?
- A I was present at a meeting where my vesting was approved. I gave a \$10 million line of credit note to the corporation which was never exercised but was used for the application process. And --
- Q Relied upon for the application process?
- 25 A Yes.

And why did they need to do that? 1 Q They had to show the capital ability to develop the 2 Α 3 dispensaries and cultivation and production facilities. All right. So the issuance of this credit -- of Q 5 course, the agreement says 3 million, but you put in ten? What happened was I met with Jennifer Goldstein on 6 Α this as the application process was going on. We calculated what the net worth -- the free net worth of the buildings that I owned, and then we multiplied by 70 percent and came up with 10 million. 10 All right. 11 Q (Pause in the proceedings) 12 13 BY MR. MAUPIN: So when did that happen? 14 0 15 That happened during the application process in Α either 2014 or 2015. 16 17 All right. So was there any objection -- after you Q 18 put this -- issued this credit to the company was there any objection to it? 19 20 Α No. You're referring to the line of credit? 21 THE COURT:

23 BY MR. MAUPIN:

22

24

25

Q Was there any objection to it?

MR. MAUPIN:

A No.

Line of credit, yeah.

Were you -- was eventually a vote taken to make you 1 Q a vested member? 2 3 Yes. Α And what was that vote? 0 5 It was -- everybody was in favor. Α Did Mr. -- Mr. Terry was the CEO at that point, 6 Q wasn't he? He could have been the COO or the CEO at that time. 8 I don't know. And Ms. Goldstein was also the general counsel at 10 0 the time? 11 12 She was. Α But, consistent with their poor recordkeeping, they 13 Q didn't sign some sort of resolution; is that correct? 14 15 I have been to several meetings since, and I always Α had my voting share at the meeting. Nobody ever contested it. 16 17 So your vesting is that you provided the line of Q 18 credit, they accepted it, and then they used it in the application process? 19 They did. 20 Α 21 And again, when did this happen? Q 22 2014. Α 23 Did Mr. Terry himself at any meeting in which you in Q 24 attendance ever object to your participation as a voting 25 member?

1 Α No. 2 Have you ever heard him do that until he was in Q 3 court the other day? 4 Α No. 5 MR. MAUPIN: Can I have 201. (Pause in the proceedings) 6 7 BY MR. MAUPIN: 8 Can you look at 201 in the white binder. Q 9 Α Yes. And if you'll look at the top of this, it's an 10 Q email, isn't it? 11 12 Yes. Α 13 And the subject is you; right? Q 14 Well, it's vesting of me, yes. Α 15 Right. On page 2 of this exhibit there is a --Q there's language or a statement to this effect. 16 "As we finalize the application --" 17 And that's the middle paragraph? 18 THE COURT: MR. MAUPIN: I'm sorry? 19 The middle paragraph? 20 THE COURT: 21 MR. MAUPIN: Right. 22 Okay. Thank you. THE COURT: 23 The second full paragraph. MR. MAUPIN: 24 BY MR. MAUPIN: 25 "As we finalize the applications Team Ivey expressed

some hesitation to show the full 10 million previously discussed. With Mr. Kennedy's financials we were able to get through the application by only showing Phil's 1.9 million in liquid assets which we referenced in the letter of commitment as the Ivey credit line. As stated in the August 17, 2014, letter, the equity position was offered in exchange on Phil's providing a line of credit, with terms to be negotiated subsequently. I know that we're being artful with the drafting of the letter to fulfill State requirements and actual percentages, LOCs, and equity offering were expected to change, but this was all in the context of our collective expectation of a more comprehensive investment and equity position as long as NuVeda provided favorable terms."

So at this point -- at this point, according to this section here, it is clear that they had obtained a benefit, a substantial benefit from your line of credit; is that correct?

A That's correct.

Q All right. There was some discussion about the 2113 lease during this trial, and you weren't present for a good part of it. But, according to Mr. Terry, the options to purchase the two 2113 properties gave them an option to purchase the property at cost plus 10 percent on execution of these leases, that is, in the first year. Is that testimony correct?

A It's incorrect.

Q And why is it incorrect?

A The option to purchase the two properties was at actual cost for the first year. For the second year we added a premium of 10 percent because all of us envisioned NuVeda being able to purchase the properties during the first year.

Q All right. Do you know anything about the Golpa loan?

A I know that it exists.

Q But beyond that do you know any of the dynamics that led to it or any of that?

A I don't really.

Q Same with the Dr. Bahri loans?

A Just know about the loans. I don't know the dynamics.

Q But did NuVeda ever issue ownership interests to Doctors Golpa and Dr. Bahri at any time?

A No.

Q And one of the most serious allegations in this case is that they issued stock to these people without -- or membership interests without telling anybody. Is that true?

A No.

Q And the reason it's not true is because they never got any ownership interest, did they?

A It's similar to every other deal. There is a pledge that if they make an investment that there will be ownership

interest when the State allows it. And it's the same as it is for other -- all of the other investors. Nobody would put in money without getting some interest for it.

Q Now, again, the 2113 transaction is also a major issue for the plaintiffs in this case, saying that this was an example of self dealing and fraud. Can you explain the 2113 transaction.

A On December 23rd, 2014, I got a call from Dr. Bady, and he said that the financing for the purchase of the North Las Vegas property had fallen through and that he was accumulating as much cash as he could to pay for the \$2.5 million that would be required and he would need my help.

So he accumulated by borrowing and drawing down his lines of credit about 2 million, and I contributed a half a million. And we did that in six days, and we closed the deal on the North Las Vegas property for 2.5 million.

Q Why was this necessary, though? Why didn't NuVeda close on the deal itself?

A Well, NuVeda didn't have the financing to do it. The financing that they had intended to use had fallen through. And I was very hesitant to participate, because the value was not in the property, which is what I'm normally accustomed to deal with. The value was in the potential license, which was supported subsequently by an appraisal of about 350,000 for the property for which we paid 2.5 million.

But the license, the dispensary license that came with it was worth about 2.15 million, according to the members of NuVeda.

Q So this just isn't some sort of silly, thoughtless overpayment for a substandard piece of property, is it?

A Well, if you ask my wife, she would tell you it was. But seriously --

- Q Well, the pictures would suggest so, but it has some other intrinsic value to it.
 - A No. And the license went to NuVeda.
- Q Now -- so how was this going -- so there's a resolution that allowed Dr. Mohajer to close the deal, signed by Ms. Goldstein, that's in evidence. Did he -- while this is all going on was he the only person in town?
 - A I was here.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

19

20

- Q Yeah. But Dr. Bady and --
- 16 A And Mr. Terry.
- 17 Q -- and Mr. Terry were in -- on vacation off the 18 continent.
 - A They were.
 - Q And so why did they assign Dr. Mohajer to do this?
- A I believe Ms. Goldstein was also out of town. I
 don't know that, but I believe so.
 - Q But it was DocuSign?
- 24 A Yes. Which you could remotely.
- 25 Q Right. But is Dr. Mohajer normally in the business

side of all this?

A No.

Q And is he more of a passive investor in this in terms of the operation of the company?

A Yes, he's passive.

Q But he is consulted and he's entitled to make decisions; correct?

A Yes.

Q And he's entitled to disagree with Mr. Terry even though -- with regard to some sort of proposal that affected the company?

A Yes.

Q Just like anybody else in the company.

A Exactly.

Q Did Mr. Terry have some sort of written authority to make determinations about the -- about the business and then if somebody else didn't agree with him, he could expel them?

A I don't think that's allowed.

Q Now, did -- was Mr. Terry and Ms. Goldstein kept in the dark about this transaction where 2113 LLC ended up closing the deal for itself and leased it back to the company?

A The genesis of that was that we had an arrangement with a bank. Okay. First of all, as I testified, we draw down all of our lines of credit to make the cash payment to the City of North Las Vegas.

THE COURT: Individual lines of credit, your own?

THE WITNESS: My own --

THE COURT: Okay.

THE WITNESS: -- and Dr. Bady's.

BY MR. MAUPIN:

Q But that didn't come out of the 10 million?

A No.

Q All right. Go ahead.

A So we were looking -- we were talking to the bank about making a long-term financing package because all of these funds had to be repaid in relatively short period of time. So the bank said, we will not be able to lend to NuVeda because NuVeda is in the marijuana business and the federal banking regulations prohibit us from lending, so you will have to make a separate entity to take the long-term loans.

So, being a prudent step, we created 2113 Investors, put the properties into the name of 2113 Investors -- when we subsequently bought the Third Street property we also put that on -- and looked to the bank for financing. And the bank said at the time they thought that they could lend on the two properties. So Dr. Bady and I would guarantee it personally, and we would borrow against the two properties. But ultimately the bank said, well, since the properties are going to be used in the medical marijuana business, we will not be able to lend to you on those properties. So then our question

was, well, how can we get long-term financing. And they said, you're going to have to pledge other properties.

Well, I was the person who had other properties, so I pledged my Las Vegas properties, my California properties, and I got financing to pay back the lines of credit. And then Pej Bady, who had been intended to be a part of the 2113 Investors as a guarantor would no longer have a role. So he reconveyed any interest that he had or any options that he had to me, and I'm now the -- my wife and I are the only members of the 2113 Investors.

Q Right. And so your company is the lessor to NuVeda of these properties.

A And this was supposed to be a short-term solution, because we wanted them to buy back the properties. The whole purpose of this was to facilitate NuVeda getting the properties. They still to this day have the option to buy the properties at cost.

Q But, unlike the testimony earlier in this case, the -- during the first year they could have purchased it at cost.

A We're still in the first year, Counselor. And that's why I say at this moment they could still it at cost.

Q Could buy it for cost?

A Yes, sir.

Q Now, when did you close the NuVeda deal or the property purchase of the 2113 properties?

A Well, the first one was on December 30th of 2014, and the second one was February of 2015.

Q And when did -- was Dr. Bady removed as a participant in that company?

A In August of 2015.

1

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Were there any Secretary of State filings between then and now that would suggest that Dr. Bady was still a member and had a position in the company?

A In February we filed a new list of members which only included my wife and myself.

Q So the sale closed in late December, and Dr. Bady was out of this arrangement as of say February the 24th?

A Well, he wasn't completely out. He had an option, if was going to be a guarantor on the new financing, to be a member again.

Q All right. Does the operating agreement -- I'm referring to 4.1 in the black folder.

A Yes.

Q And does that provision allow members to loan money to the company and lease property to the company under proper terms?

A Yes.

Q Does it allow the company to pay those loans back and pay lease payments?

A Yes.

- And was Mr. Terry advised of all this as it was 1 Q going on? 2 Advised of all of what? 3 Α When it became apparent that they couldn't borrow --5 NuVeda couldn't borrow the money because of the banking regulations and you had to take this other step to acquire the 6 property or lose it --8 That's true, isn't it? 9 That's true. Α Was Mr. Terry aware of this problem? 10 Q I don't know. 11 Α And but this was a matter of some urgency, wasn't 12 Q 13 it? 14 Yes. Α 15 And why is that? Q Because we had to close by December 31st. 16 Α closed one day early. 17 18 But do you know if Ms. Goldstein -- did you guys try to go around Ms. Goldstein to keep her from disapproving this? 19 Dr. Mohajer had the resolution to act for the LLC, 20 Α So we took that authority as our permission to 21 for NuVeda.
- Q And do you have that resolution in front of you?

proceed with the -- with his consent to proceed with the

25 A It's somewhere in here. I don't know where.

22

23

changes.

(Pause in the proceedings) 1 35. 2 MR. MAUPIN: 3 MS. PIKE-TURNER: 35 is the purchase and sale agreement, Your Honor. 4 5 I'm sorry. I had it yesterday. THE COURT: Oh. We had it in the 200 series. 6 MR. AIELLO: I believe 7 it's 206. 8 MS. PIKE-TURNER: 204. It should be loose there in the 9 THE COURT: 204. book, sir. 10 THE WITNESS: 11 Yes. 12 BY MR. MAUPIN: In the third full paragraph it says, "Now therefore 13 Q it is resolved that all actions by the majority vote of the 14 15 voting members of the company in connection with the acquisition of the property under the agreement, including, 16 but not limited to, the execution of necessary escrow and 17 18 sales agreements on behalf of the company, and to make all financial arrangements necessary and proper to purchase the 19 property, to include making payment of 2,501,026 purchase 20 price be and the same hereby are ratified, approved, and 21 22 confirmed in all respects as being in the best interests of the company and its members." Is that what it says? 23 24 It is. Α 25 Does it happen to have Jennifer Goldstein's DocuSign

signature on it? 1 2 It does. Α Now, how did this benefit this company? 3 Q The property itself was only worth about \$350,000. 4 Α 5 NuVeda got the dispensary license. And if you do the arithmetic, 2.5 million minus 350,000 means that the company 6 got an asset worth 2.15 million. And an option to buy it. 8 0 And an option to buy the property itself. 9 Α Is this an interception of a NuVeda corporate 10 Q opportunity? 11 12 Oh, clearly not. 13 And in fact they can buy the property from you for Q what you paid for it? 14 15 Exactly. Α And again, NuVeda couldn't close in its own name 16 Q because when they tried to get financing the bank balked 17 18 because of federal regulations that prohibit loans to marijuana operation? 19 That wasn't the reason. 20 The reason was their Α No. financing fell through. 21 22 It fell through. So it was the second Q

Yeah. During our efforts to salvage the deal.

financing that encountered difficulties because of the federal

23

24

25

rule -- banking rules?

Α

- All right. Now, has there ever been, to your Q knowledge, any resolutions within this company, NuVeda, changing the original percentages? Not to my knowledge. 5 And are there any provisions in this operating Q agreement that you are aware of that expressly allow removal 6 of members without notice? There's a -- in the operating agreement there's an 8 expulsion paragraph. Right. And is there anything in that agreement that 10 provides for expulsion without some sort of notice that expulsion is somehow agendized before some members of the 12 company or at a formal meeting? 13 14 Α No.
 - Does this operating agreement provide for Q forfeitures of majority members by a minority member?

17 Α No.

1

2

11

15

16

18

19

20

21

- Now, talked about the Ivey investment and the Q allegations that Dr. Bady somehow ruined it or sabotaged it or whatever. Did he ruin the Ivey investment?
 - I went to a luncheon and --
 - Well, the answer is yes or not. Q
- 23 Α No.
- All right. And so how do you know that? 24 Q
- 25 I went to a luncheon and met with the financial Α

```
advisor for Phil Ivey, who told me that Phil Ivey was engaged
 1
    in two pieces of --
 3
              MS. PIKE-TURNER:
                                We have a hearsay --
              THE COURT: You've got to make the objection.
 4
                                                               You
 5
    can't just look at me.
              Sustained.
 6
    BY MR. MAUPIN:
                          Did Dr. Bady sabotage this agreement?
 8
              Sustained.
         Q
              Sabotage? I'm sorry.
 9
         Α
              The Ivey agreement.
10
         Q
              I still didn't hear the question.
11
         Α
12
              Did he sabotage the Ivey agreement?
         Q
              No, he did not.
13
         Α
                          And this is Phil Ivey the poker player;
14
              THE COURT:
15
    right?
16
              MR. MAUPIN: Correct.
17
              THE COURT:
                           Okay.
18
    BY MR. MAUPIN:
              Now, what was the Ivey agreement?
19
         Q
              The Ivey agreement was that Phil Ivey would invest
20
         Α
    up to $10 million for a percentage interest in NuVeda. A
21
    portion of it would be capital contribution, and a portion of
22
23
    it would be loans.
24
              Did he ever come through with that?
         Q
25
              He did not.
         Α
```

Why is that? 1 Q MS. PIKE-TURNER: Objection to the extent it calls 2 3 for hearsay. And I also don't want you to speculate. 4 THE COURT: 5 BY MR. MAUPIN: Well, do you know why? 6 Q 7 Because he had other demands on his capital. Α At least that's what he said? 8 Q MS. PIKE-TURNER: Your Honor, I move to strike. 9 THE COURT: 10 Sustained. MR. MAUPIN: No, it's not offered for the truth of 11 12 the matter. It's just offered here that he said it. 13 THE COURT: Well, but that is the truth of the 14 matter. 15 MR. MAUPIN: Well, there's the old problem with 16 the --I know. I had that discussion this 17 THE COURT: 18 morning with some other lawyers. MR. MAUPIN: All right. Well, let's look at it this 19 way. It's hearsay. It's the hearsay exception. He was 20 there, it's inherently reliable, and there is no jury present. 21 22 MS. PIKE-TURNER: Your Honor, that's not a 23 recognizable exception to hearsay. 24 THE COURT: Actually, it is. I have to make a 25 determination as to the reliability in making the assessment

as to whether to allow it in. But I don't think it's reliable. So --MR. MAUPIN: You don't think that what he is saying 3 is reliable 4 5 THE COURT: I don't think what Mr. Ivey may have told him is necessarily reliable. 6 7 MR. MAUPIN: Well, you know something, I can live with that. All right. 8 BY MR. MAUPIN: So what was Dr. Bady supposed to have done to 10 Q sabotage this agreement? 11 MS. PIKE-TURNER: Objection. Calls for speculation. 12 13 THE COURT: Overruled. I have no idea. 14 THE WITNESS: 15 BY MR. MAUPIN: And did Dr. Bady ever tell you about any of this? 16 Q I mean, we discussed the Phil Ivey deal. 17 Α 18 What did he tell you? Q He just told me that Phil Ivey wasn't going to be 19 Α able to do the investment and we were going to have to look 20 for new investors. 21 22 Did Shane and Pej disagree at times over proposed 23 investors? 24 Not in front of me. Α 25 Did Dr. Bady -- was there anything in this that said Q

that he couldn't disagree with anyone in the company about potential investors or the vision of the company, for example? 3 Everybody has a right to disagree. Α That's right. Now, going to the Daniels deal. Αt 5 first it was Mr. Terry's testimony that it fell through because Daniels -- Dr. Daniels objected during his due 6 diligence to the 2113 arrangement because Dr. Bady was involved in it. Is that why -- were you aware of anything 8 like that in terms of why Dr. Daniels backed out? MS. PIKE-TURNER: Objection. Misstates prior 10 testimony. It was 2113 and 2Prime. 11 Overruled. 12 THE COURT: MR. MAUPIN: Well, there's -- I'm talking about the 13 14 first --15 Overruled. Let's not argue. THE COURT: Wait. Let's let the witness answer. He either knows or he doesn't 16 17 know. 18 BY MR. MAUPIN: Go ahead. 19 Q Repeat the question, please. I want to make sure --20 Α Did Dr. Daniels back out of the deal 21 All right. Q 22 because he didn't like the fact that Dr. Bady was a member of 23 the landlord? 24 No. Α 25 Why did he back out? Q

- A He backed out because he wanted to have control, veto power over the expenditures of the capital that he contributed and any future capital that was contributed. He wanted to be able to determine how that money would be spent.
 - Q And was anybody in NuVeda hot for that?
- A I don't know.
 - Q Were you willing to sign onto an agreement like that?
- 9 | A I was.

1

2

5

6

7

- 10 Q You were?
- 11 A I was. But I'm only 1 percent.
- 12 Q Ah. But there's a series of emails that went back
 13 and forth that we could show you, but there's -- the question
 14 is at the time of the Daniels due diligence was Dr. Bady a
 15 member of 2113 Investors.
- 16 A No.
- 17 Q And that had happened back in February?
- 18 A He was no longer a member after February something.
- 19 Q Never a member --
- 20 A Never what?
- 21 Q -- after that?
- 22 A After that, no.
- Q And does the operating agreement, again, allow members to lease property to the company and lend money to them?

1 Α Yes. And you're referring to the NuVeda 2 THE COURT: 3 operating agreement? I'm sorry. Yes, the NuVeda operating 4 MR. MAUPIN: 5 agreement. It does. 6 THE WITNESS: BY MR. MAUPIN: So just to be clear, Dr. Bady was out of 2113 at the 8 time of the Daniels due diligence? Presuming it was after February, yes. 10 Α And you've already told us how the deal was financed 11 Q and the process of the financing. So we can move on now to 12 13 CW arrangement. 14 Okay. Α 15 Are you familiar with it? Q 16 Α I am. Did you approve of it? 17 Q 18 I did. Α And what is the status of this agreement? 19 Q 20 There was a letter of intent and a meeting took Α place to finalize it and place it into a purchase sale 21 22 agreement which was renamed a membership sale agreement. And 23 the agreement was signed by Dr. Bady, Dr. Mohajer, and myself. 24 Now, are you familiar with the 4Front letter of Q 25 intent proposed? I guess there's two letters of intent at

this point.

- A I am.
- Q And what is the status of that proposal?
- A It has not been accepted.
- Q Now, why would you favor one of these agreements over another?

A The biggest problem with these agreements are debt service. The 4Front agreement makes no capital contribution, but requires repayment of loans with substantial interest rates. And if the loans aren't repaid, then the forfeiture of the assets of the LLC take place.

The CW deal requires no -- has no loans associated with it, requires investment by CW, and ultimately results in an income stream to NuVeda that -- without the risk of putting the company up if it doesn't meet the requirements.

Additionally, it has performance requirements on CW. And if CW doesn't meet those performance requirements, they have to fund the deficiency of the consequences of not meeting those performance requirements.

- Q Why does NuVeda need an agreement like this at this point?
- A At this point NuVeda only has -- has no tangible assets except the licenses. And it has significant debt, and there have not been any proposals that would fund the company moving forward, with the exception -- so that's why it would

be a good idea for them to partner up with somebody like CW, who already has operating cultivation centers and operating dispensaries.

- Q What is the main concern you have with the 4Front LOI in terms of the ability to go forward after the initial financing?
 - A Debt service.

- Q And again, what is the concern with that?
- A Well, there's no -- there's no requirement for performance on 4Front. So if the schedule for starting to market and -- starting to bring to market all of the plans that they have are delayed, the adverse consequences of that fall on NuVeda, not on 4Front.
- Q All right. How would it -- based upon what you know from the 4Front LOI, how long would it take them to get up into a position where the financing was in place and they were starting to build out infrastructure?
- A There's no specified time, but my guess would be that it would be a substantial period of time.
- Q Would it mean -- could all this be done by the current deadlines that have been set for the infrastructure being in place and operation?
- A Well, there's a due diligence period of one month from the time that the agreement's finalized. So just taking that -- we're now in January. Taking that one month, the

construction estimates on Third Street are that if we started today we'll have a very difficult time being finished in April.

Q All right. Now, there's a Website that the State came out with that says, well, we may not -- we might not enforce these deadlines if everybody is in good faith moving forward with their infrastructure and that sort of thing. Is that an official movement of the deadlines for these infrastructures to be placed?

A No, it's not.

Q It's just a statement that they're going to at least look at these infrastructures and see how it's coming?

MS. PIKE-TURNER: Objection, Your Honor. This misstates the missive from the government and calls for speculation.

THE COURT: Overruled. You can answer, sir.

THE WITNESS: I think that if you have -- you're in the final stages of construction or you have made substantial progress on it that it would be reasonable for the State and the local entity, the local government to extend it.

21 BY MR. MAUPIN:

Q But that's the trick. The word is "substantial," and there's -- that subsumes good faith. That's not a -- that's not a guarantee, that's a subjective analysis, isn't it?

Yes, it is. 1 Α

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

12

13

15

16

18

21

22

24

- Does the CW agreement purport to sell membership Q interests in NuVeda?
 - Α No.
 - And why is that? Q
 - Because NuVeda will be transferring to its Α subsidiary LLCs to a new entity called CW NV. And CW NV will be owned 35 percent by NuVeda and 65 percent by CW.
- Okay. So this isn't a sale of interests, membership Q interests, but it's an asset purchase arrangement; correct?
- Correct. 11 Α
 - And this agreement was approved by a vote of you, Q Dr. Bady, and Dr. Mohajer; correct?
- 14 Correct. Α
 - That's more than 60 percent of the membership Q interests?
- According to the operating agreement, yes. 17 Α
 - Now, does the CW agreement benefit all the members? Q
- I believe so. If it benefits one, it should benefit 19 Α all. 20
 - And a lot of that is that the company needs this Q agreement, doesn't it, in order to get operational?
- 23 I believe with the position we're in timewise it's the only option that will allow the company to reach the goals of getting to market and retaining their licenses.

- Q Where would the CW agreement leave CW and NuVeda in terms of their position in the Nevada medicinal marijuana industry?
- A They probably will have the most -- the largest presence.
- Q Now, do you have any comments about the testimony you've heard from Mr. Terry while you were -- before you were excluded from the courtroom?
 - A I don't know quite how to answer that question.
 - Q Pick your two best.
 - A Well, there are a couple of issues.
- MS. PIKE-TURNER: Your Honor --
- THE COURT: And your objection is?
- MS. PIKE-TURNER: -- objection. Calls for a narrative.
 - THE COURT: Overruled. So, sir, I gather he is asking you if you disagree with anything Mr. Terry stated during the testimony you actually heard.
- 19 BY MR. MAUPIN:

1

2

5

6

8

9

10

11

16

17

18

22

23

24

- Q Rather than to go through the myriad statements that he made, we're only asking for two.
 - A Well, the first thing is that the 2113 building on Third Street, Mr. Terry signed as the owner of the property an agreement, and the building was destroyed during the construction process, which the first time I heard about it

was when the building was already on the ground, completely destroyed.

The second thing is that he said that the efforts have been made to get the dispensaries going. But actually no progress has been made in all these months, and the North Las Vegas facility has been totally ignored. So I didn't -- I don't think that the best efforts were made, although he characterized it as having tried.

Q And what has his success been in raising money for the company?

A Well, the only money that has come into this company has come through Dr. Bady. If you're talking about NuVeda.

Q Correct.

A NuVeda. The only money that's come in that I know of has come through Dr. Bady and his fundraising efforts to borrow on a temporary basis or with promises of future membership. And those funds have come in and have been spent. I don't think they've been spent wisely, which is why Dr. Daniels wanted to have veto control over all of the expenditures that would be made.

- Q What happens if the CW agreement somehow fails or is unwound?
 - A NuVeda fails.
- Q And that's not particularly helpful to Mr. Terry, is it?

A I would hope that all of the members would want the best for the company.

(Pause in the proceedings)

BY MR. MAUPIN:

- Q All right. Do you know what a conspiracy is?
- 6 A Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

12

16

17

18

19

23

24

- Q What is it?
- A It's a agreement between two people to accomplish something that is nefarious.
- 10 Q Illegal or to harm someone else?
- 11 A To harm someone else.
 - Q Did the tax situation harm anyone?
- A No. The tax situation complied with the law, and ultimately the amendment corrected a defect in the initial return.
 - Q Are you aware of any conspiracy between Dr. Mohajer and Dr. Bady to sabotage various deals brought to the company by Mr. Terry?
 - A I am not.
- Q Was -- the result of the negotiations of the Daniels deal, which is it fell apart, is that a product of a conspiracy by anybody?
 - A I know that Dr. Bady made every effort he could to facilitate that deal. He even flew to Buffalo to meet with Dr. Daniels to try to negotiate an agreement that Dr. Daniels

could accept. 1 But was there any conspiracy with -- was Dr. Mohajer 2 at all involved in that? Not at all. Α 5 So has Dr. Mohajer conspired to enter into an Q agreement that's going to ruin the company, which would be the 6 CW agreement? 8 No. Α Q Because the CW agreement wouldn't ruin the company, 9 would it? 10 It will not. 11 Α And in fact it will save it? 12 Q It will. 13 Α Now -- all right. Just a few more questions. 14 Q 15 Did you have a meeting with both of these plaintiffs on December 2nd of this year? 16 Yes. 17 Α And did you discuss the issue of expelling Dr. Bady 18 Q and Dr. Mohajer with them? 19 20 I did. Α And what were you trying to convey to them about 21 Q 22 that? 23 I sent an email to Shane Terry asking him to meet Α 24 with me, because I thought he had a misunderstanding about the 25 position that he was taking. And we have always had a

congenial relationship, and we agreed to meet. And he asked me if Ms. Goldstein could join him. And I said she was more than welcome. So we met at Island Style Restaurant, which I picked because I knew Mr. Terry had a Hawaiian background and wanted something that he would like. And we met there, and we had a very congenial discussion about the state of NuVeda and where things were.

Q And -- but did you discuss with them the issue of trying to expel these two members?

A We did.

Q And what did that discussion entail?

A I said to them, you can't group members and vote on them separately -- you know, jointly with the minority and eject them, because it's not -- it's just not a business practice that's tolerable. You know, when I'm buying companies if I want to buy 50 percent of the company, it's one price. If I want 51 percent, it's a much higher price, because I will have control. And this control, you know, is something that has great value.

Additionally, as I read the agreement, a disinterested member can be voted on at any time by the interested parties, but a -- you can't group them together. So I expressed this opinion to them, and Ms. Goldstein told me that they have the -- that they have a legal theory that allows them to do it. And she didn't share the theory with

me, but that pretty much ended the discussion.

But I thought that at the meeting that I would dissuade them from proceeding. But I left the meeting convinced that they would not be dissuaded.

- Q So what has to happen, to your knowledge, before a person can be at least the subject of an inquiry as an interested person and then voted on by the company?
- A Well, somebody in the company, any member, has to perceive a malevolent action by one of the other members.
- Q Correct. And the theory here is that they've conspired to violate the tax code, they violated -- conspired to enter into this self dealing arrangement involving 2113, and allowed -- and sold memberships and transferred memberships without telling the rest of the company. That's the primary claims in the case. Any of that happen?
 - A Not to my knowledge.
- Q And you were in a position to know that, weren't you?
 - A I am.

- Q Now, at this last meeting did any one of the two of them make a statement about what they would do in the event they did not get control of the company?
 - A Yes.
- 24 Q And did Mr. Terry make a statement like that?
- 25 A He did.

- Q And did Ms. Goldstein make a statement like that?
- A She did. And it was in response --
 - Q What did Mr. Terry say?
 - A Well, it was in response to a question.
- Q What was the question?
 - A The question was, if you guys do not prevail on this would you rather see the company crash and burn than give the company back to the -- to Pej and Pouya, which are Dr. Bady and Dr. Mohajer. And they answered in the affirmative, they would rather see it go under than see it go back to them.
 - Q Now, yesterday Mr. Terry adamantly denied that that happened. Now, do you have any reason at all why you would lie about that?
- 14 A No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

- 15 Q You just have 1 percent of the company; correct?
- 16 A Correct.
- 17 Q And there's a deal pending that seems to be workable 18 for you?
- 19 A The CW deal?
- 20 Q Right.
- 21 A Yes.
- 22 And so do you have -- because they're minority
 23 members, do you have any axe to grind against either one of
 24 them?
- 25 A I like both of them.

MR. MAUPIN: No further questions.

THE COURT: Sir, I have a couple of questions before we go to the next group of people.

When you reviewed the CW deal did you look at the exhibits to it?

THE WITNESS: Yes. I was present for all of the negotiations. I went to Brian Padgett's office, and we reviewed it.

THE COURT: How did the determination -- how was the determination made as to which obligations and the amount of which obligations would be included in that agreement to be paid by CW?

THE WITNESS: CW's president is a man named Jason Thompson. We sat with Jason Thompson and went through all of the payables, that Exhibit A. And he decided that they would pay up to -- it didn't say they would pay the full amount, but up to 1.5 million of the current debts of NuVeda. And we went through them and decided whether they were negotiable or fixed. And that's basically how it was done.

THE COURT: And you were involved in that discussion?

THE WITNESS: I was.

THE COURT: Can you tell me how the obligation of the loan that Dr. Bady took from Dr. Golpa was included in that?

```
THE WITNESS: It was excluded.
 1
                          Why do you think it was excluded?
 2
              THE COURT:
 3
              THE WITNESS:
                            Because the 1.5 million -- if you take
    the numbers and subtract that loan and the other loan for
 4
 5
    Apex, you come to approximately 1.5 million.
              THE COURT: So you think it was excluded?
 6
 7
              THE WITNESS:
                            I do.
                          Okay. Hold on. Which exhibit is it,
              THE COURT:
 8
    guys? Because I had it as Exhibit 20 to the original
 9
    opposition.
10
              MS. PIKE-TURNER: It's Exhibit 21, Your Honor.
11
                          Okay. Sir, if you'll turn in the black
12
              THE COURT:
   book to Exhibit 21 and go to the last page.
13
14
              THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.
              THE COURT: No, it's not 21.
15
16
              MR. DUSHOFF:
                            22.
17
                          Go to 22 and turn to the last page.
              THE COURT:
18
    This is the chart you were involved in negotiation with Mr.
    Thompson?
19
20
              THE WITNESS:
                            Yes.
                          Okay. See where it says on the top
21
              THE COURT:
22
    "NuVeda Loans Payable"?
23
                            Oh. It must be over here on 21.
              THE WITNESS:
24
              MS. PIKE-TURNER:
                                It's 21 in the black book, and 22
25
    in the -- or --
```

21 in the white book, huh? 1 THE WITNESS: Yes, 21 in the white book, 22 in 2 MS. PIKE-TURNER: 3 the black. I have the page you're referring to, THE WITNESS: 4 5 Your Honor. This chart? 6 THE COURT: 7 THE WITNESS: Yes. Do you have the one with the initials on 8 THE COURT: it dated 12/6/15? 9 That's my initial. 10 THE WITNESS: Okay. So the top two items, which are 11 THE COURT: names of creditors, I have Gregory Daniel, who's Dr. Daniel 12 13 we've been referring to, and Golpa. Do you know how those were decided to be included as part of the obligations that CW 14 would pay? 15 Your Honor, if you look at the 16 THE WITNESS: adjusted liquidities -- liabilities on the bottom, it's about 17 18 600,000 more than the 1.5 million. The 2.1, 2 million, my understanding was that the reason it was 1.5 million is the 19 Mehjed Golpa loan was going to be excluded. 20 But it doesn't look like it's excluded 21 THE COURT: on this document, does it? 22 23 THE WITNESS: Well, if you look -- if you look at the rest of the document, which says 1.5 million maximum, it 24 25 obviously is excluded. It's the only -- it's the only item

1 that would make it 1.5 million.

THE COURT: Okay. So you don't think that the

1.5 million was how much you guys thought you could negotiate
the 2.1 down to?

THE WITNESS: Well, by excluding Dr. Golpa's loan you arrive at the 1.5 million, more or less.

THE COURT: Okay. When you decided to do the amended K-1s --

THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: -- did you have a discussion with Mr. Terry about what amendments were actually being made to the K-1s?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. What did you discuss with him?

THE WITNESS: I told him that the -- that Pouya did not make the cash contributions. When we tied to cash when we're preparing the return we could see the cash flow that came into the company, but we couldn't tell where the cash flow was coming from. We could see the disbursements and decide whether they were expenses or capital expenses very easily, because we knew who the payees were. But we didn't have the contributors. So when we were allocating the losses we allocated them based on a discussion that was had with the bookkeeper and with several of the members. I think Shane was

one of the members who I discussed it with. And his contribution was approximately \$120,000. And that was -- which I didn't -- which I didn't know at the time, but that was through a loan from Dr. Bady. But still, he still had the contribution of 120,000, which matched approximately the 20 percent that he was allocated. It was 126,000, because I believe he contributed other expenses and things like that.

So then the balance that was remaining could only have come from Dr. Mohajer and Dr. Bady, because they were the only other people who contributed funds to the company. So when we -- and we allocated those evenly, because at the time I believe Dr. Mohajer was not participating in the discussion, he just said, whatever, you know, whatever it comes out comes out. And so we divided that evenly. When he finally looked at his K-1 I guess when he was preparing to do his 1040 tax return he decided that that amount was not what he had contributed and so he requested the change.

THE COURT: So when that change was requested did you have a discussion with Mr. Terry about the change?

THE WITNESS: I did. I did.

THE COURT: And what was the discussion you had with Mr. Terry?

THE WITNESS: My discussion was how to allocate Dr. Mohajer's share. And he said that his 20 percent was on target, it was exactly right. So the only other contributor

was Dr. Bady. So when we issued the K-1s we left Mr. Terry's 1 K-1 the same, we made Dr. Mohajer's K-1 zero for the losses, and we put the rest -- the balance of the losses on Dr. Bady's tax return. 5 THE COURT: Okay. Did you want to -- anybody on this side want to go before --6 7 MR. DUSHOFF: Well, I know have something in one minute, Your Honor, in front of you. 8 Oh. That's right. Where's Mr. 9 THE COURT: Hymanson? 10 We're going to take a short break. Mr. Hymanson 11 12 showed up a half hour early. We're going to have some sort of discussion about some issue on a case called Fortunet. 13 14 (Court recessed at 10:59 a.m., until 11:09 a.m.) THE COURT: Sir, are you ready? 15 16 THE WITNESS: I am. THE COURT: All right. Did you want to ask some 17 18 more questions given what I asked? MR. MAUPIN: Well, there's just a couple of 19 clarifications. 20 21 THE COURT: That's fine. 22 FURTHER DIRECT EXAMINATION 23 BY MR. MAUPIN: 24 On the exhibit to the CW agreement that's Exhibit Q 25 Number -- exhibit for the hearing purposes 23 in the black

1 book. 2 I show it as 22 in the black book. THE COURT: 3 MR. MAUPIN: I may have been standing too far from All right. May I approach the witness? 4 it. You may. 5 THE COURT: 6 BY MR. MAUPIN: 7 Mr. Kennedy, if you'll turn to the last page of the Q exhibits that you've been talking about with regard to the 8 loans. This page. Yes. 10 Α This is Exhibit -- what exhibit is this to the 11 Q agreement? It's the debt exhibit, Schedule 2. 12 13 MR. MAUPIN: Your Honor, I'm going to try --You're welcome to stay up there as long 14 THE COURT: as you keep your voice up. 15 16 BY MR. MAUPIN: All right. With regard to this table, which part of 17 Q this table was prepared by NuVeda? Isn't it true that the --18 there's a "Comments" side, and everything to the left of that 19 is -- was prepared by NuVeda? Is that correct? 20 21 Α That's true. 22 Q And who prepared that? Who provided that? 23 Dr. Bady. Α 24 Now, on the column there with regard to Q All right. 25 the Dr. Golpa loan it says, "Personal loan to Pej. Why wasn't

this a NuVeda loan? How was the money used?" And that's in 1 the larger bracket on the side. 2 3 I see that. Α Now, those are comments that are added to this 4 Q 5 exhibit by CW? By Mr. Thompson, yes. 6 Α 7 Q By Mr. Thompson. All right. So now, with the loan 8 of 600,000 what is the total debt structure at the bottom of the page? 2.192, I think. 10 Α All right. What is 2.192 minus six hundred? Q 11 Approximately 1.592. 12 Α MR. MAUPIN: All right. That's all the questions I 13 14 have. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 15 Mr. Dushoff. 16 17 CROSS-EXAMINATION 18 BY MR. DUSHOFF: Mr. Kennedy, turn to Exhibit 37, if you can, please. 19 Q Okay. I think that's up here. 20 Α Marked "Option Agreement." 21 Q 22 Α Right. 23 May I approach your clerk, Your Honor? MR. DUSHOFF: 24 THE COURT: You can. (Pause in the proceedings) 25

1 BY MR. DUSHOFF: You testified on direct examination regarding this 2 option agreement; correct? I did. 4 Α And that was an option agreement between you and Dr. 5 Q Bady regarding 2113; is that accurate? 6 7 That's correct. Α And Dr. Mohajer was not part of this option 8 agreement; is that correct? 10 That's correct. Α This option agreement was entered on February 25th, 11 Q 2015; is that right? 12 That's right. 13 Α Was the option, the \$1 option ever effectuated by 14 Q Dr. Bady? 15 16 Α No. Why not? 17 Q We were unable to get the financing with his 18 Α 19 personal guarantee and my personal guarantee because of the 20 uses of the property. Can I have this marked as -- what are 21 MR. DUSHOFF: we, 207? 22 23 MR. AIELLO: 208. 24 MR. DUSHOFF: If I may. 25 You may. And then could you hand copies THE COURT: 52

to your colleagues. 2 MR. DUSHOFF: Absolutely. THE COURT: And please remember, Mr. Dushoff, give 3 the one with the sticker to the witness. 5 BY MR. DUSHOFF: I want to show you what has been marked as 6 7 Exhibit 208. MR. DUSHOFF: I'm going to ask if there are any 8 objections. Anybody object to 208's admission? 10 THE COURT: MS. PIKE-TURNER: Lack of foundation. But so long 11 12 as he --Okay. So let's lay some foundation. 13 THE COURT: 14 Sure. Absolutely. MR. DUSHOFF: 15 BY MR. DUSHOFF: I want to show you what has been marked as 16 Q Exhibit 208? Do you recognize this exhibit? 17 18 Α I do. What do you recognize this exhibit to be? 19 Q This exhibit is an agreement -- an amendment to an 20 Α agreement that Pej and I signed because --21 22 Without telling the cause of it, that's what it is. Q 23 That's fine. Α Okay. 24 Q And is this a fair and accurate copy of that 25 agreement?

```
1
         Α
              It is.
              Okay. You see a signature line down on the bottom?
 2
         Q
    It says "Joseph Kennedy"?
 3
 4
         Α
              Yes.
              Okay. Is that your signature?
 5
         Q
 6
         Α
              Yes.
 7
         Q
                     Were you present when that was signed, or is
 8
    this DocuSigned?
 9
              I was present when it was signed.
         Α
              It was -- Valerie Kennedy, is that your wife?
10
         Q
              Yes.
11
         Α
              Okay. Was she present, or was this DocuSigned?
12
         Q
13
              She was present.
         Α
14
              Okay. Were all parties present at the same time
         Q
    when this was signed?
15
16
         Α
              Yes.
                            I move in Exhibit 208 for evidence.
17
              MR. DUSHOFF:
18
              THE COURT: Any objection?
              MS. PIKE-TURNER:
19
                                No.
20
              THE COURT: Be admitted.
                (Defendant Bady's Exhibit 208 admitted)
21
22
                          Can I have a copy.
              THE COURT:
23
              MR. DUSHOFF: Yes, you may. Got one left.
24
              THE COURT: Thank you. I appreciate that, Mr.
25
    Dushoff.
              Lovely. Thank you.
```

BY MR. DUSHOFF:

Q In Exhibit 208 the amendment to the membership interests and the option agreement, that refers to Exhibit 37; is that accurate?

A That's correct.

Q Okay. And what does this document, Exhibit 208, show?

A What it shows is that the option to become a member for \$1 that Dr. Bady had was rescinded.

Q Okay. And I think you previously testified it was rescinded because Dr. Bady couldn't get the funding.

A We couldn't find a bank that would lend on our signatures and the properties that were the subject properties because of the medical marijuana use of the properties. So I pledged my personal -- my other properties, which were Nevada and California properties, to secure the long-term financing, and then Dr. Bady no longer had a role.

Q Exhibit 37 gave the opportunity for Dr. Bady to literally reach into his wallet, pull -- I got nothing -- pull out a dollar bill, give it to you, and have 50 percent interest in 2113; is that accurate?

A Not completely, but yes.

Q When you say not completely what do you mean?

A This would only go into effect if he was responsible for half of the liabilities associated with the properties.

And at no time from the signing of Exhibit 37, the 1 Q option agreement, up until the Exhibit 208 that was signed in 2 August, at no time did Dr. Bady ever try and execute on this option agreement? 5 He never gave me a dollar, no. Α You said you had a meeting with Mr. Ivey, is that 6 Q accurate --8 Α No. -- regarding the investments in NuVeda? 9 Q 10 Α No. Okay. You never -- did you have a meeting with his 11 Q people? 12 13 Yes. Α Now, who were his people? And we always say people, 14 Q but who were they? 15 That was a gentleman named Cleve. 16 Α Okay. Who's Cleve? 17 Q 18 He's an attorney who represents his financial Α interests. 19 And did Cleve have the authority to meet with 20 Q Okay. you, or did he tell you he had the authority to meet with you 21 regarding the investment of Phil Ivey into NuVeda? 22 23 He didn't meet with me. He met with Shane Terry, 24 and I was present at the meeting.

But you were there when Shane Terry and Cleve met?

25

Q

1 A Yes.

- Q Okay. Did you have any input in that meeting?
- A Yes.
 - Q And what was your input in that meeting?

A Well, my input was that I was interested in finding out what the actual funding schedule would be, because I could -- I was looking ahead in normal business practice at the demands, the financial demands on the company, and I wanted to know when the contributions that were scheduled would be made.

- Q And that was the contribution regarding Phil Ivey?
- 11 A Yes.
 - Q All right. Without telling me what was said at that meeting, because I don't want a hearsay objection, what was the outcome of your meeting with Phil Ivey's people with Cleve?
 - A My conclusion was that they were not going to do the investment.
 - Q They meaning Phil Ivey?
 - A Phil Ivey.
 - Q I want to direct your attention to 4Front. Mr. Terry testified specifically -- you don't know this, so I'm going to tell you -- specifically on direct yesterday that there are no 4Front options in which Dr. Bady and Dr. Mohajer would have to be removed in order to do the 4Front deal. Is that true?

I don't know. 1 Α Okay. I want to show you Exhibit 131. If you can 2 Q 3 go to that, please. That's the black book, or the white book? 4 Α It should be in the black book. 5 THE COURT: So it's In the black book. Okay. 6 THE WITNESS: going to be 31. THE COURT: I'm sorry. The white book. 8 The smaller book. THE WITNESS: Okay. 10 11 BY MR. DUSHOFF: I think the one on your --12 Q I see 131. Yes. 13 Α Okay. This is an email to Shane from -- do you know 14 Q 15 anybody at 4Front? No, I do not. 16 Α Okay. This is 4Front -- did you ever see this 17 Q document before? 18 19 I have not. Α Okay. Why don't you take a look at it. 20 Q 21 Α Okay. 22 And when you're done just look up. Q 23 Α Okay. 24 And I relay to you that this is a document --Okav. Q 25 email sent -- letter sent from 4Front, representative of

4Front to Shane. And I want to direct your attention to the second paragraph we discussed, various structures.

A Right.

3

5

6

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Okay. And specifically we discussed various structures. So to you that would mean that there are various structures of the 4Front deal that would be included with NuVeda; is that correct?

A Correct.

MS. PIKE-TURNER: Objection. Calls for speculation.
THE COURT: Sustained.

11 BY MR. DUSHOFF:

Q It says, "One structure for consideration is for NuVeda Holdings to issue note in exchange for all equity," all equity, "interests from the two of the founders." Who were two of the founders of NuVeda?

A Jennifer Goldstein and Shane Terry.

Q How about Dr. Bady?

A Dr. Bady's also a founder.

Q And how about Pouya?

A He's also a founder.

Q So for this -- in this paragraph are you aware -- and if you're not, that's fine -- are you aware whether 4Front was talking about the removal of Dr. Bady and Dr. Mohajer in order to execute a 4Front deal?

A I am not aware.

Mr. Terry testified that Dr. Bady was solely removed 1 Q from 2113 because he himself approached Dr. Bady and told him and said, hey, you need to get out of 2113, that's an issue. Is that an accurate statement? 5 Not from my perspective. It was all monetary. Α What do you mean by it was all monetary. 6 Q 7 Who had the investment in 2113. Α What do you mean by that? 8 Q When I paid off the short-term loans and pledged my 9 Α property and borrowed the money to pay those loans Dr. Bady no 10 longer had a role for 2113. He no longer had an investment in 11 it. So it was logical to exclude him from the company, for 12 13 him to leave. So it had nothing to do, in your opinion -- in your 14 opinion, why you and Dr. Bady split ways was because of the 15 money that he couldn't raise for it? 16 17 Α Yes. 18 I have nothing further at this time. MR. DUSHOFF: THE COURT: Thank you. 19 20 Cross-examination? 21 CROSS-EXAMINATION 22 BY MS. PIKE-TURNER: 23 'Morning. Q 24 Good morning. Α 25 When you met with Counsel to prepare for providing Q

testimony here today who was present?

- A I don't understand the question.
- Q When you talked with Counsel in preparation for your testimony who was present?
- A I had a meeting with Justice Maupin, and he was the only person who was present when I met with him.
 - Q He prepared you for providing your testimony here?
- A He did.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

22

- Q Okay. Now, Mr. Kennedy, you're familiar with the operating agreement; correct?
- 11 A Correct.
 - Q And it says that you were granted a 1 percent membership interest in exchange for you putting up 3 million in credit; correct?
- 15 A Correct.
 - Q And that was interest that did not vest until certain requirements were met; right? It wasn't vested originally?
 - A Originally it wasn't.
 - Q Now, you testified you believe you vested; correct?
- 21 A I did.
 - Q And you believe you vested because you attended a meeting where it was discussed?
- 24 A Yes.
- Q Did you see an action consent in writing?

A I've never seen anything in writing from the meetings.

Q Okay. Now, you walked out of the meeting thinking that your membership interest vested. Do you recall whether Jennifer Goldstein objected to you being a member?

A No.

Q Okay. Now, do you recall that defendants Pouya Mohajer and Pej Bady treated you like you were a voting member?

A Yes.

Q Now, would you expect that if they were to communicate with the State they would disclose that you had an interest in NuVeda?

A It's been in the operating agreement since it was first written.

Q And would you expect that it would be disclosed to third-party investors that you had a voting interest?

A I would.

Q Based on you coming out of the meeting where your vesting was discussed?

A Yes.

Q And that's regardless of whether there was a written action item, written action consent?

A Well, there were things in writing. I mean, we did -- we did do the -- when we did the offering to the State in

the application process I gave the note. So --

Q But the fact that you believed that you vested, your 1 percent vested, you didn't see any meeting minutes reflecting that?

A I haven't seen meeting minutes except for one meeting.

- Q And you haven't seen any action consent item where there's DocuSign signatures; correct?
 - A That's correct.
- Q So it's been your observation that things were done by casual agreement and then you moved forward based on that casual agreement, sitting around a table?
- A I never really gave a lot of thought to the 1 percent, and -- but when I attended meetings I always voted.
- Q Now, if you go to Exhibit 204 -- pardon me. I have the wrong one. 37, the option agreement.
- 17 A Okay.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

21

22

23

- 18 Q In this option agreement the first recital -19 Do you know what a recital is?
- 20 A Yes.
 - Q Okay. That first recital, it says, "The parties to this agreement executed a membership interest exchange agreement. It is dated the same date as this option agreement, February 25th, 2015"; correct?
- 25 A Yes.

And Pejman Bady transferred, assigned, and sold to 1 Q you, Joe Kennedy, the Bady 2113 interest; right? 2 3 Α Yes. And then you transferred, assigned, and sold to Pej 5 Bady the Kennedy NuVeda interest; correct? 6 Α Correct. 7 Okay. And is it your position that from February to Q August that was the case, and then in August that was all 8 rescinded? 10 Α Yes. Did you provide a copy of this option agreement to 11 Q general counsel for NuVeda, Jennifer Goldstein? 12 I don't recall. 13 Α Did you provide a copy of the option agreement to 14 Q 15 the CEO, Shane Terry? I don't recall. 16 Α Do you recall having any discussion with Shane Terry 17 Q 18 or Jennifer Goldstein regarding the existence of this option agreement? 19 20 Α Yes. 21 Q And when was that? 22 Between February and August. Α 23 And it's your position that you disclosed the Q 24 details of this option agreement? 25 The reason that I had the discussions with Mr. Terry Α

were that I was telling him about the financing, what was going on with the financing for the property.

- Q Did you advise Mr. Terry that there was the existence of an option agreement during that discussion?
 - A I thought he knew about it.
- Q My question is did you tell him about the existence of the option agreement, or did you assume he knew about it?
 - A I assumed he knew about it.
 - Q And you assumed that Pej Bady told him about it?
- A Actually, there was quite a bit of transfer of documents and discussion when we were doing the leases, and this was subsequent to that -- or at that same time period when we were doing the leases, and I just assumed that he knew that this existed.
- Q Now, this Exhibit 208, where there's an amendment to this membership interest exchange agreement, which --
- A Yes.

- Q -- I've never seen, and the option agreement, when did Pej Bady, you, and your wife sit down and sign this document?
 - A On the date that -- sometime in August.
- Q Okay. And it's your testimony that the reason for this amendment is that you bought out the loans that had been obtained by Pej Bady? Is that right?
 - A That's not what I said.

- Q Okay. Let me back up so that I understand.
- A Okay.

- Q When 2113 Investors was -- when they purchased the property at 2113 Las Vegas Boulevard, that was funded with Pej Bady having a financial obligation and you having a financial obligation; correct?
 - A That's correct.
 - Q And that was in December 2014?
 - A Yes.
- Q And then subsequent to closing you came forward with your own financial wherewithal to buy out Mr. Bady's financial position; is that correct?
- A Well, there was another step in between, which was the purchase of Third Street. And we were negotiating with a bank in Wisconsin to lend money on both properties. And when the time came to fund the property for Third Street the bank came to us through their general counsel, and he told us that they wouldn't lend money on anything involved in the medical marijuana business. So in order to close Third Street I pledged I think four properties that I had in Las Vegas that were free and clear. And they lent us the money to -- they lent me the money to buy Third Street. At that time it became clear they couldn't lend us the money to pay back the short-term loans for the North Las Vegas acquisition, so I started sending them property profiles of other properties that I was

proposing to substitute to get some long-term financing, and they eventually agreed and accepted two properties. And those properties were both in California. So I then pledged those properties, got a loan from Farmers and Merchants Bank in Wisconsin, and paid back Pej's BM Partners, an LLC, who then paid off his loans.

- Q So Pej Bady contributed towards the initial purchase of 2113, the property, through 2113 Investors LLC; correct?
 - A Correct.

- Q And then subsequent to that through your efforts of getting financing and using your properties you repaid Pej's loans back?
 - A And my own.
- Q Okay. Now, did you have any discussion or written communication with general counsel Jennifer Goldstein regarding Pej Bady funding the acquisition of 2113 Investors?
 - A Did I have any communication with her?
- Q Any communication.
- 19 A No.
 - Q And same question with Shane Terry. Prior to closing escrow with the use of Pej Bady and your funds did you have a discussion or a written communication with Shane Terry disclosing that 2113 Investors was going to close with your funds and Pej Bady?
 - A Well, he was with Pej, I believe.

- Q That's not my question. Did you have --
- 2 A Did I have any direct --
 - Q Yes.

3

4

5

6

10

12

14

15

16

21

22

23

24

- A -- communication with him? No.
- Q And your testimony earlier was that Pouya Mohajer executing the documents to facilitate the assignment from NuVeda to 2113 Investors so that 2113 Investors could close escrow in lieu of NuVeda, that that was authorized pursuant to the action by written consent set forth at Exhibit 204? That's your testimony; correct?
- 11 A That's my testimony, yes.
 - Q All right. If you can go to that Exhibit 204, sir.
- A Okay. Okay.
 - Q All right. And there's no dispute that this action by written consent is executed by Jennifer Goldstein, Pouya Mohajer, and Pejman Bady. Do you see that?
- 17 A I see that.
- Now, where in that action by written consent is there any mention of 2113 Investors LLC?
- 20 A There's not in --
 - Q Or an assignment to 2113 or its designee?
 - A It says that he's -- that he's to make the necessary -- arrangements necessary, financial arrangements necessary and proper to purchase the property. It couldn't be put in NuVeda's name, because we couldn't get long-term financing

through NuVeda.

1

2

3

5

6

8

10

11

12

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

- Q But you didn't have long-term financing when you closed on December 31st, 2014, did you?
 - A We did not. But we had -- but --
- Q Sir.
 - A -- but we had -- but normal business practices that you -- if you're going to -- if you have six days to make a closing, you're not going to get a real estate deal closed. So you borrow against lines of credit, you make the payments, and then you make long-term arrangements.
 - Q And, sir, you borrowed against your line of credit in order to close in December 2013 [sic]; correct?
- 13 A I did.
- Q And have you ever borrowed against a line of credit
 where NuVeda received the funds?
 - A I don't understand the question. NuVeda refused the funds?
 - Q No. Has NuVeda ever received funds borrowed against your line of credit?
- 20 A No.
 - Q Now, the action by written consent in the recital, the first paragraph of the recital -- and you indicated you understand what a recital is. Do you see where it says, "Whereas, the company entered into that certain purchase and sale agreement"? Do you see that?

1 A I see that.

2

3

4

5

6

8

13

14

19

20

21

22

- Q And do you see where "company" is defined?
- A I see that.
 - Q Okay. And it's your -- separate and apart from this action by written consent there's no amendment to this or any other document that you know of that references Jennifer Goldstein, Pouya Mohajer, and Pejman Bady authorizing Pouya Mohajer to go forward and assign NuVeda's interest to 2113 Investors --
- 10 A Okay.
- 11 Q -- correct? Sir, that's a yes or no.
- 12 A That's a no.
 - Q Okay. Now, Mr. Kennedy -- you know there's another Joe Kennedy out in this community that does real estate?
- 15 A I do know.
- Q Now, Mr. Kennedy, you said you have a lot of
 experience in building or developing industrial property. Did
 I understand that correctly?
 - A That's correct.
 - Q All right. And as the landlord for 2113 Investors, the property at Las Vegas Boulevard, are you constructing the tenant improvements for the tenant NuVeda?
 - A No. The lease requires the tenant to do it.
- Q And when the tenant improves that property will you be reimbursing NuVeda for the increased value to 2113

1 Investors? Well, they're being subsidized by the lease. 2 So, 3 yes, indirectly. Okay. So you will be paying back NuVeda the value 5 that they --By discounting the lease amount, yes. 6 7 Okay. Now, Mr. Kennedy, since we've been in this Q litigation -- well, let me -- strike that. 8 9 2113 Investors LLC sued NuVeda; correct? 10 Α True. And this week, while we've in this litigation, your 11 Q 12 attorney filed an intention to take default against NuVeda; 13 correct? 14 Correct. Α So if NuVeda does not file a response to the lawsuit 15 Q initiated by you on behalf of 2113, you intend to default 16 17 NuVeda; correct? 18 I don't know that. But you filed a document saying that you have that 19 Q 20 intention; correct? Does the document require us to take a default? 21 Α Ι 22 don't think so. 23 Have you had any discussions with Pej Bady or Pouya Q Mohajer regarding defending the lawsuit commenced by 2113? 24 25 I have. Α

Q And did they indicate they intend to file a response prior to any deadline for responding? Did Pouya Mohajer or Pej Bady indicate that they will be defending that lawsuit on behalf NuVeda?

A My counsel has had correspondence with Jennifer Goldstein on this, and --

- Q Sir, I'm sorry if I wasn't clear. Did you have communications with Pej Bady and Pouya Mohajer about their intention to defend that lawsuit on behalf of NuVeda?
- A I have not asked them if they're going to defend it.
- Q And have they indicated any intention to defend that lawsuit against 2113?
 - A No.

1

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

- Q How many meetings have you attended, the NuVeda team meetings?
- 16 A Ten maybe.
- 17 Q What day are those held?
 - A I have no recollection of what day. Oh. You mean what day of the week?
- 20 Yeah.
- 21 A I think they're usually on Tuesdays.
- Q And did you go to the meeting on November 18th?
- 23 A I don't think so.
- 24 Q Now, if you'd go to Exhibit 17 in the black book. I 25 have the wrong one. 17 in my book -- or in the white book.

Pardon me. White book. I apologize. 1 You've seen this before; correct? 2 3 Give me a moment. I have. Α And, sir, just so we're clear, if you go five pages 4 5 in, it looks like your signature. Is that your signature? I don't see my signature on it. It's blank on --6 7 There is. I'm sorry. One extra page. Yeah. oh. And Exhibit 18, same thing. If you could just look 8 at your signature on the last page. Is that it? 10 And you're in 118 and 117? THE COURT: 118. Pardon me. 11 MS. PIKE-TURNER: There is no last page on this one, but 12 THE WITNESS: I recall signing it. 13 14 BY MS. PIKE-TURNER: 15 Okay. And these are written consents in lieu of Q special meeting to expel Shane Terry and Jennifer Goldstein; 16 17 correct? 18 They are. Α Was there a meeting where there was discussion of 19 Q expelling Shane and Jennifer? 20 21 Α No. 22 Q Was there a phone call? 23 Between members? Α 24 Q Yes. 25 No. Α

Q What is the basis for expelling Shane Terry and Jennifer Goldstein?

A The basis is that they were -- they expelled -- they attempted to expel Pej Bady and Pouya Mohajer, and that that was a wrong action, it was the wrong thing to do.

- Q Anything else? Any other basis?
- A Any?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- Q Anything else?
- A No. That's what it was.
- Q Okay. Now -- so is it your testimony that you were aware that Jennifer Goldstein and Shane Terry had voted to expel Pej Bady and Pouya Mohajer when you executed this written consent?
 - A That's right.
- Q Okay. And in addition to expelling Mr. Terry and Ms. Goldstein, if you go to the third page of Exhibit 117, two paragraphs up, do you see, "Be it further resolved that any and all --"
 - A A lot of "further resolveds," but --
 - Q Yeah. Do you see that?
- 21 A Which one?
- 22 Q The second one from the bottom.
- 23 A From the bottom. Okay.
- 24 Q And you ratified all the conduct that had taken 25 place to that day by Pej Bady; correct?

- 1 A Can I read it?
- 2 Q Sure. Absolutely.
 - A Yes, it says that.
 - Q Okay. And that action ratifying all the actions -- prior actions of Pej Bady, was that discussed with Shane Terry and Jennifer Goldstein?
 - A No, this was not discussed at all with them.
 - Q Okay. Was it discussed with you?
- 9 A This agreement?
- 10 Q No. That provision in particular.
- 11 A No.

4

5

6

7

8

12

13

17

18

19

- Q Okay. Now, Jennifer Goldstein and Shane Terry, were they provided a copy of this written consent to sign?
- A Not by me.
- 15 Q Okay. Do you know if it was provided at all?
- 16 A I don't know.
 - Q Okay. Now, you testified that you thought it was a bad thing for Shane Terry and Jennifer Goldstein to expel Pej Bady and Pouya Mohajer. You're not disputing that they can do it under the terms of the operating agreement; correct?
- 21 A I am disputing that they can do it.
- Q Okay. You're disputing that they -- that they can vote out Pej Bady and Pouya Mohajer?
- 24 A By grouping them, yes.
- 25 Q So you're concerned about the grouping?

- 1 Α Yes. Now, if there is conduct that you think is wrongful, 2 3 like Shane Terry and Jennifer Goldstein voting out Pej Bady and Pouya Mohajer, that was an action they took together; 5 correct? 6 Α Correct. 7 So if you're voting to expel Shane Terry for voting Q 8 out Pouya Mohajer and Pej Bady, then Shane Terry, the other actor, wouldn't be disinterested in the vote, would they?
 - A They would not.
 - Q Now, you testified that you're an enrolled agent; correct?
 - A I am.

11

12

13

18

19

20

- 14 Q That you're not a CPA?
- 15 A I'm not.
- 16 Q And you're not a tax attorney?
- 17 A Nope.
 - Q Now, you'd agree that losses under the terms of the operating agreement, Section 5.1 in particular, that they are to be allocated on a pro rata basis; correct?
 - A No. That's one of the options.
- 22 Q Under the operating agreement that's the option.
- A No, it's not the only option.
- Q Okay. Let's go to the operating agreement.
- A I will. 5.2, I think, or something like that.

- 1 Q 5.1, sir.
- 2 A 5.1.

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q It's page number 9 in the bottom right-hand --
- A Oh. I have it on -- 5.1 on 8.
- Q Page 8 of the agreement. You're correct.
- 6 A Okay.
 - Q So --
 - A It says, "Any special allocations necessary to comply with the requirements set forth in the Internal Revenue Code Section 704 and the corresponding regulations, including, without limitation, qualified income offset and minimum gains chargeback provisions contained therein shall be made if voting members deem these actions to be appropriate."
 - Q Right. Okay. So it's your testimony that it's a requirement of the Internal Revenue Code for Pouya Mohajer to allocate his losses to Pej Bady?
 - A No, I didn't say that.
 - Q You're saying that it's an option unless provided --
 - A It's an option that I spoke to 86 percent of the voting interests about at the time and received consent from the 86 percent to do it based on the contributions. There's a very sound reason for this.
- Q Wait. Sir.
- 24 A Okay.
- Q You didn't talk to Jennifer Goldstein; correct?

- A Jennifer was not affected by it.
- Q Okay. You didn't -- you didn't have a conversation with Shane Terry where you said, Pouya Mohajer's going to allocate his losses to Pej Bady; correct?

A It isn't -- that's not factual. It never was Pouya Mohajer allocating his losses to Pej Bady.

- Q Okay. So Shane Terry --
- A You're mischaracterizing it completely.
- Q You had a -- let's break this down. Shane Terry, you had a conversation with him where you said that 20 percent of the losses would be allocated to him; correct?
- A Yes.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

- Q Now, 20 percent is his ownership interest in the entity NuVeda; correct?
- 15 A It's coincidental.
 - Q Okay. Mr. Dushoff questioned Shane Terry yesterday about him not having any skin in the game, that he hadn't contributed moneys to the enterprise.
- MR. DUSHOFF: Objection. I never asked him that question.
- THE COURT: Overruled. That was the context, but you didn't use those words.
- 23 BY MS. PIKE-TURNER:
- Q Now, is it your testimony that Shane Terry brought in 20 percent?

THE COURT: Oh. You're right. It wasn't you, Mr. 2 Dushoff. I'm sorry.

MS. PIKE-TURNER: I'm sorry. You're all wearing ties. It's not -- it's not to be --

MR. DUSHOFF: Well, my dress is in dry cleaning.

MS. PIKE-TURNER: I'm sorry if that goes to somebody else.

BY MS. PIKE-TURNER:

Q Now, Mr. Kennedy, is it your testimony that Shane Terry gave 20 percent -- or contributed 20 percent of the funding of NuVeda?

A I was told that because he signed a note, a personal note with Pej Bady for 120,000. So he was given credit for 120,000 of the cash that was contributed in 2014.

Q Now, did you have a discussion with Shane Terry where you provided a copy of the K-1s and said that Pej Bady was going to receive 80 percent of the losses and Shane Terry was going to receive 20 percent?

A I provided Shane with all of the K-1s and the amended K-1s when he requested them.

Q And Shane Terry never objected to 80 percent of the losses going to Pej Bady?

A Nobody ever objected.

Q With respect to the CW -- oh. Before I move on, the 2113 transaction, is it your testimony that Jennifer Goldstein

was out of town and that's why you didn't communicate --1 2 Α No. 3 -- with her regarding the assignment? Q No, that's not my testimony. 4 Α 5 Okay. You don't dispute that Jennifer Goldstein was Q in town at the time of the closing? 6 7 I don't know where she was. Α Now, with respect to this CW deal if you could --8 you testified earlier that this was not a sale of membership interest. It's actually called a membership sale agreement; 10 Membership interest purchase agreement? 11 correct? It might be titled -- I think they usually say 12 Α titles in bold type are simply for informational -- or 13 directional purposes. 14 15 Your Honor, can we direct him to an MR. DUSHOFF: exhibit if she's reading from something? 16 We're on 22. 17 THE COURT: 18 MR. DUSHOFF: Thank you. THE COURT: 19 Right? MS. PIKE-TURNER: Yes, Your Honor. He's in the 20 That's 21. It's -- same thing. 21 white book. BY MS. PIKE-TURNER: 22 23 Now, the CW deal is a transfer of 100 percent of the 24 interest in the subsidiaries of NuVeda; correct? 25 Can I address -- can I address first why it says Α

membership interest purchase agreement?

- Q It says membership interest purchase agreement; correct?
 - A It does. And that's correct.
- Q Okay. Now --

2

5

6

7

8

10

11

18

19

20

21

- A It's a membership in the new entity CW NV.
- Q Okay. Pursuant to the agreement 100 percent of the interest in the subsidiaries of NuVeda that hold the Nye County cultivation and processing licenses and the dispensaries in Las Vegas and North Las Vegas, those are being transferred to the NewCo; correct?
- 12 A Correct.
- 13 Q Now, have you seen proof of funds for CW?
- 14 A Yes.
- 15 Q And is it -- is there money in escrow?
- 16 A No.
- Q Okay. The proof of funds is sufficient to do what?
 - A They have several hundred million dollars. It's sufficient to do anything they want.
 - Q Okay. Did they indicate that several hundred million dollars are going to be used to perform under this membership sale agreement?
- A No. It was more like six to eight million.
- Q All right. Did they pledge that they will spend six to eight million?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Is that in writing?

A There's a section on the cultivation and production facility in Nye County in which they say that if they don't complete it on time that -- I believe it's where it says "Lost Profits, Additions to Operating Agreement."

- Q Where are you looking, sir?
- A I'm looking -- I'll tell you -- the next -- the third-to-last page. "Additions to Operating Agreement." The very last paragraph.
 - Q I don't see any mention of the total commitment.
- A Well, it does say that if they haven't -- "If the cultivation and production facilities are not up and running in earnest by the end of 2016, CW shall provide lost profits to CW NV based on number of months the facilities are tardy in opening." The purpose of that addition is to give them an incentive to complete the project.
- Q Okay. They're buying the property -- or the -- strike that. They're buying the dispensaries, as well as cultivation and processing; correct?
- 21 A Correct.
 - Q The two dispensaries, they're to be complete on or about on April 16th, 2016, under this timeline; correct?
- 24 A Right.
- 25 Q And there's been no construction to date; correct?

A Actually, there has been. We have met with the contractor, and we have -- I have a meeting on Friday with the contractor again with CW. And they have already moved ahead. They've paid the fees for the plans and have made -- have instituted actions for completing the projects.

We also have submitted to the -- for bid to the contractors a proposed improvement for North Las Vegas.

- Q Have you applied for regulatory approval of the CW deal?
 - A That's not my job.
- Q Has anybody from NuVeda or its subsidiaries applied for approval?
 - A I don't know. It's not my bailiwick.
- Q Now, you'd agree that there are no plans or specifications that are attached to this agreement; correct?
 - A I agree.

- Q So there's a provision that says that there is an object to build dispensaries and to build a cultivation center, but nothing about whether it's a tile or tin roof, dirt or marble floors; correct?
- A Well, the problem was that the plans that were in with the City of Las Vegas for the Third Street facility, I went to the City Planning, and I went then to Building & Safety, and they told me that I would have to get the plans from the contractor, I couldn't get -- that they were not in

the business of giving me copies of my own -- of plans on my own property. So I went to Trinity --

Q Sir, my question is is there an agreement that's signed --

A I'm answering --

MR. MAUPIN: Your Honor --

THE WITNESS: I'm answering your question.

MS. PIKE-TURNER: It's a yes or no.

MR. DUSHOFF: -- complete his answer.

THE COURT: Let him -- please let him finish the answer.

Sir, keep going.

THE WITNESS: Okay. So because we didn't have the plans, they were not attached to it. If we had had the plans available, if they had been made available to me as the owner of the property before they were submitted to the City, then I would have had a copy to attach to it. But I didn't have it because Mr. Terry didn't deem it necessary to give me copies of the plans.

20 BY MS. PIKE-TURNER:

- Q My question to you is whether there's anything that is signed in writing where CW says, I agree to these specifications.
- 24 A Nothing.
- 25 Q Have they signed the plans and said, we commit to

build pursuant to those plans? Well, they may have done something better. 2 paid the City to review the plans. My question is do you have anything in writing. 4 Q 5 The answer was no. Α Did you go through the entirety of the debts for 6 Q NuVeda as part of your due diligence about whether or not CW deal is a good one for NuVeda? 8 I did sit in a meeting in which it was reviewed. 9 Okay. If you could go to Exhibit 31 already in 10 Q evidence. 11 12 I have 131. Sorry. Α It's in the black book. 13 Q Sorry. Okay. No problem. I just realized it's 131. 14 Α 15 How much longer do you have, Counsel? THE COURT: MS. PIKE-TURNER: Not long at all. I would say five 16 17 minutes. 18 THE COURT: Okay. 19 THE WITNESS: Okay. BY MS. PIKE-TURNER: 20 Have you seen this document before? 21 Q 22 I've either seen this document or one similar to it. Α 23 Now, if you go to the second page, there's a Q Okay. 24 It says, "Total NuVeda Liabilities \$4,355,226." total. Do

25

you that?

1 Α I see that. Why wasn't the 2Prime loan, for instance, 2 Q 3 included into the debt to be assumed by CW Nevada? I don't know. 4 Α 5 Why was the \$600,000 loan from Mehjed Golpa to Pej Q Bady included in the CW list, the CW deal list that you have? 6 7 Well, this document, there's so many things in it Α There's no -- there's no -that are inaccurate. 8 Sir, can you focus, please, because we're trying to 9 Q get done. 10 And I would ask he please complete the 11 MR. DUSHOFF: 12 answer. 13 BY MS. PIKE-TURNER: My question --14 Q 15 THE COURT: Wait. Hold on. Let him finish. THE WITNESS: I'm responding --16 Sir, you can finish, please. 17 THE COURT: 18 THE WITNESS: There are so many things that are different here. I don't know why one thing was moved and the 19 other one wasn't. 20 21 BY MS. PIKE-TURNER: That's my question. Do you know why the Mike Golpa 22 23 loan to Pej Bady was included on the list of liabilities for 24 the CW loan? 25 I think because Pej Bady put that money into NuVeda,

and he felt that even though he had personally committed for the loan, that it was owed by NuVeda. But CW rejected that theory.

- Q And 2Prime, you don't know why that's excluded?
- 5 A I have no idea.

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Q You testified earlier that NuVeda has no assets. Do you recall that?
 - A I said except the licenses.
- Q Except for the licenses. Pardon me. Thanks for the correction. NuVeda has the Apex property, 15-1/2 acres; correct?
 - A It's fully encumbered.
- Q And how is the Apex debt -- what's the plan for paying the Apex mortgage other than Shane Terry coming out of pocket?
- A Well, my understanding is that the Faraday Electric Car Company wants the land and that we could extinguish the debt by allowing them to purchase the land.
 - Q And is that the plan?
- 20 A Don't know.
- Q Have you had communications with anybody about selling the Apex property?
- 23 A I have not.
- Q Has Pej Bady or Pouya Mohajer discussed an intention 25 to sell the Apex property?

A They've discussed it with me.

- Q And how far along are the negotiations?
- A They're in their infancy. And it has not been decided, I want to say.
- Q Now, did you do due diligence about the total amount of investment that CW is making in the CW transaction or pursuant to that transaction?
- A I certainly did look into it. Whether or not -- I'm hesitating on your term "due diligence."
- Q What did you do in your due diligence before you approved the transaction?
- A Okay. I took a look at the proposed debt reduction, I took a look at the property that was being transferred, and I took a look at the -- meaning the two LLCs, and I took a look at the long-term benefit to NuVeda and its capital requirements to participate in it, and decided it was a really good deal.
- Q Did you do an analysis of how this would play out with the investment and compare it to the 4Front investment, how much NuVeda would actually receive from the transaction?
- A Yes. It -- potentially there would be -- well, in year two they would be in the range of receiving a million dollars. In year five they're projecting may four or five million.
 - Q Who did these projections?

1 Α CW. Did you do your own projections? 2 Q I took a look at the numbers and decided they were 3 Α reasonable. 4 5 38? THE COURT: 6 THE CLERK: Yes. BY MS. PIKE-TURNER: Proposed Exhibit 38 was received from Mr. Dushoff. 8 Q 9 MR. AIELLO: Could we get one more of those? MS. PIKE-TURNER: Sure. 10 11 MR. AIELLO: Thanks so much. 12 MS. PIKE-TURNER: Sure. 13 BY MS. PIKE-TURNER: Was received from Mr. Dushoff. Is this the analysis 14 Q 15 that was presented to you done by CW? 16 Α No. Have you ever seen this analysis? 17 Q 18 No, I haven't. Α So there is additional analysis that is not included 19 Q in the Proposed Exhibit 38 that you've seen? 20 I'm looking through the exhibit. It's lengthy. 21 Α Ιf you'd give me a moment. 23 Sure. 24 Is there an objection to the admission THE COURT: 25 of 38?

I have seen this document before, but 1 THE WITNESS: I haven't analyzed it. 2 3 MR. DUSHOFF: No. BY MS. PIKE-TURNER: 5 Okay. My question is does this document --Q Be admitted. 6 THE COURT: 7 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 38 admitted) BY MS. PIKE-TURNER: 8 -- Proposed 38 --9 THE COURT: 10 It's admitted 38. 11 BY MS. PIKE-TURNER: Admitted 38. Thank you. Admitted 38, does it 12 0 Oh. include the analysis of the CW transaction that you relied on? 13 You know, I like to do my own Excel sheets, because 14 a lot of times when you see something that's presented in a 15 format like this you don't know what the basis for the 16 formulas are. So it's not unusual for me to go ahead and take 17 18 something like -- not this particular thing, but I took -- I took the information from CW and put it into a spreadsheet 19 that I would use to analyze the benefits of -- because it's 20 21 been my experience not knowing what the formulas are it's very 22 difficult to come to a correct conclusion or at least your 23 best bet. 24 Okay. You testified that you didn't do your own Q 25 analysis, you looked at CW's and relied upon it.

What I'm saying is that for something like this 1 Α No. that's what I would do. But I took the numbers from CW and 2 just ran them out to see what they would be -- what the income I don't call that an analysis. And those were the would be. 5 numbers I gave you. And, you know, I understand projections are 6 projections. Nobody knows what the actual numbers will be in the future. If we did, we could --8 Well, in the calculation that's done -- I'm going to Q have you look at 472 --10 Can I have a copy? 11 THE COURT: 12 BY MS. PIKE-TURNER: 13 -- and 473. Q MS. PIKE-TURNER: Yes, Your Honor. 14 15 THE COURT: Thank you. I apologize. 16 MS. PIKE-TURNER: Wasn't admitted yet. 17 THE COURT: 18 BY MS. PIKE-TURNER: 19 Bates Number 472 and 473. Q That's the Excel spreadsheet that was 20 Α Okay. 21 provided to you from CW; correct? 22 I believe that's right, yes. 23 And then CW ran that against 4Front, correct, 24 against the 4Front offer? 25 They may have. Α

Did you see that? 1 Q I don't recall it. 2 Α Do you know why the cultivation revenue is not 3 Q included in the assessment from CW? Or projected revenue. 4 5 It is. It says "Cultivation Nye." Α On 472 --6 Q 7 The very last line. Yeah. Α -- "Cultivation Nye." Okay. So that's the 8 9 cultivation and processing revenue? That's the cultivation revenue. Processing is 10 Α No. different. 11 Okay. Do you know why there's no production 12 Q 13 revenue? 14 No, I don't. Α Or is that -- I'm trying to understand what went 15 Q into this. 16 Well, there is. It says "Nye Production" above it. 17 Α 18 Okay. So that's using the licenses up in Nye Q County? 19 20 That's correct. Α All right. And any federal taxes? 21 Q 22 It says "Pre-tax Income." 23 Okay. Now, with the NewCo have you seen an 24 operating agreement for the NewCo to be created under this

25

agreement?

- A I haven't seen the articles of organization.
- Q Okay. What protections did you make sure were in place to avoid dilution of the minority, 35 percent?

A Since the organization hasn't even been formed, we have a verbal agreement that said that we will have a operating agreement that protects the 35 percent interest of NuVeda.

- Q It's a verbal -- did you say verbal agreement?
- A I said verbal.

1

2

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

Q Anything in writing?

A Well, we have the acquisition agreement that says they're going to get 35 percent. I can't tell you what the terms of the operating agreement are going to be until the organization's been formed. I mean, I've looked at a lot of operating agreements, and they're definitely different.

MS. PIKE-TURNER: I'd pass the witness.

THE COURT: Redirect?

MR. MAUPIN: Just a couple of followup questions.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

20 BY MR. MAUPIN:

- Q I believe you said that you didn't recall attending the November 18 meeting with Pej, Pouya, Shane, and Ms.
- 23 Goldstein. Is that correct?
- 24 A That's right.
- 25 Q Do you remember if you were on the phone with them?

1 Α No. But if Dr. Bady or Dr. Mohajer said that, that's not 2 Q out of the realm of possibility, is it? 3 Possibility. I just don't recall it. 4 Α 5 All right. Now, when the reallocation of the tax Q losses was made did Pej -- excuse me, did Dr. Mohajer rely 6 upon you? MS. PIKE-TURNER: Objection. Calls for speculation. 8 THE COURT: Overruled. Did he rely upon --10 THE WITNESS: 11 BY MR. MAUPIN: 12 Did you discuss what they should do about Q Yeah. these losses? 13 Oh, I did. 14 Α And what was Pouya's concern? 15 Q His concern was that he hadn't actually made the 16 Α cash contribution so he didn't want to take credit for the 17 losses on his 1040. 18 And did you advise him that this move was 19 Q Correct. legal or illegal? 20 Well, of course, I did the changes. I think it's a 21 Α 22 legal move. 23 And was he relying on you to make that decision? Q 24 He was. Α

And is there anything unreasonable about relying on

25

Q

an enrolled IRS agent in terms of how to fill out these returns and the K-1s and all that business?

A I want to correct what you said. I'm not an enrolled IRS agent. I'm an enrolled agent who's admitted to practice before the IRS.

Q Ah. Very good. Very good.

A But no. I do maybe a hundred LLC returns a year, and I've been doing them for a long time, and --

Q So this decision that was made was done in consultation with you?

A Yes.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Did you intend to conspire to do anything with regard to that tax return that would hurt anybody?

A No.

Q That would somehow cause the IRS to audit the company?

A No. I wanted to make the record correct.

Q Now, when you file one of these returns the IRS may or may not approve the allocation; correct?

A Correct.

Q And what's the upshot of the disapproval?

A There would be an audit.

Q And what would -- is there any criminal issues involved, or is it simply just to determine the tax liability?

A It's simply money.

And penalties. 1 THE COURT: And penalties, yes, ma'am. 2 THE WITNESS: 3 BY MR. MAUPIN: But those penalties --4 Q 5 And interest. Α But those penalties would be personal, wouldn't 6 Q they? Yes. 8 Α But there's -- it's not illegal, it's not a crime? Q 10 Α No. All right. One other thing. If -- in your 11 Q experience with a hundred or so LLCs and your familiarity with 12 many more what's your opinion about what would happen if a 13 bunch of minority shareholders could hijack the company like 14 15 this? Well, that was why I asked for the meeting with 16 Α Shane and Jennifer. I just don't think that that's something 17 18 that is permitted. So if this was possible, wouldn't we be having 19 Q lawsuits like this all over America right now? 20 I think you'd have minorities --21 Α 22 MS. PIKE-TURNER: Objection. Calls for speculation. 23 THE COURT: Sustained. 24 MR. MAUPIN: Sustained. It's an argument. 25 THE COURT: It is an argument.

```
MR. MAUPIN: No further questions.
 1
              THE COURT:
                         Look at my docket.
 2
 3
              All right. Anything else, Mr. Dushoff?
                            Yeah, I do. Just to set the record.
 4
              MR. DUSHOFF:
 5
                          RECROSS-EXAMINATION
 6
    BY MR. DUSHOFF:
              Can you turn to Proposed Exhibit 114. Now, would --
 7
         Q
 8
              THE COURT: Any objection to 14? It's your own
    exhibit.
                                     If it's my own exhibit, no.
              MS. PIKE-TURNER: Oh.
10
                         Exhibit 14 will be admitted.
11
              THE COURT:
12
                   (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 14 admitted)
13
    BY MR. DUSHOFF:
14
              I want to show you -- tell me when you get there.
         Q
              I'm here.
15
         Α
              Okay. I want you to read it real briefly.
16
         Q
              It's from Shane Terry --
17
         Α
18
              You don't have to read it out loud.
         Q
19
              THE COURT:
                         Read it to yourself.
    BY MR. DUSHOFF:
20
                     Read it to yourself.
21
              Yeah.
         Q
22
              Oh. Read it to myself. Okay.
23
              It's the -- hold on, you've got the wrong one.
    can almost see it.
24
25
              Okay.
         Α
```

These are the minutes, so I think you might be in 1 Q the wrong book. 2 3 Well, 14 is an email. THE COURT: BY MR. DUSHOFF: It's behind it. Keep going back. You'll see the 5 Q 6 minutes. 7 THE COURT: So you want to go to the page that says 90 on the bottom. 8 BY MR. DUSHOFF: It says NUVEDA90 on the bottom. Aha. Take a second 10 Q and look through that. Those are the minutes of the meeting, 11 proposed minutes of the meeting for November 18th, 2015. 12 Okay. How far do you want --13 Α Does this refresh your recollection that you were 14 Q 15 actually at the meeting on the phone? Yeah, I was. 16 Α MR. DUSHOFF: All right. That's all I've got. 17 18 THE COURT: Anything else? MS. PIKE-TURNER: Not for this witness, no, Your 19 20 Honor. Thank you, sir. We appreciate your 21 THE COURT: 22 time. 23 What's your plan? Can the witness remain in the 24 room now that he's testified? 25 MS. PIKE-TURNER: Sure.

THE COURT: Everybody says okay. So, sir, you don't 1 have to sit in the hallway anymore, you can sit in the 2 3 courtroom if you'd like. What's the plan? It's 12:22. I wanted to let you 5 finish this witness before I went to the next step. MR. MAUPIN: Before you went to the next step? 6 7 Which is do you have another witness, or THE COURT: 8 do you want to do something else. MR. MAUPIN: We're going to call Brian Padgett at 9 around 1:00 o'clock. He's been ill, so --10 Thought you had to be in front of Judge 11 THE COURT: 12 Bulware at 1:00 o'clock. 13 I do. And I communicated that to MS. PIKE-TURNER: 14 Counsel. I'm sorry. I just -- the plan was 15 MR. MAUPIN: Oh. -- and I had -- I just told you the arrangements that were 16 made, and I made them before I knew about that. 17 18 MS. PIKE-TURNER: No. I discussed it yesterday. Yes, that's true. That's true. 19 MR. MAUPIN: Oh. It's an evidentiary hearing, so 20 MS. PIKE-TURNER: 21 it's --22 You're going to be gone the rest of the THE COURT: 23 day. I am, Your Honor, unfortunately. 24 MS. PIKE-TURNER: 25 I know. You told me that originally, THE COURT:

which was why we tried to schedule on Wednesday instead of Thursday. 2 So are we doing something on Friday, or what is your 3 plan? 4 5 MR. MAUPIN: Please. THE COURT: You want to finish Friday? 6 7 MR. MAUPIN: Yes. THE COURT: I'd love to finish Friday. What time 8 do you want to start on Friday? My people say I have four Rule 16 conferences at 8:30, which means I can be done at 10 9:15. I do not have anyone named Peek on the calendar on 11 Friday, although I do have Pisanelli and Bailey and Flansburg. 12 Do you want to start 9:00 o'clock on Friday? 13 MS. PIKE-TURNER: That's fine, Your Honor. 14 How many more witnesses do you think 15 THE COURT: you've got? 16 We've got those two. 17 MR. DUSHOFF: 18 So you think if we have Friday all day THE COURT: 9:00 to whatever? 9:00 to 4:00 with a lunch 19 we'll finish? Can I have a lunch break on Friday? 20 break? I think that's entirely possible. 21 MR. MAUPIN: Oh. 22 Thank you. THE COURT: 23 MR. MAUPIN: Maybe in time to get in nine holes 24 afterwards. 25 Not for me. You've seen how I play THE COURT:

golf. Never mind. Anything else? MR. DUSHOFF: No, Your Honor. MR. AIELLO: Nothing. THE COURT: All right. So we'll be in recess until Friday, which is tomorrow, at 9:00 o'clock. (Court recessed at 12:24 p.m., until the following day, Friday, January 8, 2016, at 9:00 a.m.)

INDEX

NAME	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS
DEFENDANT MOHAJER'S	WITNESSES			
Joseph E. Kennedy	3	51/60	93	97/

* * *

EXHIBITS

DESCRIPTION	ADMITTED
PLAINTIFFS' EXHIBIT NO.	
14 38	97 90

* * *

DEFENDANT BADY'S EXHIBIT NO.

208

* * *

CERTIFICATION

I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE AUDIO-VISUAL RECORDING OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.

AFFIRMATION

I AFFIRM THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT CONTAIN THE SOCIAL SECURITY OR TAX IDENTIFICATION NUMBER OF ANY PERSON OR ENTITY.

FLORENCE HOYT Las Vegas, Nevada 89146

Three M. Hoyt, TRANSCRIBER

1/9/16

DATE