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## Chronological Index to Joint Appendix

| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| $12 / 29 / 2010$ | Complaint | 1 | JA000001- <br> JA000006 |
| $01 / 14 / 2011$ | Amended Complaint | 1 | JA0000007- <br> JA000012 |
| $02 / 11 / 2011$ | Amended Summons | 1 | JA000013- <br> JA000016 |
| $03 / 02 / 2011$ | Answer to Amended Complaint | 1 | JA000017- <br> JA000023 |
| $10 / 25 / 2011$ | Transcript re Discovery Conference | JA000024- <br> JA000027 |  |
| $11 / 08 / 2011$ | Scheduling Order | 1 | JA0000031- <br> JA000032 |
| $11 / 29 / 2011$ | Order Setting Civil Non-Jury Trial | 1 | JA000033- <br> JA000039 |
| $12 / 15 / 2011$ | Stipulated Confidentiality Agreement and <br> Protective Order | 1 | JA000040- <br> JA000048 |
| $12 / 16 / 2011$ | Notice of Entry of Stipulated <br> Confidentiality Agreement and Protective <br> Order | 1 | JA000049- <br> JA000050 |
| $08 / 27 / 2012$ | Transcript re Hearing | JA000051- <br> JA000054 |  |
| $08 / 29 / 2012$ | Stipulation and Order to Extend Discovery <br> Deadlines (First Request) | 1 | JA000055- <br> JA000060 |
| $08 / 30 / 2012$ | Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order to <br> Extend Discovery Deadlines (First <br> Request) | JA000061- <br> JA000062 |  |
| $09 / 21 / 2012$ | Amended Order Setting Civil Non-Jury <br> Trial | 1 | 1 |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10/24/2012 | Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment | 1 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { JA000063- } \\ \text { JA000082 } \end{array}$ |
| 10/24/2012 | Appendix of Exhibits in Support of Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA000083- } \\ & \text { JA000206 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/24/2012 | Declaration of Aaron D. Shipley in Support of Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA000207- } \\ & \text { JA000211 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/25/2012 | Appendix of Exhibits in Support of Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment - filed under seal | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA000212- } \\ & \text { JA000321 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 11/07/2012 | Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment and Plaintiffs' Counter Motion for Partial Summary Judgment | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA000322- } \\ & \text { JA000351 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 11/09/2012 | Appendix of Exhibits to Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment and in Support of Plaintiffs' Counter Motion for Summary Judgment - sections filed under seal | 3-6 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA000352- } \\ & \text { JA001332 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 11/13/2012 | Appendix of Exhibits to Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment and in Support of Plaintiffs' Counter Motion for Summary Judgment | 7-12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA001333- } \\ & \text { JA002053 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 11/29/2012 | Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiff's Counter Motion for Partial Summary Judgment Re: Real Parties in Interest | 13 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA002054- } \\ \text { JA002065 } \end{array}$ |
| 12/06/2012 | Transcript re Status Check | 13 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA002066- } \\ \text { JA002080 } \end{array}$ |
| 01/07/2013 | Reply Brief in Support of Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment | 13 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA002081- } \\ \text { JA002101 } \end{array}$ |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01/17/2013 | Plaintiffs' Reply in Further Support of Their Counter Motion for Partial Summary Judgment | 13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA002102- } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 03/01/2013 | Defendant's Motion in Limine to Exclude Plaintiffs' Claim for Attorneys' Fees as an Element of Damages (MIL \#1) | 13 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA002145- } \\ & \text { JA002175 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 03/01/2013 | Defendant's Motion in Limine to Exclude Plaintiffs' Claim for Damages in the Form of Compensation for Time (MIL \#2) | 13 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA002176- } \\ & \text { JA002210 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 03/05/2013 | Transcript of Proceedings - March 5, 2013 | 14 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA002211- } \\ \text { JA002350 } \end{array}$ |
| 03/14/2013 | Order re Order Granting Plaintiffs Countermotion for Summary Judgment | 14 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { JA002351- } \\ \text { JA002353 } \end{array}$ |
| 03/15/2013 | Notice of Entry of Order re Order Granting Plaintiffs Countermotion for Summary Judgment | 14 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA002354- } \\ & \text { JA002358 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 03/20/2013 | Plaintiffs Opposition to Defendant's Motion in Limine to Exclude Plaintiffs Claim for Attorney's Fees as an Element of Damages MIL 1 | 15 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA002359- } \\ \text { JA002408 } \end{array}$ |
| 03/20/2013 | Plaintiffs Opposition to Defendants Motion in Limine to Plaintiffs Claim for Damages in the form of compensation for time MIL 2 | 15 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA002409- } \\ & \text { JA002433 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 03/21/2013 | Motion to File Second Amended Complaint | 15 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA002434- } \\ \text { JA002461 } \end{array}$ |
| 04/02/2013 | Order re Order Denying Defendants Motion for Summary Judgment | 16 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA002462- } \\ & \text { JA002464 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 04/03/2013 | Notice of Entry of Order re Order Denying Defendants Motion for Summary Judgment | 16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA002465- } \\ & \text { JA002470 } \end{aligned}$ |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| $04 / 08 / 2013$ | Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiffs' <br> Motion for Leave to File a Second <br> Amended Complaint | 16 | JA002471- <br> JA002500 |
| $04 / 17 / 2013$ | Second Amended Order Setting Civil Non- <br> Jury Trial | 16 | JA002501- <br> JA002502 |
| $04 / 23 / 2013$ | Plaintiffs Reply in Further Support of <br> Motion for Leave to File Second Amended <br> Complaint | 16 | JA002503- <br> JA002526 |
| $04 / 26 / 2013$ | Transcript re Hearing | 16 | JA002527- <br> JA002626 |
| $05 / 10 / 2013$ | Plaintiffs Supplement to Motion for Leave <br> to File a Second Amended Complaint <br> Pursuant to the Courts order on Hearing on <br> April 26, 2013 | 16 | JA002627- <br> JA002651 |
| $05 / 10 / 2013$ | Defendant's Supplemental Brief in Support <br> of Its Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for <br> Leave to File a Second Amended <br> Complaint | 16 | JA002652- <br> JA002658 |
| $05 / 30 / 2013$ | Order Granting Plaintiffs Motion for <br> Leave to File a Second Amended <br> Complaint | 16 | JA002659- <br> JA002661 |
| $06 / 05 / 2013$ | Order Granting Plaintiffs Motion for <br> Leave to File a Second Amended <br> Complaint | 16 | JA002662- <br> JA002664 |
| $06 / 05 / 2013$ | Notice of Entry of Order Granting <br> Plaintiffs Motion for Leave to File a <br> Second Amended Complaint | 16 | JA002665- <br> JA002669 |
| $07 / 03 / 2013$ | Answer to Second Amended Complaint <br> and Counterclaim | 16 | JA002678- <br> JA002687 |
| JA002670- |  |  |  |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| $07 / 15 / 2013$ | Plaintiffs Reply to Defendants <br> Counterclaim | 17 | JA002724- <br> JA002731 |
| $07 / 18 / 2013$ | Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine To Permit <br> James J. Jimmerson, Esq. To Testify <br> Concerning Plaintiffs' Attorney's Fees and <br> Costs (MIL \#25) | 17 | JA002732- <br> JA002771 |
| $07 / 22 / 2013$ | Defendant's Motion for Partial Summary <br> Judgment | 17 | JA002772- <br> JA002786 |
| $07 / 22 / 2013$ | Plaintiffs Supplemental Opposition to <br> Defendants Motion in Limine to Plaintiffs <br> Claim for Damages in the Form of <br> Compensation for Time MIL 2 | 17 | JA002787- <br> JA002808 |
| $07 / 23 / 2013$ | Transcript re Status Check | 17 | JA002809- <br> JA002814 |
| $08 / 05 / 2013$ | Defendant Pardee Homes of Nevada's <br> Response to Plaintiffs' Motions in Limine <br> \#1-5; And \#20-25 | 17 | JA002815- <br> JA002829 |
| $08 / 06 / 2013$ | Plaintiffs Opposition to Defendants <br> Motion for Partial Summary Judgment | 17 | JA002830- <br> JA002857 |
| $09 / 16 / 2013$ | Reply in Support of Defendant's Motion <br> for Partial Summary Judgment | 17 | JA002858- <br> JA002864 |
| $09 / 16 / 2013$ | Reply in Support of Defendant's Motion in <br> Limine to Exclude Plaintiff's Claim for <br> Attorney's Fees As An Element of <br> Damages | 17 | JA002865- <br> JA002869 |
| $09 / 23 / 2013$ | Transcript re Hearing <br> Time <br> Damages in the Form of Compensation for <br> Limine to Exclude Plainiffst Claim For in | 17 | JA002870- <br> JA002874 |
| $09 / 16 / 2013$ | JA002875- <br> JA002987 |  |  |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| $09 / 27 / 2013$ | Plaintiffs Supplement to Their Opposition <br> to Defendants Motion for Partial Summary <br> Judgment | $19-21$ | JA002988- <br> JA003203 |
| $09 / 27 / 2013$ | Supplemental Brief in Support of <br> Defendant's Motion for Partial Summary <br> Judgment | 21 | JA003204- <br> JA003209 |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Order Denying Motion for Partial <br> Summary Judgment | 21 | JA003210- <br> JA003212 |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Transcript re Trial | 22 | JA003213- <br> JA003403 |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit A | 23 | JA003404- <br> JA003544 |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit B - filed under seal | JA003545- <br> JA003625 |  |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit C | JA003626- <br> JA003628 |  |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit D | 23 | JA003629- <br> JA003631 |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit E - filed under seal | 23 | JA003632- <br> JA003634 |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit F | 23 | JA003635- <br> JA003637 |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit G | JA003641- <br> JA003643 |  |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit H | JA003639- <br> JA003640 |  |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit I | 23 | JA |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10/23/2013 | Trial Exhibit J - filed under seal | 24 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA003644- } \\ \text { JA003669 } \end{array}$ |
| 10/23/2013 | Trial Exhibit K | 24 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA003670- } \\ & \text { JA003674 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/23/2013 | Trial Exhibit L | 24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA003675- } \\ & \text { JA003678 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/23/2013 | Trial Exhibit M | 24 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA003679- } \\ & \text { JA003680 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/23/2013 | Trial Exhibit N | 24 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA003681- } \\ & \text { JA003683 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/23/2013 | Trial Exhibit O - filed under seal | 25-26 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { JA0003684- } \\ \hline \text { JA004083 } \end{array}$ |
| 10/23/2013 | Trial Exhibit P | 27 | JA004084 |
| 10/23/2013 | Trial Exhibit Q | 27 | JA004085 |
| 10/23/2013 | Trial Exhibit R | 27 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA004086- } \\ & \text { JA004089 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/23/2013 | Trial Exhibit S | 27 | JA004090 |
| 10/23/2013 | Trial Exhibit T | 27 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA004091- } \\ & \text { JA004092 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/23/2013 | Trial Exhibit U | 27 | JA004093 |
| 10/23/2013 | Trial Exhibit V | 27 | JA004094 |
| 10/23/2013 | Trial Exhibit W | 27 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA004095- } \\ & \text { JA004096 } \end{aligned}$ |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit X | 27 | JA004097 |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit Y | 27 | JA004098 |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit Z | 27 | JA004099- <br> JA004100 |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit AA | 27 | JA004101- <br> JA004102 |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit BB | 27 | JA004103 |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit CC | 27 | JA004105 |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit DD | 27 | JA004106- <br> JA004113 |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit EE | 27 | JA004114- <br> JA004118 |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit FF | 27 | JA004119- <br> JA004122 |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit GG | 27 | JA004123 |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit HH | JA004126- <br> JA004167 |  |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit II | Trial Exhibit JJ | 27 |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | TA004124 |  |  |
| $10 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit KK | 27 | JA004125 |
|  |  | 27 |  |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit LL | 27 | JA004168 |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit MM | 27 | JA004169 |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit NN | 27 | JA004170- <br> JA004174 |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit OO | JA004175- <br> JA004183 |  |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit PP | 27 | JA004184- <br> JA004240 |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit QQ | JA004241- <br> JA004243 |  |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit RR | JA004244- <br> JA004248 |  |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit SS | JA004249- <br> JA004255 |  |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit TT | 27 | JA004256- <br> JA004262 |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit UU | 27 | JA004263- <br> JA004288 |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit 1 | 27 | JA004289- <br> JA004292 |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit 6 - filed under seal | JA004311- <br> JA004312 |  |
| $10 / 23 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit 7 - filed under seal | JA004293- <br> JA004307 |  |
| Trial Exhibit 8 - filed under seal | $27308-$ |  |  |
| 1013 |  |  |  |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10/23/2013 | Trial Exhibit 9 - filed under seal | 27 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA004313- } \\ & \text { JA004319 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/23/2013 | Trial Exhibit 10 - filed under seal | 27 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA004320- } \\ & \text { JA004329 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/23/2013 | Trial Exhibit 11 - filed under seal | 28 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA004330- } \\ & \text { JA004340 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/23/2013 | Trial Exhibit 12 - filed under seal | 28 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA004341- } \\ & \text { JA004360 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/23/2013 | Trial Exhibit 13 - filed under seal | 28 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA004361- } \\ & \text { JA004453 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/23/2013 | Trial Exhibit 21 | 28 | JA004454 |
| 10/23/2013 | Trial Exhibit 25 | 28 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA004455- } \\ & \text { JA004462 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/24/2013 | Transcript re Trial | 29-30 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA004463- } \\ & \text { JA004790 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/24/2013 | Trial Exhibit VV | 31 | JA004791 |
| 10/24/2013 | Trial Exhibit 26 | 31 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA004792- } \\ & \text { JA004804 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/24/2013 | Trial Exhibit 30 | 31 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA004805- } \\ & \text { JA004811 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/25/2013 | Notice of Entry of Order Denying Motion for Partial Summary Judgment | 31 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA004812- } \\ & \text { JA004817 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/25/2013 | Plaintiffs Trial Brief Pursuant to EDCR 7.27 | 31 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA004818- } \\ & \text { JA004847 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/28/2013 | Transcript re Trial - filed under seal | 32-33 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA004848- } \\ & \text { JA005227 } \end{aligned}$ |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10/28/2013 | Trial Exhibit 15 | 34 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA005228- } \\ & \text { JA005232 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/28/2013 | Trial Exhibit 18 | 34 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA005233- } \\ & \text { JA005235 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/28/2013 | Trial Exhibit 19 | 34 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA005236- } \\ & \text { JA005237 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/28/2013 | Trial Exhibit 20 | 34 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA005238- } \\ & \text { JA005254 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/28/2013 | Trial Exhibit 23 | 34 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA005255- } \\ & \text { JA005260 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/28/2013 | Trial Exhibit 24 | 34 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA005261- } \\ & \text { JA005263 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/29/2013 | Transcript re Trial - filed under seal | 35 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA005264- } \\ \text { JA005493 } \end{array}$ |
| 10/29/2013 | Trial Exhibit 28 | 36 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA005494- } \\ & \text { JA005497 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/29/2013 | Trial Exhibit 29 | 36 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA005498- } \\ \text { JA005511 } \end{array}$ |
| 10/30/2013 | Transcript re Trial | 37-38 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA005512- } \\ & \text { JA005815 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/30/2013 | Trial Exhibit 23a | 39 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA005816- } \\ & \text { JA005817 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/30/2013 | Trial Exhibit 27 | 39 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA005818- } \\ \text { JA005820 } \end{array}$ |
| 12/09/2013 | Transcript re Trial - filed under seal | 40-41 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA005821- } \\ & \text { JA006192 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 12/10/2013 | Transcript re Trial | 42-43 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA006193- } \\ & \text { IAAO6530 } \end{aligned}$ |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| $12 / 10 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit WW | 43 | JA006531- <br> JA006532 |
| $12 / 12 / 2013$ | Transcript re Trial - filed under seal | $44-45$ | JA006533- <br> JA006878 |
| $12 / 12 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit XX | 46 | JA006879- <br> JA006935 |
| $12 / 12 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit 39 | 46 | JA006936- <br> JA006948 |
| $12 / 12 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit 40 | 46 | JA006949- <br> JA006950 |
| $12 / 12 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit 41 | JA006951- <br> JA006952 |  |
| $12 / 13 / 2013$ | Transcript re Trial - Part 1 | 46 | JA006953- <br> JA007107 |
| $12 / 13 / 2013$ | Transcript re Trial - Part 2 | JA007108- <br> JA007384 |  |
| $12 / 13 / 2013$ | Trial Exhibit 31a | 48 | JA007385- <br> JA007410 |
| $06 / 24 / 2014$ | Pardee's Motion to Expunge Lis Pendens - <br> section filed under seal | 48 | JA007411- <br> JA007456 |
| $06 / 25 / 2014$ | Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and <br> Order | 48 | JA007457- <br> JA007474 |
| $07 / 15 / 2014$ | Reply in Support of Pardee's Motion to <br> Expunge Lis Pendens | 48 | JA007560- <br> JA007570 |
| $06 / 27 / 2014$ | Notice of Entry of Findings of Fact, <br> Conclusions of Law and Order | 48 | JA007475- <br> JA007494 |
| $07 / 14 / 2014$ | Opposition to Pardee's Motion to Expunge <br> Jis Pendens | 48 | JA007495- |
| 1007559 |  |  |  |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07/24/2014 | Order Granting Motion to Expunge Lis Pendens | 48 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { JA007571- } \\ \text { JA007573 } \end{array}$ |
| 07/25/2014 | Notice of Entry of Order Granting Motion to Expunge Lis Pendens | 48 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA007574- } \\ \text { JA007578 } \end{array}$ |
| 07/17/2014 | Transcript re Hearing | 49 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA007579- } \\ & \text { JA007629 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 07/31/2014 | Transcript re Hearing | 49 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { JA007630- } \\ \text { JA007646 } \end{array}$ |
| 08/25/2014 | Plaintiff's Accounting Brief Pursuant to the court's Order Entered on June 25, 2014 | 49 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA007647- } \\ \text { JA007698 } \end{array}$ |
| 08/25/2014 | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Supplemental Brief Regarding Future Accounting | 49 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { JA00769- } \\ \text { JA007707 } \end{array}$ |
| 05/13/2015 | Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Supplemental Briefing re Future Accounting | 49 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA007708- } \\ \text { JA007711 } \end{array}$ |
| 05/13/2015 | Notice of Entry of Order on Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Supplemental Briefing re Future Accounting | 49 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA007712- } \\ \text { JA007717 } \end{array}$ |
| 05/28/2015 | Pardee's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 49 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { JA007718- } \\ \text { JA007734 } \end{array}$ |
| 05/28/2015 | Appendix of Exhibits to Pardee's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 50-51 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA007735- } \\ \text { JA008150 } \end{array}$ |
| 06/15/2015 | Judgment | 52 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA008151- } \\ \text { JA008153 } \end{array}$ |
| 06/15/2015 | Notice of Entry of Judgment | 52 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA008154- } \\ \text { JA008158 } \end{array}$ |
| 06/19/2015 | Plaintiffs, James Wolfram and Walt Wilkes' Memorandum of Costs and Disbursements | 52 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA008159- } \\ \text { JA008191 } \end{array}$ |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $06 / 24 / 2015$ | Pardee's Motion to Retax Plaintiffs' <br> Memorandum of Costs Filed June 19, <br> 2015 | 52 | JA008192- <br> JA008215 |
| $06 / 29 / 2015$ | Plaintiffs' Motion for Attorney's Fees and <br> Costs | $52-53$ | JA008216- |
| 06/29/2015 | Motion to Strike "Judgment', Entered June <br> 15, 2015 Pursuant To NRCP. 52 (B) And <br> N.R.C.P. 59, As Unnecessary and <br> Duplicative Orders Of Final Orders <br> Entered on June 25, 2014 and May 13, <br> 2015, and as Such, is a Fugitive Document | 53 | JA008328- |
| $06 / 29 / 2015$ | Plaintiffs' Motion Pursuant to NRCP 52(b) <br> and 59 to Amend The Court's Judgment <br> Entered on June 15, 2015, to Amend the <br> Findings of Fact/conclusions of Law and <br> Judgment Contained Therein, Specifically <br> Referred to in the Language Included in <br> the Judgment at Page 2, Lines 8 Through <br> 13 and the Judgment At Page 2, Lines 18 <br> Through 23 to Delete the Same or Amend <br> The Same to Reflect the True Fact That <br> Plaintiff Prevailed On Their Entitlement to <br> the First Claim for Relief For an <br> Accounting, and Damages for Their <br> Second Claim for Relief of Breach of <br> Contract, and Their Third Claim for Relief <br> for Breach of the Implied Covenant for <br> Good Faith and Fair Dealing and That <br> Defendant Never Received a Judgment in <br> its Form and Against Plaintiffs <br> Whatsoever as Mistakenly Stated Within <br> the Court's Latest "Judgment - sections <br> filed under seal | $54-56$ | JA008395- |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $06 / 30 / 2015$ | Supplement to Plaintiffs' Pending Motion <br> for Attorney's Fees and Costs, Motion to <br> Strike Judgment, Motion Pursuant to <br> NRCP 52(b) and NRCP 59 to Amend the <br> Court's Judgment, and Plaintiffs' <br> Opposition to Pardee's Motion for <br> Attorney's Fees and Costs | 59 | JA009110- <br> JA009206 |
| $07 / 02 / 2015$ | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Motion to <br> Amend Judgment | 59 | JA009207- <br> JA009283 |
| $07 / 08 / 2015$ | Plaintiffs' Opposition to Pardee's Motion to <br> Retax Costs | $60-61$ | JA009284- |
| $07 / 08 / 2015$ | Errata to Motion to Strike "Judgment", <br> Entered June 15, 2015 Pursuant to NRCP <br> $52(b)$ and NRCP 59, as Unnecessary and <br> Duplicative Orders of Final Orders <br> Entered on June 25, 2014 and May 13, <br> 2015, and as such, is a Fugitive Document | 62 | JA009645- <br> JA009652 |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07/08/2015 | Errata to Plaintiffs' Motion Pursuant to NRCP 52(b) and 59 to Amend the Court's Judgment Entered on June 15, 2015, to Amend the Findings of Fact/Conclusions of Law and Judgment Contained Therein, Specifically Referred to in the Language Included in the Judgment at Page, 2, Lines 8 through 13 and the Judgment at Page 2, Lines 18 through 23 to Delete the Same or Amend the Same to Reflect the True Fact that Plaintiff Prevailed on their Entitlement to the First Claim for Relief for an Accounting, and Damages for their Second Claim for Relief of Breach of Contract, and Their Third Claim for Relief for Breach of the Implied Covenant for Good Faith and Fair Dealing and that Defendant Never Received a Judgment in its form and Against Plaintiffs Whatsoever as Mistakenly Stated Within the Court's Latest "Judgment" | 62 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA009653- } \\ & \text { JA009662 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 07/08/2015 | Pardee's Emergency Motion to Stay Execution of Judgment: and Ex Parte Order Shortening Time | 62 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA009663- } \\ \text { JA009710 } \end{array}$ |
| 07/08/2015 | Pardee's Supplemental Briefing in Support of its Emergency Motion to Stay Execution of Judgment | 62 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA009711- } \\ & \text { JA009733 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 07/10/2015 | Transcript re Hearing | 62 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA009734- } \\ & \text { JA009752 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 07/10/2015 | Order on Pardee's Emergency Motion to Stay Execution of Judgment; and Ex Parte Order Shortening Time | 62 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA009753- } \\ & \text { JA009754 } \end{aligned}$ |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $07 / 10 / 2015$ | Notice of Entry of Order on Pardee's <br> Emergency Motion to Stay Execution of <br> Judgment; and Ex Parte Order Shortening <br> Time | 62 | JA009755- <br> JA009758 |
| $07 / 15 / 2015$ | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Opposition to <br> Plaintiff's Motion for Attorney's Fees and <br> Costs | 62 | JA009759- <br> JA009771 |
| $07 / 15 / 2015$ | Appendix of Exhibits to Pardee Homes of <br> Nevada's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion <br> for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 63 | JA009772- <br> JA009918 |
| $07 / 15 / 2015$ | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Consolidated <br> Opposition To: (1) Plaintiff's Motion to <br> Strike Judgment Entered on June 15, 2015 <br> Pursuant to NRCP 52(b) and NRCP 59; <br> and (2) Plaintiffs' Motion Pursuant to <br> NRCP 52(b) and 59 to Amend the Court's <br> Judgment Entered on June 15, 2015 | 63 | JA009919- <br> JA009943 |
| $07 / 15 / 2015$ | Appendix of Exhibits to Pardee Homes of <br> Nevada's Consolidated Opposition to: (1) <br> Plaintiff's Motion to Strike Judgment <br> Entered on June 15, 2015 Pursuant to <br> NRCP 52(b) and NRCP 59; and Plaintiffs' <br> Motion Pursuant to NRCP 52(b) and 59 to <br> Amend the Court's Judgment Entered on <br> June 15, 2015 | 64 | JA009944- <br> JA010185 |
| $07 / 17 / 2015$ | Plaintiffs' Opposition to Pardee Homes of <br> Nevada's Motion to Amend Judgment and <br> Countermotion for Attorney's Fees | $65-67$ | JA010203- <br> JA010481 |
| Apposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for |  |  |  |
| Attorn's Fees and Costs |  |  |  |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07/24/2015 | Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration, Ex Parte (With Notice) of Application for Order Shortening Time Regarding Stay of Execution and Order Shortening Time Regarding Stay of Execution | 67 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA010482- } \\ \text { JA010522 } \end{array}$ |
| 07/24/2015 | Declaration of John W. Muije, Esq. In Support of Motion for Reconsideration | 67 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA010523- } \\ & \text { JA010581 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 08/10/2015 | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration of the Order on Pardee's Emergency Motion to Stay Execution of Judgment | 67 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { JA010582- } \\ \text { JA010669 } \end{array}$ |
| 08/17/2015 | Reply Points and Authorities in Support of Motion for Reconsideration | 67 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA010670- } \\ & \text { JA010678 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 08/24/2015 | Minute Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration, Ex Parte (With Notice) of Application for Order Shortening Time Regarding Stay of Execution and Order Shortening Time Regarding Stay of Execution | 67 | JA010679 |
| 09/11/2015 | Plaintiffs' Reply to Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 68 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA010680- } \\ & \text { JA010722 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 09/11/2015 | Plaintiffs' Reply to Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Strike "Judgment" Entered June 15, 2015 Pursuant to NRCP 52(b) and NRCP 59 | 68 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA010723- } \\ \text { JA010767 } \end{array}$ |
| 09/11/2015 | Plaintiffs' Reply to Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion Pursuant to NRCP 52(b) and NRCP 59 to Amend the Court's Judgment Entered on June 15, 2015 | 68 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA010768- } \\ & \text { JA010811 } \end{aligned}$ |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 09/12/2015 | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Consolidated <br> Reply in Support of (1) Motion to Retax <br> Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Costs Filed <br> June 19, 2015; and (2) Motion for <br> Attorney's Fees and Costs | 68 | JA010812- <br> JA010865 |
| $12 / 08 / 2015$ | Plaintiffs' Supplement to Plaintiffs' <br> Opposition to Pardee's Motion for <br> Attorney's Fees and Costs | 68 | JA010866- <br> JA010895 |
| $12 / 08 / 2015$ | Notice of Defendant Pardee Homes of <br> Nevada's Non-Reply and Non-Opposition <br> to "Plaintiff's Opposition to Pardee Homes <br> of Nevada's Motion to Amend Judgment <br> and Countermotion for Attorney's Fees" | 69 | JA010896- <br> JA010945 |
| $12 / 30 / 2015$ | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Consolidated <br> Response to: (1) Plaintiffs' Notice of Non- <br> Reply and Non-Opposition to Plaintiffs' <br> Opposition to Pardee's Motion to Amend <br> Judgment and Countermotion for <br> Attorney's Fees; and (2) Plaintiffs' <br> Supplement to Plaintiffs' Opposition to <br> Pardee's Motion for Attorney's Fees and <br> Costs | 69 | JA010946- <br> JA010953 |
| $01 / 11 / 2016$ | Plaintiffs' Reply to Defendants <br> Consolidated Response to (1) Plaintiffs' <br> Notice of Non-Reply and Non-Opposition <br> to Plaintiff's Opposition to Pardee's Motion <br> to Amend Judgment and Countermotion <br> for Attorney's Fees And (2) Plaintiffs' <br> Supplement to Plaintiffs' Opposition to <br> Pardee's Motion for Attorney's Fees and <br> Costs | 69 | JA010954- <br> JA010961 |
| $01 / 15 / 2016$ | Transcript re Hearing | 70 | JA010962- <br> JA011167 |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 03/14/2016 | Plaintiffs' Motion to Settle Two (2) Competing Judgments and Orders | 70 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA011168- } \\ & \text { JA011210 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 03/16/2016 | Release of Judgment | 71 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA011211- } \\ \text { JA011213 } \end{array}$ |
| 03/23/2016 | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Response to Plaintiffs' Motion to Settle Two (2) Sets of Competing Judgments and Orders | 71 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA011214- } \\ & \text { JA011270 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 04/20/2016 | Plaintiffs' Reply to Defendant's Response and Supplement to Plaintiffs' Motion to Settle Two (2) Sets of Competing Judgments and Orders | 71 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA011271- } \\ & \text { JA011384 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 04/26/2016 | Order from January 15, 2016 Hearings | 71 | JA011385- <br> JA011388 |
| 05/16/2016 | Judgment | 71 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA011389- } \\ & \text { JA011391 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 05/17/2016 | Notice of Entry of Judgment | 71 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA011392- } \\ & \text { JA011396 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 05/23/2016 | Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Costs and Disbursements | 71 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA011397- } \\ & \text { JA011441 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 05/31/2016 | Pardee's Motion to Retax Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Costs Filed May 23, 2016 | 71 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA011442- } \\ \text { JA011454 } \end{array}$ |
| 06/01/2016 | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Motion to Amend Judgment | 72 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA011455- } \\ & \text { JA011589 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 06/06/2016 | Pardee's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 72 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA011590- } \\ \text { JA011614 } \end{array}$ |
| 06/06/2016 | Appendix of Exhibits to Pardee Homes Motion for Attorney Fees and Costs Volume 1 | 73-74 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA011615- } \\ & \text { JA011866 } \end{aligned}$ |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 06/06/2016 | Appendix of Exhibits to Pardee Homes Motion for Attorney Fees and Costs Volume 2 | 75-76 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA011867- } \\ \text { JA012114 } \end{array}$ |
| 06/08/2016 | Plaintiffs' Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 77 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { JA012115- } \\ \text { JA012182 } \end{array}$ |
| 06/20/2016 | Plaintiffs' Opposition to Pardee's Motion to Retax Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Costs Filed May 23, 2016 | 77-79 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA012183- } \\ \text { JA012624 } \end{array}$ |
| 06/21/2016 | Plaintiffs' Opposition to Pardee's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 80 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA012625- } \\ \text { JA012812 } \end{array}$ |
| 06/21/2016 | Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendant, Pardee Homes of Nevada's, Motion to Amend Judgment and Plaintiffs' Countermotion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS 18.010 and EDCR 7.60 | 81 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA012813- } \\ \text { JA013024 } \end{array}$ |
| 06/27/2016 | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 82 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA013025- } \\ \text { JA013170 } \end{array}$ |
| 06/30/2016 | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Reply in Support of Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 82 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA013171- } \\ & \text { JA013182 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 06/30/2016 | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Reply in Support of Motion to Amend Judgment; and Opposition to Plaintiffs' Countermotion for Attorney's Fees | 82 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA013183- } \\ \text { JA013199 } \end{array}$ |
| 07/01/2016 | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Reply in Support of Motion to Retax Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Costs Filed May 23, 2016 | 82 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA013197- } \\ \text { JA013204 } \end{array}$ |
| 08/02/2016 | Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 83-84 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA013205- } \\ \text { JA013357 } \end{array}$ |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 08/02/2016 | Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of Countermotion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 84-85 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA013358- } \\ \text { JA013444 } \end{array}$ |
| 08/15/2016 | Transcript re Hearing - August 15, 2016 | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA013445- } \\ & \text { JA013565 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 09/12/2016 | Plaintiffs' Brief on Interest Pursuant to the Court's Order Entered on August 15, 2016 | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA013566- } \\ & \text { JA013590 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/17/2016 | Pardee's Supplemental Brief Regarding Pre- and Post-Judgment Interest Pursuant to the Court's Order | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA013591- } \\ & \text { JA013602 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 11/04/2016 | Plaintiffs' Reply Brief in Support of Brief on Interest Pursuant to the Court's Order Entered on August 15, 2016 | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA013603- } \\ & \text { JA013612 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 01/09/2017 | Order and Judgment from August 15, 2016 Hearings Regarding Defendants Motion to Amend Judgment | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA013613- } \\ & \text { JA013615 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 01/09/2017 | Order and Judgment from August 15, 2016 Hearings Regarding Plaintiff's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA013616- } \\ & \text { JA013618 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 01/09/2017 | Order and Judgment from August 15, 2016 Hearings Regarding Defendant's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 86 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { JA013619- } \\ \text { JA013621 } \end{array}$ |
| 01/10/2017 | Notice of Entry of Order and Judgment from August 15, 2016 Hearings Regarding Plaintiff's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA013622- } \\ & \text { JA013628 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 01/10/2017 | Notice of Entry of Order and Judgment from August 15, 2016 Hearings Regarding Defendant's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA013629- } \\ & \text { JA013635 } \end{aligned}$ |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01/10/2017 | Notice of Entry of Order and Judgment from August 15, 2016 Hearings Regarding Defendant's Motion to Amend Judgment | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA013636- } \\ & \text { JA016342 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 01/12/2017 | Order on Plaintiffs' Countermotion for Attorney's Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS 18.010 and EDCR 7.60 | 86 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA013643- } \\ \text { JA013644 } \end{array}$ |
| 01/12/2017 | Notice of Entry of Order on Plaintiffs' Countermotion for Attorney's Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS 18.010 and EDCR 7.60 | 86 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA013645- } \\ \text { JA013648 } \end{array}$ |
| 01/12/2017 | Order on Defendant's Motion to Retax Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Costs Filed May 23, 2016 | 86 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { JA013649- } \\ \text { JA013651 } \end{array}$ |
| 01/13/2017 | Notice of Entry of Order on Defendant's Motion to Retax Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Costs Filed May 23, 2016 | 86 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA013652- } \\ \text { JA013656 } \end{array}$ |
| 02/08/2017 | Pardee Notice of Appeal | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA013657- } \\ & \text { JA013659 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 04/07/2017 | Pardee's Motion to Stay Execution of Judgment and Post-Judgment Orders | 86 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA013660- } \\ \text { JA013668 } \end{array}$ |
| 04/07/2017 | Appendix of Exhibits in Support of Pardee's Motion to Stay Execution of Judgment and Post-Judgment Orders, [Volume I] | 87 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA013669- } \\ \text { JA013914 } \end{array}$ |
| 04/07/2017 | Appendix of Exhibits in Support of Pardee's Motion to Stay Execution of Judgment and Post-Judgment Orders, [Volume II] | 88 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA013915- } \\ & \text { JA014065 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 04/27/2017 | Plaintiffs' Response to Pardee's Motion to Stay Execution of Judgment and PostJudgment Orders | 88 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA014066- } \\ \text { JA014068 } \end{array}$ |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| $05 / 10 / 2017$ | Pardee's Reply in Support of Motion to <br> Stay Execution of Judgment and Post- <br> Judgment Orders | 88 | JA014069- <br> JA014071 |
| $05 / 12 / 2017$ | Plaintiffs' Opposition to Pardee's Motion <br> Stay Execution of Judgment and Post- <br> Judgment Orders | 88 | JA014072- <br> JA014105 |
| $07 / 12 / 2007$ | Supplemental Order Regarding Plaintiffs' <br> Entitlement to, and Calculation of, <br> Prejudgment Interest | 88 | JA014106- <br> JA014110 |
| $07 / 14 / 2017$ | Notice of Entry of Supplemental Order <br> Regarding Plaintiffs' Entitlement to, and <br> Calculation of, Prejudgment Interest | 88 | JA014111- <br> JA014117 |
| $10 / 12 / 2017$ | Amended Judgment | 88 | JA014118- <br> JA014129 |
| $10 / 13 / 2017$ | Notice of Entry of Amended Judgment | 88 | JA014130- <br> JA014143 |
| $10 / 12 / 2017$ | Order Re: Defendant Pardee Homes of <br> Nevada's Motion to Stay Execution of <br> Judgment and Post-Judgment Orders | 88 | JA014144- <br> JA014146 |
| $10 / 13 / 2017$ | Notice of Entry of Order Re: Defendant <br> Pardee Homes of Nevada's Motion to Stay <br> Execution of Judgment and Post-Judgment <br> Orders | 88 | JA014147- <br> JA014151 |
| $11 / 02 / 2017$ | Pardee Amended Notice of Appeal <br> FA014152- |  |  |

## Alphabetical Index to Joint Appendix

| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $01 / 14 / 2011$ | Amended Complaint | 1 | JA000007- <br> JA000012 |
| $10 / 12 / 2017$ | Amended Judgment | JA014118- <br> JA014129 |  |
| $09 / 21 / 2012$ | Amended Order Setting Civil Non-Jury <br> Trial | 1 | JA000061- <br> JA000062 |
| $02 / 11 / 2011$ | Amended Summons | 1 | JA000013- <br> JA000016 |
| $03 / 02 / 2011$ | Answer to Amended Complaint | JA000017- <br> JA000023 |  |
| $07 / 03 / 2013$ | Answer to Second Amended Complaint <br> and Counterclaim | 16 | JA002678- <br> JA002687 |
| $10 / 24 / 2012$ | Appendix of Exhibits in Support of <br> Defendant's Motion for Summary <br> Judgment | JA0000083- <br> JA000206 |  |
| $10 / 25 / 2012$ | Appendix of Exhibits in Support of <br> Defendant's Motion for Summary <br> Judgment - filed under seal | 2 | JA000212- <br> JA000321 |
| $04 / 07 / 2017$ | Appendix of Exhibits in Support of <br> Pardee's Motion to Stay Execution of <br> Judgment and Post-Judgment Orders, <br> [Volume I] | 87 | JA013669- <br> JA013914 |
| $04 / 07 / 2017$ | Appendix of Exhibits in Support of <br> Pardee's Motion to Stay Execution of <br> Judgment and Post-Judgment Orders, <br> [Volume II] | 88 | JA013915- <br> JA014065 |
| $06 / 06 / 2016$ | Appendix of Exhibits to Pardee Homes <br> Motion for Attorney Fees and Costs - <br> Volume 1 | $73-74$ | JA011615- <br> JA011866 |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 06/06/2016 | Appendix of Exhibits to Pardee Homes Motion for Attorney Fees and Costs Volume 2 | 75-76 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA011867- } \\ & \text { JA012114 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 07/15/2015 | Appendix of Exhibits to Pardee Homes of Nevada's Consolidated Opposition to: (1) Plaintiff's Motion to Strike Judgment Entered on June 15, 2015 Pursuant to NRCP 52(b) and NRCP 59; and Plaintiffs' Motion Pursuant to NRCP 52(b) and 59 to Amend the Court's Judgment Entered on June 15, 2015 | 64 | JA009944- JA010185 |
| 07/15/2015 | Appendix of Exhibits to Pardee Homes of Nevada's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 63 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA009772- } \\ & \text { JA009918 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 05/28/2015 | Appendix of Exhibits to Pardee's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 50-51 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA007735- } \\ & \text { JA008150 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 11/09/2012 | Appendix of Exhibits to Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment and in Support of Plaintiffs' Counter Motion for Summary Judgment - sections filed under seal | 3-6 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA000352- } \\ & \text { JA001332 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 11/13/2012 | Appendix of Exhibits to Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment and in Support of Plaintiffs' Counter Motion for Summary Judgment | 7-12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA001333- } \\ & \text { JA002053 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 12/29/2010 | Complaint | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA000001- } \\ & \text { JA000006 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/24/2012 | Declaration of Aaron D. Shipley in Support of Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA000207- } \\ & \text { JA000211 } \end{aligned}$ |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07/24/2015 | Declaration of John W. Muije, Esq. In Support of Motion for Reconsideration | 67 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA010523- } \\ & \text { JA010581 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 08/05/2013 | Defendant Pardee Homes of Nevada's Response to Plaintiffs' Motions in Limine \#1-5; And \#20-25 | 17 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA002815- } \\ & \text { JA002829 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 07/22/2013 | Defendant's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment | 17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA002772- } \\ & \text { JA002786 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/24/2012 | Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA000063- } \\ & \text { JA000082 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 03/01/2013 | Defendant's Motion in Limine to Exclude Plaintiffs' Claim for Attorneys' Fees as an Element of Damages (MIL \#1) | 13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA002145- } \\ & \text { JA002175 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 03/01/2013 | Defendant's Motion in Limine to Exclude Plaintiffs' Claim for Damages in the Form of Compensation for Time (MIL \#2) | 13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA002176- } \\ & \text { JA002210 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 11/29/2012 | Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiff's Counter Motion for Partial Summary Judgment Re: Real Parties in Interest | 13 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA002054- } \\ & \text { JA002065 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 04/08/2013 | Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to File a Second Amended Complaint | 16 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA002471- } \\ & \text { JA002500 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 05/10/2013 | Defendant's Supplemental Brief in Support of Its Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to File a Second Amended Complaint | 16 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA002652- } \\ & \text { JA002658 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 07/08/2015 | Errata to Motion to Strike "Judgment", Entered June 15, 2015 Pursuant to NRCP 52(b) and NRCP 59, as Unnecessary and Duplicative Orders of Final Orders Entered on June 25, 2014 and May 13, 2015, and as such, is a Fugitive Document | 62 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA009645- } \\ & \text { JA009652 } \end{aligned}$ |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07/16/2015 | Errata to Pardee Homes of Nevada's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 65 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA010186- } \\ & \text { JA010202 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 07/08/2015 | Errata to Plaintiffs' Motion Pursuant to NRCP 52(b) and 59 to Amend the Court's Judgment Entered on June 15, 2015, to Amend the Findings of Fact/Conclusions of Law and Judgment Contained Therein, Specifically Referred to in the Language Included in the Judgment at Page, 2, Lines 8 through 13 and the Judgment at Page 2, Lines 18 through 23 to Delete the Same or Amend the Same to Reflect the True Fact that Plaintiff Prevailed on their Entitlement to the First Claim for Relief for an Accounting, and Damages for their Second Claim for Relief of Breach of Contract, and Their Third Claim for Relief for Breach of the Implied Covenant for Good Faith and Fair Dealing and that Defendant Never Received a Judgment in its form and Against Plaintiffs Whatsoever as Mistakenly Stated Within the Court's Latest "Judgment" | 62 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA009653- } \\ & \text { JA009662 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 05/13/2015 | Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Supplemental Briefing re Future Accounting | 49 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA007708- } \\ & \text { JA007711 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 06/25/2014 | Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order | 48 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA007457- } \\ & \text { JA007474 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 06/15/2015 | Judgment | 52 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA008151- } \\ & \text { JA008153 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 05/16/2016 | Judgment | 71 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA011389- } \\ & \text { JA011391 } \end{aligned}$ |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 08/24/2015 | Minute Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration, Ex Parte (With Notice) of Application for Order Shortening Time Regarding Stay of Execution and Order Shortening Time Regarding Stay of Execution | 67 | JA010679 |
| 03/21/2013 | Motion to File Second Amended Complaint | 15 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA002434- } \\ \text { JA002461 } \end{array}$ |
| 06/29/2015 | Motion to Strike "Judgment", Entered June 15, 2015 Pursuant to N.R.C.P. 52 (B) And N.R.C.P. 59, As Unnecessary and Duplicative Orders of Final Orders Entered on June 25, 2014 And May 13, 2015, And as Such, Is A Fugitive Document | 53 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA008328- } \\ & \text { JA008394 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 12/08/2015 | Notice of Defendant Pardee Homes of Nevada's Non-Reply and Non-Opposition to "Plaintiff's Opposition to Pardee Homes of Nevada's Motion to Amend Judgment and Countermotion for Attorney's Fees" | 69 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA010896- } \\ & \text { JA010945 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/13/2017 | Notice of Entry of Amended Judgment | 88 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA014130- } \\ & \text { JA014143 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 06/27/2014 | Notice of Entry of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order | 48 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA007475- } \\ & \text { JA007494 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 06/15/2015 | Notice of Entry of Judgment | 52 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA008154- } \\ & \text { JA008158 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 05/17/2016 | Notice of Entry of Judgment | 71 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA011392- } \\ & \text { JA011396 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 01/10/2017 | Notice of Entry of Order and Judgment from August 15, 2016 Hearings Regarding Defendant's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA013629- } \\ & \text { JA013635 } \end{aligned}$ |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01/10/2017 | Notice of Entry of Order and Judgment from August 15, 2016 Hearings Regarding Defendant's Motion to Amend Judgment | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA013636- } \\ & \text { JA016342 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 01/10/2017 | Notice of Entry of Order and Judgment from August 15, 2016 Hearings Regarding Plaintiff's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA013622- } \\ & \text { JA013628 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/25/2013 | Notice of Entry of Order Denying Motion for Partial Summary Judgment | 31 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA004812- } \\ & \text { JA004817 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 07/25/2014 | Notice of Entry of Order Granting Motion to Expunge Lis Pendens | 48 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA007574- } \\ & \text { JA007578 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 06/05/2013 | Notice of Entry of Order Granting Plaintiffs Motion for Leave to File a Second Amended Complaint | 16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA002665- } \\ & \text { JA002669 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 01/13/2017 | Notice of Entry of Order on Defendant's Motion to Retax Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Costs Filed May 23, 2016 | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA013652- } \\ & \text { JA013656 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 05/13/2015 | Notice of Entry of Order on Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Supplemental Briefing re Future Accounting | 49 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA007712- } \\ & \text { JA007717 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 07/10/2015 | Notice of Entry of Order on Pardee's Emergency Motion to Stay Execution of Judgment; and Ex Parte Order Shortening Time | 62 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA009755- } \\ & \text { JA009758 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 01/12/2017 | Notice of Entry of Order on Plaintiffs' Countermotion for Attorney's Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS 18.010 and EDCR 7.60 | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA013645- } \\ & \text { JA013648 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 04/03/2013 | Notice of Entry of Order re Order Denying Defendants Motion for Summary Judgment | 16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA002465- } \\ & \text { IAOO2470 } \end{aligned}$ |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 03/15/2013 | Notice of Entry of Order re Order Granting Plaintiffs Countermotion for Summary Judgment | 14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA002354- } \\ & \text { JA002358 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/13/2017 | Notice of Entry of Order Re: Defendant Pardee Homes of Nevada's Motion to Stay Execution of Judgment and Post-Judgment Orders | 88 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA014147- } \\ & \text { JA014151 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 12/16/2011 | Notice of Entry of Stipulated Confidentiality Agreement and Protective Order | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA000040- } \\ & \text { JA000048 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 08/30/2012 | Notice of Entry of Stipulation and Order to Extend Discovery Deadlines (First Request) | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA000055- } \\ & \text { JA000060 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 07/14/2017 | Notice of Entry of Supplemental Order Regarding Plaintiffs' Entitlement to, and Calculation of, Prejudgment Interest | 88 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA014111- } \\ & \text { JA014117 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 11/07/2012 | Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment and Plaintiffs' Counter Motion for Partial Summary Judgment | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA000322- } \\ & \text { JA000351 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 07/14/2014 | Opposition to Pardee's Motion to Expunge Lis Pendens | 48 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA007495- } \\ & \text { JA007559 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 01/09/2017 | Order and Judgment from August 15, 2016 Hearings Regarding Defendant's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA013619- } \\ & \text { JA013621 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 01/09/2017 | Order and Judgment from August 15, 2016 Hearings Regarding Defendants Motion to Amend Judgment | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA013613- } \\ & \text { JA013615 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 01/09/2017 | Order and Judgment from August 15, 2016 Hearings Regarding Plaintiff's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA013616- } \\ & \text { JA013618 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/23/2013 | Order Denying Motion for Partial Summary Judgment | 21 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA003210- } \\ & \text { JA003212 } \end{aligned}$ |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04/26/2016 | Order from January 15, 2016 Hearings | 71 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA011385- } \\ & \text { JA011388 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 07/24/2014 | Order Granting Motion to Expunge Lis Pendens | 48 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA007571- } \\ & \text { JA007573 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 05/30/2013 | Order Granting Plaintiffs Motion for Leave to File a Second Amended Complaint | 16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA002659- } \\ & \text { JA002661 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 06/05/2013 | Order Granting Plaintiffs Motion for Leave to File a Second Amended Complaint | 16 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA002662- } \\ & \text { JA002664 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 01/12/2017 | Order on Defendant's Motion to Retax Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Costs Filed May 23, 2016 | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA013649- } \\ & \text { JA013651 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 07/10/2015 | Order on Pardee's Emergency Motion to Stay Execution of Judgment; and Ex Parte Order Shortening Time | 62 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA009753- } \\ & \text { JA009754 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 01/12/2017 | Order on Plaintiffs' Countermotion for Attorney's Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS 18.010 and EDCR 7.60 | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA013643- } \\ & \text { JA013644 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 04/02/2013 | Order re Order Denying Defendants Motion for Summary Judgment | 16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA002462- } \\ & \text { JA002464 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 03/14/2013 | Order re Order Granting Plaintiffs Countermotion for Summary Judgment | 14 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA002351- } \\ & \text { JA002353 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/12/2017 | Order Re: Defendant Pardee Homes of Nevada's Motion to Stay Execution of Judgment and Post-Judgment Orders | 88 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA014144- } \\ & \text { JA014146 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 11/29/2011 | Order Setting Civil Non-Jury Trial | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA000031- } \\ & \text { JA000032 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 11/02/2017 | Pardee Amended Notice of Appeal | 88 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA014152- } \\ & \text { JA014154 } \end{aligned}$ |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $07 / 15 / 2015$ | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Consolidated <br> Opposition To: (1) Plaintiff's Motion to <br> Strike Judgment Entered on June 15, 2015 <br> Pursuant to NRCP 52(b) and NRCP 59; <br> and (2) Plaintiffs' Motion Pursuant to <br> NRCP 52(b) and 59 to Amend the Court's <br> Judgment Entered on June 15, 2015 | 63 | JA009919- <br> JA009943 |
| 09/12/2015 | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Consolidated <br> Reply in Support of (1) Motion to Retax <br> Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Costs Filed <br> June 19, 2015; and (2) Motion for <br> Attorney's Fees and Costs | 68 | JA010812-- <br> JA010865 |
| $12 / 30 / 2015$ | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Consolidated <br> Response to: (1) Plaintiffs' Notice of Non- <br> Reply and Non-Opposition to Plaintiffs' <br> Opposition to Pardee's Motion to Amend <br> Judgment and Countermotion for | 69 | JA010946- <br> JA010953 |
| Attorney's Fees; and (2) Plaintiffs' <br> Supplement to Plaintiffs' Opposition to <br> Pardee's Motion for Attorney's Fees and <br> Costs |  |  |  |
| $06 / 01 / 2016$ | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Motion to <br> Amend Judgment | 72 | JA011455- <br> JA011589 |
| $07 / 02 / 2015$ | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Motion to <br> Amend Judgment | 59 | JA009207- <br> JA009283 |
| $06 / 27 / 2016$ | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Opposition to <br> Plaintiffs' Motion for Attorney's Fees and <br> Costs | 82 | JA013025- <br> JA013170 |
| $07 / 15 / 2015$ | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Opposition to <br> Plaintiff's Motion for Attorney's Fees and <br> Costs | 62 | JA009759- <br> JA009771 |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 08/10/2015 | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration of the Order on Pardee's Emergency Motion to Stay Execution of Judgment | 67 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA010582- } \\ \text { JA010669 } \end{array}$ |
| 06/30/2016 | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Reply in Support of Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 82 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA013171- } \\ & \text { JA013182 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 06/30/2016 | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Reply in Support of Motion to Amend Judgment; and Opposition to Plaintiffs' Countermotion for Attorney's Fees | 82 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA013183- } \\ & \text { JA013196 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 07/01/2016 | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Reply in Support of Motion to Retax Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Costs Filed May 23, 2016 | 82 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA013197- } \\ & \text { JA013204 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 03/23/2016 | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Response to Plaintiffs' Motion to Settle Two (2) Sets of Competing Judgments and Orders | 71 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA0112144- } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 08/25/2014 | Pardee Homes of Nevada's Supplemental Brief Regarding Future Accounting | 49 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA007699- } \\ & \text { JA007707 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 02/08/2017 | Pardee Notice of Appeal | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA013657- } \\ & \text { JA013659 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 07/08/2015 | Pardee's Emergency Motion to Stay Execution of Judgment: and Ex Parte Order Shortening Time | 62 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA009663- } \\ & \text { JA009710 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 06/06/2016 | Pardee's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 72 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA011590- } \\ & \text { JA011614 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 05/28/2015 | Pardee's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 49 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA007718- } \\ & \text { JA007734 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 06/24/2014 | Pardee's Motion to Expunge Lis Pendens - section filed under seal | 48 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA007411- } \\ & \text { JA007456 } \end{aligned}$ |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 06/24/2015 | Pardee's Motion to Retax Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Costs Filed June 19, 2015 | 52 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA008192- } \\ & \text { JA008215 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 05/31/2016 | Pardee's Motion to Retax Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Costs Filed May 23, 2016 | 71 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA011442- } \\ & \text { JA011454 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 04/07/2017 | Pardee's Motion to Stay Execution of Judgment and Post-Judgment Orders | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA013660- } \\ & \text { JA013668 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 05/10/2017 | Pardee's Reply in Support of Motion to Stay Execution of Judgment and PostJudgment Orders | 88 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA014069- } \\ & \text { JA014071 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10/17/2016 | Pardee's Supplemental Brief Regarding Pre- and Post-Judgment Interest Pursuant to the Court's Order | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA013591- } \\ & \text { JA013602 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 07/08/2015 | Pardee's Supplemental Briefing in Support of its Emergency Motion to Stay Execution of Judgment | 62 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA009711- } \\ & \text { JA009733 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 08/25/2014 | Plaintiff's Accounting Brief Pursuant to the court's Order Entered on June 25, 2014 | 49 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA007647- } \\ & \text { JA007698 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 09/12/2016 | Plaintiffs' Brief on Interest Pursuant to the Court's Order Entered on August 15, 2016 | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA013566- } \\ & \text { JA013590 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 05/23/2016 | Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Costs and Disbursements | 71 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA011397- } \\ & \text { JA011441 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 06/08/2016 | Plaintiffs' Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 77 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA012115- } \\ & \text { JA012182 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 06/29/2015 | Plaintiffs' Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 52-53 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA008216- } \\ & \text { JA008327 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 07/24/2015 | Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration, Ex Parte (With Notice) of Application for Order Shortening Time Regarding Stay of Execution and Order Shortening Time Regarding Stay of Execution | 67 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA010482- } \\ & \text { JA010522 } \end{aligned}$ |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $07 / 18 / 2013$ | Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine To Permit <br> James J. Jimmerson, Esq. To Testify <br> Concerning Plaintiffs' Attorney's Fees and <br> Costs (MIL \#25) | 17 | JA002732- <br> JA002771 |
| $06 / 29 / 2015$ | Plaintiffs' Motion Pursuant to NRCP 52(b) <br> and 59 to Amend The Court's Judgment <br> Entered on June 15, 2015, to Amend the <br> Findings of Fact/conclusions of Law and <br> Judgment Contained Therein, Specifically <br> Referred to in the Language Included in <br> the Judgment at Page 2, Lines 8 Through <br> 13 and the Judgment At Page 2, Lines 18 <br> Through 23 to Delete the Same or Amend <br> The Same to Reflect the True Fact That <br> Plaintiff Prevailed On Their Entitlement to <br> the First Claim for Relief For an <br> Accounting, and Damages for Their <br> Second Claim for Relief of Breach of <br> Contract, and Their Third Claim for Relief <br> for Breach of the Implied Covenant for <br> Good Faith and Fair Dealing and That <br> Defendant Never Received a Judgment in <br> its Form and Against Plaintiffs <br> Whatsoever as Mistakenly Stated Within <br> the Court's Latest "Judgment - sections <br> filed under seal | JA008395- <br> JA008922 |  |
| Plaintiffs' Motion to Settle Two (2) <br> Competing Judgments and Orders | 70 | JA011168- <br> JA011210 |  |
| $08 / 06 / 2013$ | Plaintiffs Opposition to Defendants <br> Motion for Partial Summary Judgment <br> 7.60 | 17 | JA002830- <br> JA002857 |
| $06 / 21 / 2016$ | Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendant, <br> Pardee Homes of Nevada's, Motion to <br> Amend Judgment and Plaintiffs' <br> Countermotion for Attorneys' Fees and | 81 | JA012813- <br> JA013024 |
|  |  |  |  |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 03/20/2013 | Plaintiffs Opposition to Defendant's Motion in Limine to Exclude Plaintiffs Claim for Attorney's Fees as an Element of Damages MIL 1 | 15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA002359- } \\ & \text { JA002408 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 03/20/2013 | Plaintiffs Opposition to Defendants Motion in Limine to Plaintiffs Claim for Damages in the form of compensation for time MIL 2 | 15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA002409- } \\ & \text { JA002433 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 07/17/2015 | Plaintiffs' Opposition to Pardee Homes of Nevada's Motion to Amend Judgment and Countermotion for Attorney's Fees | 65-67 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA010203- } \\ & \text { JA010481 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 06/30/2015 | Plaintiffs' Opposition to Pardee's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 57-58 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA008923- } \\ & \text { JA009109 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 06/21/2016 | Plaintiffs' Opposition to Pardee's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 80 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA012625- } \\ & \text { JA012812 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 05/12/2017 | Plaintiffs' Opposition to Pardee's Motion Stay Execution of Judgment and PostJudgment Orders | 88 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA014072- } \\ & \text { JA014105 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 07/08/2015 | Plaintiffs' Opposition to Pardee's Motion to Retax Costs | 60-61 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA009284- } \\ & \text { JA009644 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 06/20/2016 | Plaintiffs' Opposition to Pardee's Motion to Retax Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Costs Filed May 23, 2016 | 77-79 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA012183- } \\ & \text { JA012624 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 11/04/2016 | Plaintiffs' Reply Brief in Support of Brief on Interest Pursuant to the Court's Order Entered on August 15, 2016 | 86 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA013603- } \\ & \text { JA013612 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 04/23/2013 | Plaintiffs Reply in Further Support of Motion for Leave to File Second Amended Complaint | 16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA002503- } \\ & \text { JA002526 } \end{aligned}$ |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01/17/2013 | Plaintiffs' Reply in Further Support of Their Counter Motion for Partial Summary Judgment | 13 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA002102- } \\ & \text { JA002144 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 08/02/2016 | Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of Countermotion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 84-85 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA013358- } \\ & \text { JA013444 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 08/02/2016 | Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 83-84 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA013205- } \\ & \text { JA013357 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 01/11/2016 | Plaintiffs' Reply to Defendants Consolidated Response to (1) Plaintiffs' Notice of Non-Reply and Non-Opposition to Plaintiff's Opposition to Pardee's Motion to Amend Judgment and Countermotion for Attorney's Fees And (2) Plaintiffs' Supplement to Plaintiffs' Opposition to Pardee's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 69 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA010954- } \\ & \text { JA010961 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 07/15/2013 | Plaintiffs Reply to Defendants Counterclaim | 17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA002724- } \\ & \text { JA002731 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 09/11/2015 | Plaintiffs' Reply to Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 68 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA010680- } \\ & \text { JA010722 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 09/11/2015 | Plaintiffs' Reply to Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion Pursuant to NRCP 52(b) and NRCP 59 to Amend the Court's Judgment Entered on June 15, 2015 | 68 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA010768- } \\ & \text { JA010811 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 09/11/2015 | Plaintiffs' Reply to Defendant's <br> Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Strike <br> "Judgment" Entered June 15, 2015 <br> Pursuant to NRCP 52(b) and NRCP 59 | 68 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA010723- } \\ & \text { JA010767 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 04/20/2016 | Plaintiffs' Reply to Defendant's Response and Supplement to Plaintiffs' Motion to Settle Two (2) Sets of Competing Judgments and Orders | 71 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA011271- } \\ & \text { JA011384 } \end{aligned}$ |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $04 / 27 / 2017$ | Plaintiffs' Response to Pardee's Motion to <br> Stay Execution of Judgment and Post- <br> Judgment Orders | 88 | JA014066- <br> JA014068 |
| $05 / 10 / 2013$ | Plaintiffs Supplement to Motion for Leave <br> to File a Second Amended Complaint <br> Pursuant to the Courts order on Hearing <br> on April 26, 2013 | 16 | JA002627- <br> JA002651 |
| $12 / 08 / 2015$ | Plaintiffs' Supplement to Plaintiffs' <br> Opposition to Pardee's Motion for <br> Attorney's Fees and Costs | 68 | JA010866- <br> JA010895 |
| $09 / 27 / 2013$ | Plaintiffs Supplement to Their Opposition <br> to Defendants Motion for Partial <br> Summary Judgment | $19-21$ | JA002988- <br> JA003203 |
| $07 / 22 / 2013$ | Plaintiffs Supplemental Opposition to <br> Defendants Motion in Limine to Plaintiffs <br> Claim for Damages in the Form of <br> Compensation for Time MIL 2 | 17 | JA002787- <br> JA002808 |
| $10 / 25 / 2013$ | Plaintiffs Trial Brief Pursuant to EDCR <br> 7.27 | 31 | JA004818- <br> JA004847 |
| $06 / 19 / 2015$ | Plaintiffs, James Wolfram and Walt <br> Wilkes' Memorandum of Costs and <br> Disbursements | 52 | JA008159- <br> JA008191 |
| $03 / 16 / 2016$ | Release of Judgment | JA011211- <br> JA011213 |  |
| $01 / 07 / 2013$ | Reply Brief in Support of Defendant's <br> Motion for Summary Judgment | 13 | JA002081- <br> JA002101 |
| $09 / 16 / 2013$ | Reply in Support of Defendant's Motion <br> for Partial Summary Judgment | 17 | JA002858- <br> JA002864 |
| $09 / 16 / 2013$ | Reply in Support of Defendant's Motion in <br> Limine to Exclude Plaintiff's Claim for <br> Attorney's Fees as An Element of <br> Damages | 17 | JA002865- <br> JA002869 |
|  |  |  |  |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 09/16/2013 | Reply in Support of Defendant's Motion in Limine to Exclude Plaintiffs' Claim for Damages in the Form of Compensation for Time | 17 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA002870- } \\ \text { JA002874 } \end{array}$ |
| 07/15/2014 | Reply in Support of Pardee's Motion to Expunge Lis Pendens | 48 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA007560- } \\ & \text { JA007570 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 08/17/2015 | Reply Points and Authorities in Support of Motion for Reconsideration | 67 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA010670- } \\ & \text { JA010678 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 11/08/2011 | Scheduling Order | 1 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { JA000028- } \\ \text { JA000030 } \end{array}$ |
| 06/06/2013 | Second Amended Complaint | 16 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { JA002670- } \\ \text { JA002677 } \end{array}$ |
| 04/17/2013 | Second Amended Order Setting Civil Non-Jury Trial | 16 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA002501- } \\ & \text { JA002502 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 12/15/2011 | Stipulated Confidentiality Agreement and Protective Order | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA000033- } \\ & \text { JA000039 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 08/29/2012 | Stipulation and Order to Extend Discovery Deadlines (First Request) | 1 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA000051- } \\ \hline \text { IAOOOn54 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| 06/30/2015 | Supplement to Plaintiffs' Pending Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs, Motion to Strike Judgment, Motion Pursuant to NRCP 52(b) and NRCP 59 to Amend the Court's Judgment, and Plaintiffs' Opposition to Pardee's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs | 59 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JA009110- } \\ & \text { JA009206 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 09/27/2013 | Supplemental Brief in Support of Defendant's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment | 21 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA003204- } \\ & \text { JA003209 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 07/12/2007 | Supplemental Order Regarding Plaintiffs' <br> Entitlement to, and Calculation of, Prejudgment Interest | 88 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA014106- } \\ & \text { JA014110 } \end{aligned}$ |


| Date | Document Description | Volume | Labeled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 03/05/2013 | Transcript of Proceedings - March 5, 2013 | 14 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA002211- } \\ \text { JA002350 } \end{array}$ |
| 10/25/2011 | Transcript re Discovery Conference | 1 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA000024- } \\ \text { JA000027 } \end{array}$ |
| 08/27/2012 | Transcript re Hearing | 1 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA000049- } \\ \text { JA000050 } \end{array}$ |
| 04/26/2013 | Transcript re Hearing | 16 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA002527- } \\ \text { JA002626 } \end{array}$ |
| 07/09/2013 | Transcript re Hearing | 17 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA002688- } \\ \text { JA002723 } \end{array}$ |
| 09/23/2013 | Transcript re Hearing | 18 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { JA002875- } \\ & \text { JA002987 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 07/17/2014 | Transcript re Hearing | 49 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA007579- } \\ \text { JA007629 } \end{array}$ |
| 07/31/2014 | Transcript re Hearing | 49 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA007630- } \\ \text { JA007646 } \end{array}$ |
| 07/10/2015 | Transcript re Hearing | 62 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { JA009734- } \\ \text { JA009752 } \end{array}$ |
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THE COURT: Good morning, counsel. I apologize, we were waiting for a marshal. Thank you. Thank you, Karl, you did excellent.

THE MARSHAL: Thank you.
THE COURT: All right. I kind of put all the piles of what we're doing. I think I have it all covered, but where do you want to start? I have the motions in limine from both of you. I have defendant's motion for partial summary judgment and defendant's motion to compel production. Wherever you want to start, I have a pile.

Do you want to start with production and the summary judgments before we go to motions in limine?

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Perfectly fine, your

Honor.

MS. LUNDVALL: Good morning, your Honor. I will go ahead and make an appearance, and we'll follow whatever direction you wish for us to make.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. LUNDVALL: I'm Pat Lundvall, and this is
Aaron Shipley from McDonald Carano for Pardee Homes of

Nevada.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Good morning, Judge, Jim Jimmerson and Jim Jimmerson for the plaintiffs.

MS. LUNDVALL: Would the Court would like to start with our motion to compel?

THE COURT: That would be great.
MS. LUNDVALL: This one I think is pretty
simple and straightforward, your Honor. It deals with notes that were used by a witness to prepare himself for deposition. And $I$ think that it is a fairly standard practice that every attorney knows that when you take a deposition, what's one of the first questions that you ask? You ask what documents that the witness may have reviewed in preparation for their deposition.

Why are you asking that or why does an
attorney ask that? Because we have a statute that's a rule of evidence that says if, in fact, you've used notes or you've used documents or you've used writings by which then to refresh your recollection to prepare yourself then by which to testify, in fact, then those documents are discoverable. And so therefore, we ask Mr. Wolfram whether or not he'd reviewed any documents, and he said, Yes, that he had.

Also, $I$ think it's fairly common and standard
practice that as an attorney, when you prepare your witness, you are cautious about what documents then that you show that particular witness in an effort to try to prepare them for trial or prepare for --

THE COURT: Deposition.
MS. LUNDVALL: For their depositions. And
the reason we do that is because you're cautious, because you know that there's -- the statute says if you use documents to prepare yourself to testify during the deposition, that, in fact, those documents are discoverable.

During the course of Mr. Wolfram's
deposition, we asked him, and he said that, said he reviewed two different sets of notes. He apparently, according to his testimony --

THE COURT: On his previous deposition and
then he had some separate notes?
MS. LUNDVALL: He had some separate notes on
a separate pad of paper, and I asked him if those assisted him in being able to testify, and he said, Yes, I think so. He said, They allowed me to see things more clearly or to see things in a better way, and he said he also may have testified differently the first time around.

He very clearly indicated that those notes
and those documents that he had reviewed then had provided help and assistance to him in providing testimony then during his deposition, so we made a request for those notes.

The response then that we got from opposing counsel was that those documents were protected by the attorney/client privilege, and therefore, that we were not going to get access to those, and therefore, we brought this motion to compel.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. LUNDVALL: The case law, we believe, is pretty uniform within this jurisdiction, particularly within the jurisdiction that examines Nevada's statute, and Nevada's statute is unique in that it differs from the federal rule of evidence on this.

THE COURT: You're talking about NRS 50.125.
MS. LUNDVALL: That's correct, your Honor.
THE COURT: Right.
MS. LUNDVALL: And I compared to the Federal

Rule of Evidence 612, our state statute allows you to discover those documents, either used while testifying or before.

THE COURT: Or before?

MS. LUNDVALL: And so therefore, I believe
that these fall within the category of documents that
have been used by Mr. Wolfram to prepare himself to testify, and then he stated, in fact, they did help and assist him to be able to provide deposition testimony, so we would like to have access then to those notes.

THE COURT: Okay.
I'm actually getting a taller podium. I
actually tried to order one. That's like for miniature people. Sorry, you're too tall.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: We're just a little tall, that's all.

THE COURT: It's even short for me, and I'm short, but $I$ appreciate you using it.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Your Honor, as you heard, NRS 50.125 is what governs this issue.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: In order to get the notes, okay, there must be two things that are established. One, that the notes were actually used to refresh recollection, and two, that there was a waiver of the privilege, okay.

As to Issue Number 1, okay, the case law on
point is very clear when it says that you must establish that the notes were used to refresh
recollection. I'll quote from Sipsis (phonet), okay?
Before refreshing a witness' memory, it must appear the
witness has no recollection of the evidence to be refreshed.

THE COURT: The foundation.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly, and that's what you saw from Judge Denton's order, is that the foundation hadn't been laid properly, and they went back to allow for the foundation to be laid.

Now, reading from the deposition transcript,
Question, Did those personal notes then help prepare you for your deposition here today?

Answer, $I$ think so, 'cause $I$ could not look at, had a chance to really sit down and see things, you know. I may have made answers a little bit differently had $I$ had time to reflect like $I$ did when $I$ was reading the deposition, but mostly everything seemed to be all right with me.

That answer is referring specifically to -THE COURT: The first deposition.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly. So the notes he made in the margins of the first deposition, I don't have those notes. I asked my client to find those notes, as we gave you for an in camera review where you read actually the actual notepad notes. He makes no reference to those notepad notes. He makes no reference to, Those actually helped refresh my
recollection or $I$ had no memory of what $I$ put down there and $I$ needed to remember in preparation for this deposition.

THE COURT: In the second deposition, that's
where $I$ focused, can $I$ be honest, because $I$ read it very carefully, and it's very specific on NRS 50.125 that the notes refreshed Mr. Wolfram's memory, either before or while testifying.

The purpose of the second deposition was an entirely new area. In fact, Ms. Lundvall said, We're not going to plow old ground, so the whole focus of the second deposition had nothing to do, in fact, you would have been objecting if it would have gone over, which is always a problem. That's why I was very specific when people get a second deposition, attorneys tend to want to go over old ground, because maybe they can get, not that we would, but could get inconsistent answers, you know, so it was, that's where I focused. That was entirely different.

In fact, Ms. Lundvall was very fair about it and said, We're not gonna go over old ground, so in my thoughts for the foundation and my impression from looking at the it, he basically went over his old deposition to make himself feel better, that he did okay.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Yes.
THE COURT: Nothing to do with how he was gonna testify in this, which was very specific on time and effort damages, which is what $I$ granted this
deposition for, a very specific focused area.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Uh-huh.
THE COURT: And $I$ would have sustained any objections if they tried to go through old ground, all the stuff that was covered in the first, so I looked at that that way.

How, by looking at his first deposition, entirely different areas of inquiry, how would that refresh his recollection in any way for the new topic, which was time and effort damages?

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly.
THE COURT: And there was never a moment
where he said, Wait a minute, my notes told me something, so $I$ honestly looked at it as a foundation issue.

And Ms. Lundvall's right, you have a right to them, but under our statute, you still have to have that foundation, and without the foundation, NRS 50.125 doesn't come into play, you know.

And the reason $I^{\prime} m$ comfortable on my decision
in this one is because they were two totally separate,
different -- now, if the first deposition had been
continued and it wasn't just focused on this new
additional discovery area, $I$ still didn't see the
foundation, but it would be a little --

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: It would be a
different animal.

THE COURT: It wouldn't be so clear cut to me. That's, that's how I look at it before I even get to the waiver. And the case law is very strong on foundation. It has to refresh your recollection.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly, your Honor.
THE COURT: And everything he testified to was nothing that was asked in the previous one. And my impression was he just made notes, as some witnesses do, almost preparing for trial when you have them review their deposition, you know, to meet with you, so that's how I looked at it, so that's kind of where I wanted to focus.

I'm not even getting to the waiver, because I feel like the foundation is very explicit, and the case law says that, and applying the facts to this case, I didn't see any evidence that it refreshed his recollection, and it actually makes sense, since it was a whole different area of inquiry.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: Is how I have looked at that. I mean $I$ went over all the notes, I went through page and line of his deposition to see, you know, the same thing you said, It may have made my answers a little different, but she's not asking him about that topic.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Uh-huh.
THE COURT: In fact, she specifically wasn't supposed to go through that, so that wouldn't refresh his -- everything seemed all right. That was from the separate one, same with the notes, so that's how I look at it.

I'm gonna rule -- if you want to address it, that's where I looked. The foundation in this case was the area $I$ had a real issue with.

MS. LUNDVALL: May I very briefly be heard?
THE COURT: Absolutely. I didn't mean to cut you off, but $I$ don't need other argument, because $I$ really feel strong on the foundation.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Okay.
MS. LUNDVALL: One of the things -- two
points $I$ would like to make as far as in reply, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sure.
MS. LUNDVALL: Is that Mr. Jimmerson makes reference to Judge Denton's order.

THE COURT: It was attached.

MS. LUNDVALL: It's my case.
THE COURT: I saw that.

MS. LUNDVALL: In fact, we litigated this
issue before Judge Denton.
THE COURT: I saw that.
MS. LUNDVALL: What Judge Denton ordered in that specific case was that we needed to go back and to establish which notes were at issue, not whether or not the notes refreshed someone's recollection, not whether or not the notes had been used while testifying, not whether or not the notes had been used before to prepare himself, but which notes were at issue.

THE COURT: Okay. But that doesn't apply. I still have the statute foundation here, so $I$ really hate to get into what somebody else did in another courtroom, because as you know --

MS. LUNDVALL: I agree.
THE COURT: You know, more facts than $I$
would, $I$ honestly read it, just because $I$ read everything, but $I$ didn't use it in any way for my decision. First of all, I wasn't there. I don't know the full facts. I've learned that when other counsel come in front of me and say judge such and such did that and $I$ research and look at it, and $I$ don't get
full facts, so $I$ always do not rely on that unless it's something -- and if $I$ needed more, if $I$ had to rely on that, I would have asked for more facts.

I focused on the foundation, which it's explicit under NRS 50.125 that the notes had to refresh the recollection. That's the whole point of the statute, is that it refreshed -- and that makes sense, if it refreshed their recollection, you should have a right to look at that, because they're testifying to something that's relevant in your deposition.

If something did refresh their recollection for something they're testifying to, you would have a right to that, because you need to see what it was that refreshed, because that also could be relevant to what your witness is testifying to. That, that's the purpose of the statute.

I looked, you know, which makes sense, that's why you would have the right, but you've got to have the foundation, and $I$ just didn't see the foundation that Mr. Wolfram used these notes or the notes on the depo or the other ones to refresh his recollection to testify in the second deposition, and as I, you know, as I said, it was a whole different area, whole different, and that was the point of the second.

The only reason we did the second was because, as you know, after the second amended complaint and all the things we've been through, it was specific for that, and $I$ just don't see any foundation for that.

And he, $I$ mean there's nothing in his testimony that gives specific foundation, and then when you do that fact on top of, as your statement, I'm not gonna plow old ground, which I appreciate and I'm sure counsel appreciates, $I$ just don't see the foundation under NRS 50.125, so I'm not gonna, I'm gonna order they do not produce it.

My ruling is $I$ see no foundation in anything that $I$ reviewed that Mr. Wolfram used, either the notes he jotted on his old deposition, his previous deposition, or the hand notes, that refreshed his recollection to testify in this second deposition on an entirely new area of inquiry that was very specific. It was a new area of discovery based on this Court's ruling.

MS. LUNDVALL: Your Honor, what $I$ try hard not to do is talk over someone, and particularly $I^{\prime} m$ not going to talk over the top of you, all right?

THE COURT: That's okay.

MS. LUNDVALL: There's one last point, and I would simply --

THE COURT: I apologize, because I think it through, and $I$ like the interaction back, because if my thought process is wrong or my analysis, I like the input. It helps me.

MS. LUNDVALL: Well, I appreciate that, but by that same token, I'm not going to talk over the top of you.

THE COURT: Two at one time doesn't work, I agree.

MS. LUNDVALL: I think it's real hard for the court reporter to take down two people talking at once.

Notwithstanding, the Court seems to be
focused on the foundation component, so when $I$ asked Mr. Wolfram, Did your review of these notes help you to prepare for this deposition, the deposition that we were taking at that point in time, his response was, I think so. I think so.

THE COURT: Yeah.
MS. LUNDVALL: And so what they wish to construe that answer as, I think so, I think that those notes helped me to be able to prepare for this deposition. They want to construe it as, No, they didn't refresh my recollection. But what is the reasonable assumption that comes from, in response to a question that says, Did these notes help you prepare
for this deposition, and his response is, $I$ think so? THE COURT: But that's very qualified. I mean that's -- and then take that, that's a qualified answer, and that second deposition was an entirely different area of inquiry. How could his deposition notes from a previous deposition that had nothing do with, as you stated yourself in the deposition, I'm not gonna plow old ground, how does that refresh his recollection on a brand new area of inquiry? Common sense tells you that doesn't make sense.

MS. LUNDVALL: May I?
THE COURT: Let me just finish. He says, I
think so. It's qualified.
MS. LUNDVALL: Mat I?
THE COURT: Go ahead.

MS. LUNDVALL: So in his prior deposition, we asked him questions about how much time and effort that he had put into researching this case, and he says, I don't know. It would be impossible for me to be able to tell. I don't know whether or not if his counsel gave information to him to be able to put words in his mouth.

THE COURT: Then you should have used that
when you asked time and effort and say, We asked you
this before, did those notes refresh you, and, $I$ think

```
so, a qualified answer, does not, to me, open up the
```

foundation for NRS 50.125.

MS. LUNDVALL: I understand what the Court's
ruling is. I appreciate the Court allowing me to make
a record as far as on this point.

THE COURT: Oh, absolutely.
MS. LUNDVALL: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: You're welcome.
I'm going to deny the motion to compel.
Then it's defendant's motion for partial
summary judgment for the accounting as a remedy as
opposed to a cause of action.
MS. LUNDVALL: One of the things I like best about practicing in the Eighth Judicial is that we have the opportunity for law and motion day.

THE COURT: That is true.
MS. LUNDVALL: This is something that you
don't get in Second Judicial,
THE COURT: I know you don't.
MS. LUNDVALL: You don't get it in Ninth
Judicial. There is only a handful of jurisdictions that do allow you to do that.

THE COURT: That's true. And it is helpful for a judge. At least for this judge it's helpful very much to have argument on issues.

MS. LUNDVALL: I will tell you it's helpful, but from the standpoint of a supervising attorney, to offer different styles, you know, to the people that you are trying to mentor to suggest that they go in and sit in the courtroom and be able to see the differences.

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. LUNDVALL: The thing that $I$ find too from my practice is $I$ always learn something.

THE COURT: That's what makes it fun, isn't it? I did it 30 years, and I still, every day, learned something. I think that's why we're all still doing this, right?

MS. LUNDVALL: Well, it's the idea of being able to be a perpetual student and still be able to make your house payment.

THE COURT: That's a good way to say it. I never thought of that. We kind of are, aren't we?

MS. LUNDVALL: So when we sat in your courtroom on July 9th, 2013 of this year, you taught me something, and it was in the context of Abunadi case, I know I'm butchering the name, but it was in the context of looking at a claim that had been plead as a claim for accounting and whether or not that was a separate legal theory or whether or not that is a remedy that
one is able to retain as a result of the legal theory, so we looked into that. And the research, I hate to make this sound presumptuous, but the research
indicates you're absolutely right, that the accounting is a remedy. It's not a claim for relief.

The accounting cause of action is a claim by which, it is a remedy by which you have to demonstrate, and in this particular context, the plaintiffs have contended that we breached a contract, that's their argument, and that breach of contract is the legal claim, the remedy by which they seek is an accounting, and so therefore, accounting as a separate cause of action should be dismissed, no different than what you did for in the --

THE COURT: Abunadi.

MS. LUNDVALL: Abunadi case.

The one case $I$ do want to particularly bring to the Court's attention, it is the decision that our Nevada Supreme Court had issue, and it was discussed first in the opposition to our motion, because our opposition, our motion was --

THE COURT: It was very short.

MS. LUNDVALL: -- a couple of pages, and in
the opposition, they brought out a Nevada Supreme Court decision. It's the Botsworth versus Van Ripper case.

THE COURT: I got it, okay.
MS. LUNDVALL: In the Botsworth versus
Van Ripper case, our Nevada Supreme Court then
identified the fact, and this was in the context of a partnership dispute, that there were numerous remedies that flowed from and numerous remedies one could request by reason of a partnership dispute, and one of those remedies was an accounting.

The court went on to describe that there's a difference between money damages, which are referred to as a legal remedy, what is the consequence of making a money damage claim? It gives you a foundation for something.

THE COURT: For the accounting?
MS. LUNDVALL: It also gives the foundation
for asking for a jury.
THE COURT: Again, does --

MS. LUNDVALL: But the accounting is an equitable claim, so therefore, that jurisdiction falls within the Court's jurisdiction. So to the extent that in this case, because we are before the court on a bench trial, their accounting claim falls within this Court's equitable jurisdiction, and, in fact, then it is based upon their breach of contract claim.

So the Court has the power by which to order
an accounting as a remedy, but it is not a separate legal theory, and therefore, that's why we want our motion for partial summary judgment.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Your Honor, much has been made about the Abunadi case.

THE COURT: Yeah. And $I$ will tell you here's
what $I$ did on that case, because $I$ had the issue she said, and as $I$ say, $I$ look back at the issues, but what I did on that case is they were doing a summary judgment. It was very poorly pled complaint, not to cast dispersions on anybody, and what $I$ did for that accounting constructive trust, $I$ granted, the motion for summary judgment was granted without prejudice because they did not plead it, and it was confusing on whether they wanted a constructive trust, whether they wanted the accounting or what they were doing for the cause of action, so $I$ did not hold as a matter of law that accounting is a remedy that meets a legal cause action, but Ms. Lundvall is right, there's cases both ways, $I$ have to be honest.

That one was not briefed as well as yours, but when $I$ looked at it, it had an insufficiency, and that's how I did it, because $I$ then went back and looked at the cases and whether that issue of whether
it's a remedy or cause of action. Constructive trust
really messed it up, because that also is more of a
remedy.
So that's what $I$ did on that. I actually
pulled my order up.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: And your order
actually was --

THE COURT: Did you look at the order too?
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Yes, your Honor. In
that case, as you said, it was constructive trust and an accounting, it was not an accounting specific claim, and really there's only three paragraphs in that complaint as compared to --

THE COURT: Right.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Here we have, and I will speak specifically to Botsworth versus Van Ripper, and $I$ will get on to the evolution of the Nevada case law here. To quote the Nevada Supreme Court, it says, It's also well settled in law that one party to a joint adventure may sue the other at law for breach of contract or a share of the profits or losses or a contribution for advances made in excess of his share, but the remedy at law does not preclude a suit in equity for an accounting.

They are talking there not in terms of just
specifically remedy, they're talking about suits at law and suits in equity for an accounting, so it is very clear that the cause of action for an accounting for a suit in equity is appropriate.

Furthermore, the State of Nevada Supreme Court 50 years later in Foster versus Bank National Trust and Savings Association examined both California and Utah law for how an accounting should proceed.

THE COURT: As a cause of action.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: It's not clear
whether or not --
THE COURT: Not -- okay, you're with me then.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly. It is not
clear whether it was specifically for a cause of action, but $I$ would submit to you that if a Court who says 50 years earlier you can proceed in a suit in accounting, looks to both Utah and California, which both states permit a cause of action for accounting, that they would not say, Well, you can only find a remedy, you cannot use it for an independent cause of action when in 1993 the California Supreme Court affirmed the District Court's decision in a single count, a single count complaint which was for accounting.

THE COURT: Yeah, I saw that.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly, so if the Nevada Supreme Court is going to be, at least when it says a suit in accounting as opposed to a remedy, an equitable remedy, and 50 years later rely on both Utah and California who adopt a separate cause of action for accounting, and when you have case law at least from the District of Nevada and District of California who are saying that a constructive trust is a remedy and not $a$ cause of action, but an accounting is an
independent cause of action, okay.
THE COURT: I agree, they mix it up, can $I$ be
honest? They mix up the --
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly.
THE COURT: They do. I understand that
completely.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: And the reason, this
is being made, okay, and if you looked at their own summary judgment motion, they actually identified the elements of a cause of action for accounting.

THE COURT: I saw that.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly, and to the extent that we are learning this and reading the Dairy Queen case from the Supreme Court, it talks about a very complicated transaction, and Rule 53 eliminates the need for accounting for the reason to dissect that
cause of action. It is not saying the cause of action doesn't exist, it says the rules of civil procedure eliminated the need for such a cause of action.

THE COURT: They almost infer under Dairy
Queen that there is a cause of action.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly.
THE COURT: They don't say it, they infer it.
And then other cases, you know, I looked at the Hackett, $I$ know it's district court, $I$ know, and it's not necessarily precedence, and they just dismissed it out of hand. I mean it's very interesting.

So obviously, it's an -- they're crossovers, because as a preliminary, $I$ know it's federal district court, $I$ don't have to follow it as precedent, $I$ face that every day, I understand that. I mean $I$ just found it just, the Court says, The Court does not need to address plaintiffs's request for an accounting and the imposition of a constructive trust, because they are remedies, not causes of action, and not even a cite or anything, so it obviously is an area that's confusing.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: And we're actually a
fairly unique case in this sense, because most claims for accounting are an accounting for money, you know.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Because this is such
a complicated set of transactions.

THE COURT: This is the issue, and you're asking for money damages too, so can $I$ ask practically, does it matter?

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Yes.
THE COURT: I was trying to get to the bottom
line that there has to be a practical difference here.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: And it ties back
into Sandy Valley.
THE COURT: Okay. We wouldn't be going
through all this for just a fun lecture and scholarly endeavor, right?

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly, your Honor.
THE COURT: I got it.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: The reason why it's
important to us and why it's surely important for
defendant is that in this case, it really does hinge on
who the prevailing party is, because the prevailing party will be granted attorney's fees as per the contract between the parties.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: So the prevailing party analysis will be did you receive any money damages, that would be a key indicator or a key factor in your decision as to who the prevailing party is,
whether or not you found a breach or whether you found the covenant of good faith and fair dealing has been breached.

So whether or not the attorney's fees as
damages are awarded is a key element as to --
THE COURT: To the accounting.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: As per the
accounting claim is a key element as to whether or not we're able to proceed as the prevailing party and ask for attorney's fees, because we're only seeking
information as opposed to --
THE COURT: Money damages.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly. The
information isn't the formula for Coca-Cola, it has value to our clients only. So it's the information that's valuable. We'll argue that later. If we didn't receive attorney's fees as damages, we -

THE COURT: I knew there was a bottom line here. I appreciate it, because $I$ worked hard on this. There's something here.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly. And that's
in play at the end of trial. Were there to be a
finding in favor of plaintiff and there would be attorney's fees as damages, it would strengthen a case for prevailing party were the case to be appealed or
what not as opposed to saying you demonstrated a breach. Whether there were damages, the prevailing party analysis suggests that if the defendant only had to pay \$1 in nominal damages, they should get their fees, as opposed to us who are here because they want the information, not necessarily some large sum of money in damages.

THE COURT: It impacts their future, potentially.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly. So that's purpose here. It really gets into the prevailing party analysis later on at the end of trial.

THE COURT: Okay. I knew there was
something.
And $I$ have to, and $I$ understand $I$ have to
decide it on the law in this, not what the impact will be, and I understand that too. I just, I knew there was something else, but $I$ have to focus on the law, whether it's a remedy or cause of action.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: And I would submit
to you it is both, it is seen as both.
THE COURT: It's both.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly. And the
elements are very clear, there needs to be a special relationship of trust in order to trigger the duty to
account, whether that's by common law, for example,
with an attorney or accountant, or whether it's
establish the by a contract between partners.

THE COURT: So you have to prove up the
elements.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly. There are other elements here. It's not just, Oh, we're gonna give you an accounting.

THE COURT: No, I understand. It's like any other cause of action, you have to prove up the elements or it doesn't happen.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly. And, you know, they both have a duty, and they have failed to account, and we can establish both of those elements.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Lundvall, because honestly, this one $I$ really struggled with before today. I really struggled with this, because the case law is, you know, all over, so $I$ would appreciate your reply to help me.

MS. LUNDVALL: Your Honor, one of the things that I'd like to address first is in the argument made by Mr. Jimmerson --

THE COURT: Right.
MS. LUNDVALL: That is that their accounting claim seeks information. Now, this is an interesting
issue from my perspective. The reason that we brought this motion for partial summary judgment is because that we perceived always that they were trying to use this accounting claim to water down and to change what the information obligations were within the breach of contract.

THE COURT: Okay. Water down or change what?
The terms of the contract are what is --

MS. LUNDVALL: That's correct.
THE COURT: Because that's the reason, the way that was written, that's pretty broad.

Nevermind. I just read it recently, but
asking for information is open to a lot of interpretations.

MS. LUNDVALL: And from his perspective, that's where the parties had specifically negotiated language within the commission agreements.

THE COURT: Right.
MS. LUNDVALL: That language is in a single paragraph. It has two sentences to it. That first sentence says that you're entitled to receive the exercise of the option pursuant to Paragraph 2 , all right? I'm paraphrasing.

THE COURT: I just read it this morning, as a matter of fact, so $I$ understand those two sentences.

MS. LUNDVALL: So in other words, under Paragraph 2 --

THE COURT: If there was an option purchase, you get a commission.

MS. LUNDVALL: There's an exercise notice that has to trigger the option purchase, all right? There has to be an exercise notice of that, so they're entitled to know that.

THE COURT: Right.
MS. LUNDVALL: The second sentence there says, You are entitled to be reasonably informed of the amounts and the due dates of your commission payments, okay, so those --

THE COURT: Those are the two sentences.
MS. LUNDVALL: Those are the two sentences.

The parties contracted for those two sentences. That's what they agreed on. That's what they signed their signature to. That's what they said. This is the agreement that is going to bind our future relationship.

Now, what we have always perceived this accounting claim then to be something more than that they were asking for information, more than what was specifically contracted for.

THE COURT: Well --

MS. LUNDVALL: But, and so this is where I'm going with this, that they claim they want information. When we get to the time of trial, what we are going to demonstrate to the Court is that they have every conceivable piece of information that there is concerning any of the transactions between CSI and Pardee. That's what we're intending to prove at the time of trial, but the issue for this purpose of this particular cause of action deals with whether or not they get more than what the parties had contracted for under the commission agreement.

THE COURT: And they're looking, I
understand, for information to make sure that it's not a trust me, that you're gonna tell me.

MS. LUNDVALL: Precisely.
THE COURT: Pardee, you're gonna tell me every option, and without the information, I'm not going to go where I'm going, but $I$ understand the difference.

MS. LUNDVALL: And that's where, like I said, at the time of trial the Court is gonna see that not only have they in the past had every piece of information, but they've had the availability. And the simple proposition on this is that land transactions are public records, and $I^{\prime} m$ not gonna get into what is
going to be proven up at the time of trial, but the point $I$ guess that $I^{\prime} m$ trying to make is this: We're trying to confine them, and the reason why is so that they can not expand upon the contracting parties'
language that was found within the commission
agreement. Therefore when we looked at.
THE COURT: That's where you're doing the parol evidence.

MS. LUNDVALL: That's part of it, but also in
this particular cause of action, because they've tried to use this cause of action to try to bootstrap themselves into an argument that they were entitled to more than what the parties had contracted for in the commission agreement.

THE COURT: So your argument is they're
trying to use it that they're entitled to more
information than how you interpret reasonably informed of amounts and did dates of commissions for options, right?

MS. LUNDVALL: Correct.
THE COURT: That helps me.
MS. LUNDVALL: And the one issue,
Mr. Jimmerson makes the point that, well, it is going to be his concern that somehow that this is going to be dispositive as to the prevailing party --

THE COURT: Right.

MS. LUNDVALL: -- routine. In other words, his arguments is this: That we could lose on the breach of contract action, that there could be a demonstration that Pardee has fully performed every single contractual provision that it was obligated to, and therefore, under the contract, that they are not entitled to attorney's fees, but he says though we might be able to prevail on the accounting cause, and therefore, $I$ could get my attorney's fees in that fashion, but what is his argument then? He makes my argument that they are trying to expand the contractual obligations.

THE COURT: I think that's apparent from everything $I$ read. I mean that's their interpretation, Ms. Lundvall. I get that, I went back and read through all the summary judgments and the motions to amend. I understand their position, and $I$, you know, understand your position. I understand that.

MS. LUNDVALL: Now, so let me as far as getting back then to the specific point then that we made for purposes of this motion for partial summary judgment.

When we originally brought our motion for summary judgment, we focused on one thing that was
uniform to all the causes of action, and that is there was not a breach of contract. The Court had indicated in ruling as far as on our motion for summary judgment that there were material issues of fact on that. We understand that. We're going trial on that particular point.

But then the one fact that we sit in your courtroom and we understand now that an accounting is a remedy, it is not a separate cause of action, that's why we brought our motion for partial summary judgment on this, and what we're trying to do is to confine then our obligations that we owed to the plaintiffs to the four corners then of the commission agreement and not to allow then some type of an expansion of those contractual obligations. And that's where we get into then the issue as to whether or not the accounting claim that they have pled is a remedy.

THE COURT: Oh, absolutely, I understand
that. There's a distinction.
MS. LUNDVALL: They understand that, in fact, and they even argue in their opposition that they have to prove up a breach of the commission agreement by which to get to an accounting. What does that tell you? That tells you that they're using, that the accounting for which they've pled is a remedy. It is
an equitable remedy, and, therefore, if it is a remedy it is not a separate cause of action, and therefore, the line of cases then that says that an accounting is a remedy applies in this particular circumstance, and it is not any different than the ruling that you made back on July 9th in the Abunadi case so as to be able to find that an accounting was remedy.

THE COURT: I didn't rule that way, but I'm not counting on that. That was a whole different circumstance, but $I$ understand your argument. You're right, there's two sides, very much so.

MS. LUNDVALL: And the one thing that they wish to, as far as try to push upon the court, is some cases from the state of California that have identified then that in certain circumstances, that an accounting may be a separate cause of action, but when you look at those cases, each and every one of those cases has a common denominator, and the common denominator is that there was a breach of fiduciary duty that had been alleged. And as the Court well knows, a fiduciary duty is different than a contractual obligation.

THE COURT: Absolutely.

MS. LUNDVALL: So therefore, what you would look for in their complaint then would be some allegation that says we were fiduciaries. We're not.

We were two contracting parties. Each had separate and sophisticated counsel that negotiated the terms of this commission agreement, and it was an arm's length transaction, and that's what has been pled, that is what the proof is. That's what the disputed facts are. And so to try to bootstrap their way into claiming that accounting is something separate based upon a line of cases that asserts breach of fiduciary duty, those line of cases, even if it were applicable here in Nevada, have no application as to the facts of the case at bar, and so therefore, we would ask the Court then to grant our motion for summary judgment.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Your Honor, I would appreciate a response.

THE COURT: Absolutely, because I'm very honest with you, this one I've really struggled with, because, you know, the cases seem to, they're not very precise on how to distinguish or if it is both, in what circumstances is it both. I understand.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: I'll address the
last issue first on the issue of fiduciary.
THE COURT: That's what I'm interested in. We know it wasn't a fiduciary duty, so we understand that.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly, your Honor,
and the cases are actually clear there needs to be a special relationship but not one of fiduciary relationship.

I'll quote from Dahon North America, Inc. versus Hawn, which is a Central District of California case, saying an accounting requires a relationship but not necessarily a fiduciary relationship, citing to Sell versus McLaughlin.

THE COURT: Give up me that case again.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: It's Dahon North

America, Inc. versus hawn.

THE COURT: That's a California case?
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: 2012 .
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: WL 1413681 , and it's citing to Sell, which is a actually the case that was cited in the defendant's motion for summary judgment, and when they're talking about that, I'll actually quote from Mobias, which is the case we cited in the District of Nevada, which said, Under Nevada law, in order to prevail on a claim for inspection and accounting, a plaintiff must establish the existence of a relationship of special trust between a plaintiff and defendant, not necessarily a fiduciary relationship.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: And later on in Mobias, and this was quoted at length in our opposition for summary judgment, you will see it there, it actually looked to California law and Delaware law when as to whether or not in a case for accounting what is necessary in order to trigger the special relationship status.

THE COURT: Relationship of special trust.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly. And the way they did that is looking at whether or not there was a breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing arising from the contract, and the example they gave was a passive investor relying upon the more active investor or the operator and whether or not the passive investor is owed money. They're relying on the person with superior information.

THE COURT: Knowledge.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly, for whether or not they owed money. Here, the person with superior knowledge is the defendant, is Pardee, because our clients were not only not allowed to go to the meetings, but they weren't given the contracts so they could have that same knowledge, which is the contracts we are claiming they should have handed over to us or at least give up some information.

THE COURT: Between Pardee and Coyote?
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: No, between Pardee and our clients. Our clients were not asked to be in the meetings, they were asked to stay outside.

THE COURT: They went to the first initial meeting.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: And I think they had one other meeting six months later.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: But this, the party with special knowledge, the party with better knowledge, it's one who's relied upon to be trustworthy and truthful in what's going on.

THE COURT: In the relationship.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly. Pardee.
So it is not just fiduciary duty, it can be established through a breach contract, which you have someone with inferior knowledge relying upon someone with superior knowledge.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: As to the issue of whether or not it is remedy versus a cause of action, it is both. Everyone can agree it is a remedy. The question though is --

THE COURT: Is it a cause of action.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Is it a cause of action, and the answer is yes.

THE COURT: And under what circumstances.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly. There are
elements. You need to establish a duty, you need to establish failure to account, and Ms. Lundvall said something that was quite important, and that is that they're going to show that the plaintiffs have all the information that they could possibly have right now, okay?

THE COURT: But when did they get it?
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: And from whom did
they receive that information? They received it by subpoena from Coyote Springs, not from Pardee, so the information we're actually seeking that you'll see is going to be at issue later today on the motions in limine is whether or not those documents that we received were authentic, and do they actually reflect the transactions between the parties.

She said land transactions are a public
record, you're area, right but this isn't just about land transactions. Your heard during the motion for summary judgment that the land needs to be designated for production residential property.

THE COURT: Single family production
residential.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly, and that is not public record, okay, and the information as to where the property that is designated for that is contained in those contracts, the contracts that --

THE COURT: That's the key issue, right.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly.
THE COURT: No, that's not, then it's gonna come out at trial there's divergence.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: It is absolutely one of the issues we're going to have to establish. If they weren't entitled to it because it wasn't residential property, it wasn't designated for that. We'll find that out, but in order for them to receive the commission under the option agreement, under the commission agreement, it needed to be designated for that.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: So that's --

THE COURT: It says that.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly. The key
information is contained in those contracts, and more importantly, okay, we didn't get them. We asked for them. We didn't get them. They were duty bound to get it.

And when they quote the commission letter agreement, they're missing a couple of key words here. They're entitled to be reasonably informed not just as to due dates of commissions, they're entitled to be reasonably informed as to all matters relating to due dates and amounts of commissions, so that doesn't just mean here's what you're getting and here's when you're receiving, okay? If it's all matters and reasonably informed, it also includes here's why you're receiving this, here's the basis, here's the math, here is, you know, we are purchasing this much property, here's where it's located, here's what we're purchasing it for, and under the commission agreement you're entitled to this much.

THE COURT: Here's where it's designated as.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly, here's the information, which absolutely would be required to determine how much they are receiving and when they are supposed to receive it. That, of course, is what's at issue here.

And those documents were asked to be
produced. We've not just asked before this lawsuit was filed, we've done, as you now have before you, requests for production requesting those amendments. They were not produced. We only could receive them by having to
subpoena Coyote Springs.

The issues here go to there is a duty, and this was briefed extensively during the motion for summary judgment.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: It's not just receiving the information, the duty must be discharged by the one who has that duty, okay, it is the party that needs to --

THE COURT: That's the special relationship.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly, because the Court, citing from an Illinois decision which actually was relied upon by the Nevada Supreme Court talking about what an accounting is, and in that decision they talked about there's a difference between complying with the Court's order or the rules of civil procedure and complying with your duty to account.

The rules of civil procedure and the rules of the Court are distinct. They can apply to third parties if they receive a subpoena; however, the duty to account, okay, may go beyond what the court requires, because it arises from that duty to produce information or monies, and so that's the issue.

So when you are faced with a conflict on the law, and there, as you say --

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: You've got one case from the District of Nevada which says it's a remedy, not an independent cause of action, without any explanation, and you have a litany of cases that actually go into detail as to is an independent cause of action, here are the elements.

THE COURT: Here's the elements and here's
the criteria.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly. It is very clear that an accounting is a cause of action, okay and a remedy, when necessary, okay, because in this case we're dealing with information, okay? It's the cause of action that's important. You need to produce information. Really what's at issue is the information, which goes to whether or not they're going to receive monies 30,35 years from now, because it's a 40 year option.

THE COURT: I'm concerned about the future thing.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly. So we're really in a unique situation here, because most of the times it is for a complicated situation. As Dairy Queen enunciated here, it's we need information, we can't get it. We've used the rules of the court to get

```
it, still haven't gotten it.
```

And they have a duty to provide us that
information. The elements are there. We submit to you
we'll establish those elements at trial. I understand
that's in dispute.

THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: But the final thing
ends with --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Ms. Lundvall went on to say that we're, you know, on the prevailing party analysis, if they were to win the breach of contract or the breach of the covenant of good faith case, we could somehow win the accounting action. No, your Honor, thinking the opposite, we could win the breach of contract and have $\$ 1$ in nominal damages, and, but it's the accounting claim that allows you to give special damages, predominantly under Sandy Valley.

You could probably do it under breach of contract, but the law is not nearly as clear as far as the claim for accounting for the equitable relief.

THE COURT: I understand, right.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly. So to the extent that we are protecting our ability to allow the Court to say firmly, They are the prevailing party,
because both, they are receiving the accounting and they are getting attorney's fees as damages, because it really is, in terms of monetary issues here, the attorney's fees represent the bulk of what both sides have been affected by this.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: So when, you know, it's that issue.

If they win the breach of contract and the breach of covenant of good faith and fair dealing, we're gonna be very hard pressed to win the accounting claim, and $I$ submit it would be almost impossible, but if the reverse happens and we are successful, they could still turn around and say, You are not the prevailing party. We are asking the Court not just in terms of, of, because the law says there's a claim, okay, but because policy should dictate that this court should uphold the accounting claim for the purposes of determining whether or not there's a prevailing party. THE COURT: Okay.

MS. LUNDVALL: Your Honor, this continues to be our motion, so I'm hoping the Court will allow me?

THE COURT: Absolutely, I want all the input
I can get. This is the one that I'm very honest with you, I've struggled with, because, so no, I appreciate
it.

MS. LUNDVALL: I would like to make a couple of observations in response then to what Mr. Jimmerson had to present to the Court.

Number one, he contends that he doesn't need
a fiduciary duty claim or a fiduciary duty
relationship.

THE COURT: Right.
MS. LUNDVALL: So as to be able to support then a claim for an accounting. When he, what he tries to argue then is that instead what you need is a special relationship.

THE COURT: Right, a relationship of special trust.

MS. LUNDVALL: All right. So this is the first time this argument has been advanced. Nevada has a long line of cases dealing with what is a special relationship in the context of contracting parties.

It starts with a female attorney that was in Reno, Nevada, and her name was Aluwavich (phonetic), and that Aluwavich claim established a law that was the first case that our Nevada Supreme Court had analyzed, whether or not, in the context of contracting parties, was the state of Nevada going to recognize a special relationship such that $a$, someone could bootstrap
themselves into claims that were more than breach of contract.

And so therefore, if the court, as the Court has demonstrated a great deal of intellectual curiosity about this case, what $I$ would ask is for the Court to then allow us to bring that line of cases to your attention, and what the Court will see as a, as a result of that is that in Nevada, the only special relationship in the context of contracting parties that has ever been recognized is in the insurance context. And so therefore, we would ask for that opportunity so the Court, if you're going to take into account his argument and if you're going to consider his argument then in making your determination, we ask for us to be able to bring those cases to you, and it's a very simple proposition by which to do so.

THE COURT: I'm fine with that.
MS. LUNDVALL: All right.
THE COURT: I think that's the way he has to
go on this, so I, at least $I$ have written the cases down. I'm going to look back, so I appreciate it, because $I$ realize this is a very significant issue to both parties.

So she's just asking, and I agree, if she could give supplemental briefing. I would give you the
same right.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: I actually would support that.

THE COURT: Okay. Because it's been very helpful, but $I$ didn't get a clear answer from this.

And once again, $I$ absolutely would request if you would do it, to give me supplemental briefings on these, because $I$ honestly didn't look at it this way either. I didn't. I just was doing the crossover and trying to figure out how I could apply it as best I could to this case, which is important, and that's where oral arguments has focused me.

So I would appreciate the supplemental briefing from both, because obviously it's a significant issue and it's a complicated issue, because it's more fact specific to why your case, which is different from other contractual cases I've had --

MS. LUNDVALL: Well, and from this
perspective, your Honor, my suggestion would be to allow the parties then a specific time frame to do simultaneous briefing.

THE COURT: That would be fine. You tell me, what would you like?

MS. LUNDVALL: I would propose by the close of business on Friday that we can get that additional
briefing then to the court.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: I would support
that, your Honor.
THE COURT: Gave me the date on Friday.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: The 27th.
MR. JAMES J. JIMMERSON: The 27th.
THE COURT: Okay. If I get them by
September --
MR. JAMES J. JIMMERSON: Close of business.
THE COURT: I could work on it over the
weekend.

MS. LUNDVALL: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: Anytime on Friday would be great so I can take it home.

MS. LUNDVALL: And we'll bring that line of cases to demonstrate that not only does this case not present a special relationship, but our Nevada Supreme Court then has been very specific on that.

THE COURT: That it's just to the insurance, they have not opened it to any other context is what you're telling me?

MS. LUNDVALL: That's correct. That's the last research that I've done as far as on this particular topic, and I'm more than happy then to be able to bring that to the Court's attention.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. LUNDVALL: The second point though I want to make to the Court, and that was this: Mr. Jimmerson said that he could not prevail on his accounting claim without demonstrating a breach of contract. That, to me, is dispositive of the issue that is before the Court, and if he misspoke, I understand, but I'm taking his word at face value that he presented to the court.

He's saying, If I, $I$ cannot prevail on my
accounting claim without a breach of contract
demonstrated, if that's accurate, what he is
acknowledging is that --
THE COURT: They weren't in the alternative.

MS. LUNDVALL: Yeah, that accounting is a
remedy for them by reason of proving up a breach of contract.

And with that, your Honor, we would submit
then, subject to the supplemental motions.
THE COURT: Okay.

MS. LUNDVALL: On this particular issue.
THE COURT: Okay.

MS. LUNDVALL: I'm not gonna get into as far as the argument that they've made, how he misspoke concerning what they requested during the course of discovery, what they got during the course of

THE COURT: That will all come out during the trial anyway.

MS. LUNDVALL: Exactly.

THE COURT: If I could focus just on the facts that $I$ need which you both have done to make this legal decision, then $I$ know the rest will come out. I know that we're reading all the things again --

MS. LUNDVALL: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: -- over the weekend, all right.
Okay. Then if you would give me, I would really appreciate the supplemental briefing. If you could do it by 5:00 p.m. Friday, I know your weeks are busy, then what $I$ will do, $I$ don't want to make you come back again, what $I$ do is $I$ put them on a chambers calendar, because $I$ don't want it to fall through the cracks, and take it under submission, so I'll go ahead, how about Wednesday?

MR. JAMES J. JIMMERSON: We'd be happy to come back and listen to your decision. It's a 15 minute exercise.

THE COURT: Let me do this, let me look at that, and then I'll decide, but for me, just for my purposes, so I make sure I do it, I put on a chambers calendar. It doesn't mean $I$ may not set it for
hearing, can we do it that way, and I'm going out of
town on --

THE CLERK: Do we want to do October 9th?
THE COURT: That would be fine, because I
know we have a trial date, and $I$ understand it's
critical to your preparations for trial.
What I will do is put it on my chambers
calendar. It doesn't mean $I$ won't decide before then,
and if it brings more questions to me, I prefer to
bring you back so $I$ can get your -- if $I$ have
questions, that helps me sort it out, Because sometimes
the supplementals may give me more questions than
answers.

MR. JAMES J. JIMMERSON: Absolutely.

THE COURT: In this kind of area so, let's do it that way.

So supplemental briefing on this issue by 5:00 p.m. September 27 th , and then I will either make a decision by the $9 t h$ or actually schedule you to come back.

And $I$ don't have regular court on Monday, so

I can do it on a Monday or Friday, the special settings.

MR. JAMES J. JIMMERSON: Okay. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: You're welcome.
Let me get all my notes on that.
Okay. All right. Do we wanted to start with the defendants or the plaintiff's motions in limine? The plaintiffs motions in limine might be easier, because $I$ wasn't quite sure what you agreed to. And what $I$ did, $I$ think $I$ got it.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: There are three groups generally on the motions in limine.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: I believe there are

1 through 13.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: 14 through 19 .
THE COURT: And 14 through 19 .
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: And the third is 21
and 22 .

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: And just for the

Court's reference, the contracts that, the transaction between Pardee and Coyote Springs are the 6 through 13.

THE COURT: Do it again.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: The transaction, the contracts between Pardee and coyote Springs, the amendments and the amended option agreement.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. LUNDVALL: Can you give me the categories you have again?

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: 6 through 13, 14
through 19, and 21 and 22 .
14 through 19 are the parcel map or the plat maps, and 21 and 22 are the correspondence from.

THE COURT: 14 to 19 are the parcel maps.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: And the plat maps,
and 21 and 22 are the --

THE COURT: Correspondence.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Correspondence from Mr. Lash from 2007 to 2009 . There's been some segments of agreement. I withdrew 20 and 23 through 25 , so those correspondence have been, that's parts of the agreement between counsel.

THE COURT: And the 1 to 5 are withdrawn under stipulation.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. That's where I was, okay.

So let's start with, I'll call it Group
Number 1, which is Motions in Limine 6 through 13. They're basically the documents under the same arguments.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Yes.

THE COURT: That's what I thought.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Given the practice notice Eighth Judicial District Court of having separate motions in limine as opposed to omnibus motions, I apologize. I understand.

THE COURT: No, it's fine. Breaking it down helped me out though, because $I$ was trying to go through each one, figuring, okay, that helped me. Thank you.

Okay, 6 through 19.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: The issue before the Court is whether or not these documents are relevant and whether or not they have been authenticated. As the opposition stated, the foundation needs to be established prior to the documents being considered to be admissible.

THE COURT: Right, at trial.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: I'll deal with authenticity first.

As we stated in our motion, we have provided the affidavit of the custodian of records from Coyote Springs identifying these as true and correct copies, the documents that we asked for.

Secondly, we have provided the quotation from John Lash, he identified the documents in his
deposition, and finally, we had demonstrated through the defendant's own reply in support of their motion for summary judgment as, quote, authenticated documentary evidence where they proceeded to list each and every one of the contracts between Pardee and CSI.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Never once do they say they are not authentic, and never once do they say they are not relevant. The relevance is clear here. They demonstrate the transactions at issue. The issue is whether or not they've been authenticated, and we have provided both sworn testimony from both the defendant as well as coyote Springs.

And, okay, the standard before you is whether or not a fact could reasonably conclude that they're what they say they are. You are the trier of fact.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: And you're able to make that determination, because we know what the documents say, okay, and there are some issues on handwritten notes and stray marks, and we aren't submitting those handwritten notes or stray marks are part of the agreement.

THE COURT: You're just saying the standard amendments as produced?

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly, as produced. And because they're a party to those amendments, they are able to tell us whether or not they are authentic.

THE COURT: Right. Pardee should be able to say that.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly.
THE COURT: Without bringing someone from CSI.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: A party is able to tell us if they weren't authentic.

THE COURT: Is it the reverse?

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Pardee can tell us are the documents we presented to you authentic, and that argument hasn't been made, and the reason is they can't make the argument unless CSI literally constructed these documents. The documents are real, so the only question before you is are they admissible, so the only possible way they could be considered admissible is if they are authenticated. They didn't dispute this issue, unless they claim they are hearsay, but statements of a party, they are, by definition, not hearsay. They reflect interest in land, okay? They are excepted from the hearsay rule.

So the only question for you is: Are they
authentic, and the answer is they are, not, not just because of the words of Coyote Springs and John Lash, but they are, quote, authenticated documentary evidence, according to the papers submitted to you.

I will be happy to respond to the issue
Ms. Lundvall has on those arguments.
THE COURT: Okay, 6 through 13.
MS. LUNDVALL: Your Honor, $I$ brought an
entire box of motions in limine that have been filed by the defendants or filed by the plaintiffs, and let me set the stage on this a little bit. They took every single one of their proposed trial exhibits, and they made it the subject of a motion in limine, so you've got a motion in limine on every single one of their proposed trial exhibits, and so to the extent that they brought these motions before we had our Rule -- I think it's 2.67 conference, where the parties are supposed to sit down and stipulate to the admission of documents, that's why some of these have now been withdrawn, because we already stipulated.

THE COURT: I saw that.
MS. LUNDVALL: They brought their motion in
limine, and they asserted one ground for the
admissibility issue, and that was hearsay, and we had never contested or we never fussed about the fact that
these documents were hearsay. That had never been asserted as to their admissibility.

THE COURT: All right.
MS. LUNDVALL: All right. But that was the single ground they brought in their motion in limine. And what we did fuss about was the fact that the actual exhibits they are proposing, because they sent them to us and they gave them to us.

THE COURT: Right.
MS. LUNDVALL: These are not the documents
that they received in response to a subpoena duces tecum.

THE COURT: It's the wrong format?

MS. LUNDVALL: No. It's got handwritten marks all over it.

THE COURT: Didn't you already say you're not gonna do the ones, you're taking off the handwritten notes?

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: No, your Honor.
MS. LUNDVALL: But he hasn't --

THE COURT: Hold on.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Just to quickly
answer the question, your Honor, we produced and submitted to this court documents as they were produced, the identical documents produced from CSI.

We're not suggesting the handwritten notes or underlining or stray marks are submitted as evidence.

THE COURT: I mean are you saying -- here's my question.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: I didn't want to alter the documents.

THE COURT: Exactly. I understand.
Here's my question, Pardee. Don't you have
clean copies of these exacts same documents?
MS. LUNDVALL: From this perspective, your Honor, we do have clean copies.

THE COURT: Then that solves the issue.
MS. LUNDVALL: It does solve the issue, but
what they've been trying to do is to push this issue.
The stray marks are all over these documents, and these stray marks are not, what we can see, what were put on here by CSI, they were put on here by the plaintiffs when they were reviewing documents.

THE COURT: It's a non-issue. If you're telling me you don't want the stray marks anyway, all we have to do then is if you have what $I$ call clean copies, then problem solved.

MS. LUNDVALL: They are more than happy to come to our offices and to be able to pull the clean copies then from the responses to the subpoena duces
tecum that was served. Moreover, what these documents do not have are, some of the exhibits, they're only partials, and so if, in fact, a party like the plaintiffs wished to proffer an exhibit --

THE COURT: They have to have the complete exhibit.

MS. LUNDVALL: They have to do the complete exhibit.

THE COURT: I don't think you would argue with that, would you?

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: I wouldn't, your

Honor.

THE COURT: Because $I$ wouldn't allow partial unless there is a stipulation or grounds that the other is irrelevant or has no basis.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: If what we're having here is an agreement to use the clean copies we have, I had no idea there were additional exhibits that were missing. These are, quite literally, Judge - -

THE COURT: What you got from CSI?

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly.
The next question is, your Honor, we made requests for these documents, and they weren't, and you have those requests and you have the responses. I mean this is --

THE COURT: We have a lot of old history. We have so many new things coming up with this. Let's kind of start with a baseline here.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: If she wants --
THE COURT: Let me ask this, from Exhibits 6 through 13, do you have clean complete copies?

MS. LUNDVALL: What we have is the same responses to the subpoena duces tecum that was received from CSI, and we would be more than happy if they want to take the time to come to my office because they have marked up their own copies, we would like to offer it to them.

MR. JAMES J. JIMMERSON: Do you know how outrageous this is that they have their copies and won't produce them? Talk about an accounting.

MS. LUNDVALL: This is an issue that they have created, and what they're trying to do is to put the expense of solving the issue that they created upon me.

THE COURT: I'm sure they will pay copying charges.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Of course we will, your Honor.

MS. LUNDVALL: Precisely.
THE COURT: Real easy, okay? If you would
make copies of these Exhibits 6 through 13, produce them to Mr. Jimmerson, and Mr. Jimmerson -- and give them a copying bill that's reasonable, 50 cents a page or something, right, $I$ think the problem is solved, correct?

Are you willing to do that?
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Absolutely, your
Honor, and if there's no issue as to their --

THE COURT: That would take care of this
issue, because you also need to have complete, you know, and who did what to who at this stage, we have so many big legal issues, and it's such a big case to both of you, I would really like to focus my energy on the legal things for both of you and not who did what to whom in discovery.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly.
THE COURT: I don't mean to discourage, you know, but I'd really like to focus on where we need to go in the future, because this is big for both of you, and $I$ fully appreciate that.

If we could do that, Ms. Lundvall, that would be great.

MS. LUNDVALL: From this perspective, your
Honor --
THE COURT: I appreciate it.

MS. LUNDVALL: We'll do that. The point I'm trying to make though is very simply, we pointed out these deficiencies a long time ago to them, and we, as far as made them aware of these deficiencies.

THE COURT: I understand.
MS. LUNDVALL: So to the extent what we're simply trying to do is to make sure the evidence that is before you is the proper evidence.

THE COURT: And I assume you would want the same thing.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Absolutely, your

Honor.

THE COURT: The judge would certainly
appreciate having complete copies, so if you would do that, that would be, $I$ would be very thankful.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: The reason why these were withdrawn, one correction, these were not every single trial exhibit. I have, pursuant to the Court's order, proposed the exhibit list, deposition list, they are distinct, but --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: If we could get as an agreement now as to the admissibility of these new documents that we're gonna get, $I$ would agree to their admissibility here.

THE COURT: Okay. So can we stipulate to the admissibility of what you are producing regarding Exhibits 6 through 13?

MS. LUNDVALL: Your Honor.

THE COURT: On authentication?

MS. LUNDVALL: On authentication. They still
have to lay foundation by which to then --
THE COURT: That they're relevant.
MS. LUNDVALL: That they have witnesses. I'm assuming they have witnesses by which they can establish the foundation as to the importance of these.

THE COURT: Relevance.
MS. LUNDVALL: And to the extent -- so to the extent they have, then we won't have any type of a --

THE COURT: She has no foundation problems to the documents themselves, you just have to establish relevancy, which --

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Okay.
THE COURT: -- you have to do any way. I
don't want your cooking recipes from last night.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: I guess the question
is this: I mean to the extent that we've made
agreements to all of the prior agreements, to these amendments, were relevance and admissibility --

THE COURT: What's the difference?

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly. Do we really want to have, do $I$ really have to ask someone: Is this relevant to making this determination, or can we agree that it's relevant to this case? I mean that's --

MR. JAMES J. JIMMERSON: CSI and Pardee made agreements after the fact and never disclosed to the plaintiffs? They're not stipulating to relevancy. Come on.

THE COURT: Do you still have an issue on relevancy as far as the foundation, because that's the only foundation left.

MS. LUNDVALL: Your Honor, from this perspective, from my standpoint $I$ believe there is a difference between relevancy and foundation.

THE COURT: What foundation? Tell me what foundation are they missing.

MS. LUNDVALL: Understood, but to the extent, as far as what they're suggesting is that they believed the relevancy to this is the fact that Pardee and CSI entered into the agreement, then fine, we don't have any issue when it comes to that form of relevance.

THE COURT: Once it comes in, it can be used for whatever I feel is --

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly.

THE COURT: So just stipulate it's relevant?
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Yeah.

MS. LUNDVALL: On this one, I will try to
make it easy on them. We have a witness that's gonna come in, and we'll be able to through, and that witness will be able to explain to the court the importance of these documents then and what these documents were about, so you're gonna have that evidence.

THE COURT: But they don't necessarily want to wait until you bring that witness, correct?

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly, your Honor.

THE COURT: They have to do their case in chief. They don't want to be waiting until the defense does --

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly, your Honor.
MS. LUNDVALL: They're calling our people
during their case in chief.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: We are, your Honor.
MS. LUNDVALL: Please don't talk over the top of me, if you don't mind.

But what I'm trying to do is make this easier, because the Court is going to have those witnesses, so to the extent the Court wishes for an admission on relevance, once the fact they get the proper document then before the Court, then we won't
have any issue with this whatsoever.

THE COURT: Okay. So we have the
stipulation.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Yes, your Honor.

And I would just reserve our right to amend the proposed trial exhibit list that we have prepared for today.

THE COURT: That's fine.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: To reflect new
documents.

THE COURT: That's fine, okay.
All right. So on the motions in limine for plaintiff's motions in limine, it's been withdrawn pursuant to stipulation?

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: That would be the best way to reflect the record.

Let's go to Group 2, Exhibits 14 to 19, which my understanding are parcel maps and plat --

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Plat maps, parcel maps and plat maps. They distinguish between the two - -

THE COURT: They do?

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: -- at the recorder's
office again, your Honor, because this was a response,

```
a group response, an omnibus response to our motions.
    THE COURT: Right.
    MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: The issues are
against the same authenticity and relevance. Again,
your Honor, as to the issue of authenticity, it's a
certified copy that was presented to the court. The
actual originals we have are certified copies. They
have been providing copies of those originals. We have
authentic documents. They were presented to you in
smaller font. The originals are much bigger. They are
very large.
    THE COURT: Right.
    MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: And by statute, they
are --
    THE COURT: Aren't they public records?
    MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: They are public
records, and by statute they are self-authenticating
documents because they are certified copies of --
    THE COURT: Public records.
    MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly.
    THE COURT: I just want to make sure.
    MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly. You're a
hundred percent correct, because there is no hearsay.
Again, we addressed the issues as to admissibility, but
as to relevance, they are the maps of the land.
```

THE COURT: That's in issue.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly.
THE COURT: Okay.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: And I'm sure this

Court would very much appreciate to know where, with
respect to the contracts, this land was purchased, so
that is absolutely, the relevance is very clear here as
to why this court would want to look at --
THE COURT: I think that's the dispute --
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly.

THE COURT: -- for both parties, okay.

Ms. Lundvall, what about these parcel maps and plat maps, do you have any objection to them?

MS. LUNDVALL: This one, your Honor, is very
simple.
THE COURT: Oh, good.
MS. LUNDVALL: This, being this, we don't
argue as far as the authenticity of these because of the fact they have certified copies.

THE COURT: Right.
MS. LUNDVALL: But what counsel tells you and
he's trying to make himself as a witness are these are the parcel maps of the land that was purchased.

THE COURT: That's a decision I would have to make.

MS. LUNDVALL: Bingo, and therefore, the
foundation --

THE COURT: I didn't take it that way. I understand exactly. I understand that's what they want to prove. That's why I made the comment to Mr. Jimmerson, that's what's in dispute.

MS. LUNDVALL: And that's why they need a
witness by which to lay the foundation for these particular maps, because taking a parcel map from anyplace and just putting a certified stamp on it and saying that this should be admissible without being able to have a witness --

THE COURT: They have to hook up relevancy, obviously.

MS. LUNDVALL: Bingo.
THE COURT: That's it.
MS. LUNDVALL: Bingo.
THE COURT: I wouldn't let it in if it wasn't
relevant. That's true of any piece of evidence at trial.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: That's true.

MS. LUNDVALL: That's why, in fact, the
Court cannot admit these pretrial without being able to have a witness that would be able to tell you this parcel map deal was this particular transaction and
that this is the land that's at issue, so therefore, we can't stipulate then to these particular parcel maps, because they don't have that, and we dispute that.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Your Honor?

THE COURT: Okay, I'm trying to figure out what her objection, the objection is.

MS. LUNDVALL: It's foundation. It's
foundation.

THE COURT: Foundation, but not on authenticity, it's just whether they can make it relevant, lay the foundation at trial.

MS. LUNDVALL: Exactly.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: The agreements we just made a stipulation to as to admissibility. We'll have to establish these are the exact maps. We pulled the maps from the maps referenced in these agreements.

THE COURT: But what Ms. Lundvall's saying is you have to have someone establish what they, that they say what you say, what you're alleging they say. They'll get in.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: But the documents you have before you that have been stipulated to their admissibility, okay, actually make specific reference to --

THE COURT: The ones before?

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly, your Honor. THE COURT: I skipped those once I got the stipulation.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly. You can look to the agreements, even the first agreement of this case. The option agreement between Pardee and CSI defines the purchase property by a map.

THE COURT: So that will be easy to hook up,
if the map number matches to the agreement.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly, and that's
already been stipulated as admissible, so all of the agreements between the parties, between Pardee and CSI, have been deemed admissible, and they make specific reference to these maps. The relevance is clear, you don't need a witness to establish --

THE COURT: I don't know, as you know, but if
it hooks up that way, it's an easy fix.
MS. LUNDVALL: It's an easy fix when they put
a witness as far as on the stand to establish that
foundation, but for counsel to be able to try to
substitute his testimony --
THE COURT: No.
MS. LUNDVALL: That's the point I'm trying to make.

THE COURT: Okay. You know what, the only
issue you had really is you don't have an issue with authenticity. They get in. You're gonna put in the agreements first anyway, because otherwise they won't flow properly, so that will hook up real easy is what you're saying to me?

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Yes.
THE COURT: So as far as 14 to 19 , basically
the only issue you are concerned about is authenticity.
You don't want any problems like that.
Obviously, no one is going to, you know, if she wants to say it's not relevant, if she has a proper argument at trial, she can bring it. You know what you need to do to prove it up. I don't want to make a ruling that it is relevant and it hooks up, because I don't know everything, but $I$ think, for our purposes, for this motion in limine, $I$ just looked at them as authenticity and getting rid of any document-type objections, and that's kind of where we need to focus.

So you really don't have any objection to those, correct, as far as authenticity for 14 to 19?

MS. LUNDVALL: Correct, your Honor.
THE COURT: So we'll make that part of the stipulation, so that also will be withdrawn, so no problems with authenticity at trial, per stipulation.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Finally - -
THE COURT: 21 and 22, which is Lash's correspondence.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Yes, your Honor, dated specifically from November 24, 2009, and I believe August 23, 2007 .

It's very clearly, your Honor, it's a statement by an agent of the opposing party. Again, they didn't, because they didn't specifically respond in their opposition, their opposition was to Motions in Limine 16 through 19, I just bootstrapped it to the Motions in Limine 21 and 22 which were not part of the stipulation. I assumed they would make that same objection.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Again, there's no
issue of authenticity. These were produced by the defendant, okay, and they were identified as --

THE COURT: And I assume Mr. Lash is going to be a witness?

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly. He's going to be a witness.

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: And the letters that
he wrote to our clients are absolutely relevant, because the key issue is what information was provided by the defendant to the plaintiffs, so again, there shouldn't be any issue as to whether they should be admissible. They should be deemed admissible, because they are both authentic documents, copies of the documents produced by the defendant, and they are the, they are relevant because they are the embodiment of the communication and information between the plaintiffs and defendants.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. LUNDVALL: This one is a chicken and an ego, your Honor. We have a motion before you dealing with parol evidence, and one of the issues from our perspective is that while we very much want you to see these letters, what $I$ didn't want to have is some arguments that somehow that we've waived --

THE COURT: Your parol evidence.
MS. LUNDVALL: -- our parol evidence
objection because of these communications, so to the extent that if the Court denies our motion dealing with parol evidence --

THE COURT: We have no problem.
MS. LUNDVALL: We have no problem as far as with these documents.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. LUNDVALL: If, in fact, the Court grants our motion --

THE COURT: Then they wouldn't be relevant, they would it be excluded under parol evidence, okay.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Your Honor, in addition to the parol evidence, it also would go to the issues of notice. That is, did they provide the notice, it was not necessarily whether or not --

THE COURT: Parol evidence is just in terms of the contract, $I$ understand that.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly. It goes to the issue of whether or not our clients were notified as to whether or not they had actually fulfilled --

THE COURT: These are legitimate issues that need to come up in trial. That puts me in kind of a tough position here. That's why I don't want to make decisions on relevancy, because it may come in for another purpose.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Yes.
THE COURT: I'm looking at -- you don't have any problem with authenticity, correct?

MS. LUNDVALL: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: So I would like to treat this as the other two groups.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: There is absolutely no problem with authenticity. Once again, at the time of trial, the foundation will be laid for relevancy, and your argument will be, Hey, it goes to notice. If it gets in for notice, which is a whole separate purpose, okay?

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: So Motions in Limine 21 and 22
will also be withdrawn by stipulation that they are authentic. We don't have to worry about any issues as to hearsay or anything, it just comes to what is relevant in this case, and that would make everything clean for me and for you, okay?

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. So that would be all of
plaintiff's, correct? Am I right?
MR. JAMES J. JIMMERSON: Your Honor, would it be acceptable to the defendants if we could get clean copies of the contracts of Pardee and CSI by Friday afternoon?

THE COURT: Could you get it by Friday when your supplemental brief is due?

MS. LUNDVALL: I believe so, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you so much.
MR. JAMES J. JIMMERSON: Thank you.

THE COURT: That takes care of those.

Then we're gonna go to the defendant's
motions in limine, correct?

Why do $I$ have number two here? Let's see, let's start with Defendant's Motion in Limine Number 1, and I'm confused on this one. That's why I had my law clerk call you. I thought this was decided and briefed in the motion for summary judgment and the extensive briefing on the second amended complaint, and $I$ noticed this was filed before the ruling, so that's why I actually had my law clerk call.

What is different, Ms. Lundvall, on this
motion in limine than what $I$ already decided.
MS. LUNDVALL: Your Honor, from this
perspective, this is, as far as the way that I'm suggesting as far as how the Court should hande both, the first of motion that dealt with the attorney's fees as damages as well as the compensation for time, both of those, the court had indicated that there was evidence that the court wished to hear at the time of trial.

THE COURT: Right, but I'm not at trial yet.
MS. LUNDVALL: I know that.

THE COURT: Okay.
MS. LUNDVALL: So therefore, my suggestion is
that these motions don't get denied, but they get deferred then until a point then which would actually be the plaintiff's case in chief.

THE COURT: Right, these really aren't
motions in limine. And $I$ looked back through my ruling, absolutely they have to prove up the elements, okay?

MS. LUNDVALL: So from this perspective,
these motions were filed way back in March.
THE COURT: That's why I actually had my law clerk, but I, I looked at all the timing and pulled up everything. I understand the timing.

MS. LUNDVALL: So I think that the Court's instinct is correct, that you've made the determination then on these particular ones, and it's a matter of then the plaintiffs then offering the evidence that the Court has identified.

THE COURT: Right, under the criteria, right.
So why would I continue this? I mean you're
not -- I don't understand why it's really a proper
subject for a motion in limine. Maybe I'm just not thinking clearly, I'm not sure.

I think $I$ already made it clear that they have to prove it up at trial, so it really isn't -- I look at motions in limine as specifically excluding

```
evidence or something that can be decided in an
evidentiary hearing. This isn't evidentiary.
    They know the elements, you know. I guess I
don't understand why it's a motion in limine.
    MS. LUNDVALL: Well, at the time that the
Court -- when we filed a motion in limine, the Court
had not made the substantive determination.
    THE COURT: I absolutely, I understood that,
Ms. Lundvall. Like I said, once again, that's why when
I started working on yours, because these were
extensive, I actually had my law clerk call, because I
realized the timing they were done, so before I did, I
had them call and ask if I need to review them, and you
said yes, so I wanted to know.
MS. LUNDVALL: The communication I'm trying
to articulate though is that these simply can be set
aside until we can determine if, in fact, plaintiffs
have offered up the evidence.
    THE COURT: That's what I was hoping when I
called. Maybe I didn't have my law clerk articulate
it.
    MS. LUNDVALL: Also, we had brought a motion
in limine dealing with a production of evidence, you
know, post the discovery cutoff, and that discovery
cutoff was a long time ago.
```

THE COURT: Right.
MS. LUNDVALL: The Court's extended it, so we have withdrawn --

THE COURT: So what do you want to do on this
first motion in limine? Do you want to withdraw it?
MS. LUNDVALL: My suggestion is that the
Court, at this point in time, if you want to deal with
that, you just simply hold it in abeyance until the close of plaintiff's case in chief.

THE COURT: Okay. That's fine.

MS. LUNDVALL: The only issue then that
really is before the Court then in our motions in limine deals with the parol evidence.

THE COURT: Right, okay. And that's the same with Motion in Limine Number 2, okay.

All right. And now we go to Defendant's Motion in Limine Number 3 is the parol evidence.

MS. LUNDVALL: If $I$ can harken the Court all
the way back as far as to the argument that we had before you on our motion for summary judgment, there was an acknowledgement then by the plaintiffs during that point in time that the commission agreement, which is the contract that's at issue in this case, was clear and unambiguous, so if you've got a contract that is clear and unambiguous, the general rule then is parol
evidence is not admissible.

The plaintiffs have now changed their position in opposition to our motion in limine. Their motion now is that there's some type of an ambiguity in the paragraph that deals with what information to which they were entitled.

They have the throwaway line at the second sentence of the paragraph that states, in addition, that they be entitled to reasonable information on all matters relating to the amount and the due dates of their commissions. They have a throwaway line in their opposition. It says, That is subject to multiple interpretations. They don't offer what those multiple interpretations are. They don't offer where there's an ambiguity within the contractual language. They don't offer any suggestion that the plain meaning of the words that are used in that paragraph somehow are capable of more than one interpretation, and that for some reason that the plain meaning of that language cannot be taken at face value by the court in making its determination by applying the facts to that plain meaning.

And so we submit that the language contained in the commission agreement is clear and unambiguous, exactly like they acknowledged back during the motion
practice on the motion for summary judgment, and that, in fact, there has been no offering to the court of some type of an ambiguity, and as long as the court makes a finding that the contract at issue, the commission agreement, is clear and unambiguous, then the parol evidence is excluded.

And what that means from a parol evidence perspective, it is very important to what evidence then the Court will hear, and it is whether or not that all of the contractual documents, the drafts, the arguments, the portions that came in versus got deleted from the red lines and the black lines --

THE COURT: You're just talking to the terms, not performance of the contract?

MS. LUNDVALL: Precisely.
THE COURT: Just the terms, correct?
MS. LUNDVALL: Precisely. So I'm not talking
anything about performance, I'm talking about what do the, does the contractual language mean within the commission agreement, and so to that extent, your Honor, that's why we brought the motion, and that there is specific evidence that it would be excluded by reason of the Court granting this motion.

THE COURT: I understand. Maybe it would be better if $I$ didn't spend so much time on this.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: No, your Honor, I can assure you that both parties are well served with you spending as much time as you are.

THE COURT: Goodness.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: The issue for the Court isn't that either party wants to bring in previous negotiations or these other things, okay? The key issue really is what do the terms mean.

THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: And in their
citation to the Galardi case that was recently decided
is precisely --
THE COURT: On point.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly. They have brought in an expert to say this is what this means in traditional usage in this --

THE COURT: Because $I$ wrote down here parol evidence, meaning --

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly.
THE COURT: And the big term is "reasonably
informed."

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: And the reason we're here is because there is a difference as to what the meaning of that term is, okay?

THE COURT: Right.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: So to the extent they're asking that we exclude evidence --

THE COURT: Of prior discussion, anything before, do you have problem with that?

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: We've never had an issue. In fact, we haven't proposed as trial exhibits any of those prior negotiations, so we have no issue as to we want to say this means that, because we talked about this back here.

THE COURT: Or you have any correspondence or anything prior, like anything that might have happened with coming up with the terms of the commission agreement, because I'm sure there were discussions and stuff. Since Mr. Jimmerson was involved, I'm sure there were some discussions, and I'm sure that was a matter of quite a bit of negotiations.

MR. JAMES J. JIMMERSON: We are -- no, there are. There are. There are.

THE COURT: And you don't want to bring any of that.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: We didn't propose them as trial exhibits for this exact reason. We know what the agreement is.

THE COURT: Okay. I didn't know there were that many trial exhibits, but $I$ agree with her on that.

MR. JAMES J. JIMMERSON: Yes. And we've not suggested that that is admissible.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Whether or not you're going to allow us to have someone take the stand and say this is what this means.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: And to the extent
the goal is to eliminate that particular testimony, we are fighting for that, but we are absolutely not presenting to this Court old agreements or old negotiations.

THE COURT: I'm focused right where you want me to be.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Right. The reasonably informed, there's clearly disagreement as to what means. We can argue that it's unambiguous, because its real meaning is our meaning or the real meaning is their meaning.

THE COURT: Their meaning.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Okay. But ultimately, we are not asking the court to say that it is admissible for Mr. Wolfram to take the stand and say, John Lash told me in May of 2004 before we had this agreement. We're not.

THE COURT: Good.

MR. JAMES J. JIMMERSON: The only issue, of course, is what is the meaning of the agreement, and the Supreme Court has consistently held that to the extent they're able to tell us what the meaning of that agreement is, you're able to --

THE COURT: All right.
MS. LUNDVALL: Mr. Jimmerson just
acknowledged that, in fact, our motion should be granted. He said --

THE COURT: On the terms of what, any parol evidence, not the meaning. Not, parol evidence does not exclude any testimony to determine the meaning of the term "reasonably informed," as I read it, which I looked at, but anything under parol evidence, any discussion, any telephone calls, any prior drafts, what the commission agreement is, anything like that, which is how I'm evaluating the parol evidence in this case, you're in agreement as long as we all understand what parol evidence means?

MS. LUNDVALL: That's correct, your Honor.
So from the standpoint of our motion never suggested anything to the contrary, our motion never said, Hey, you've got to adopt our meaning as far as this contractual language. We understand that the parties
have a dispute over the meaning, but the question becomes what evidence can they offer? Can we go back and try to offer all the other drafts and the conversations and the negotiations? No. They've acknowledged then that our motion should be granted.

THE COURT: This is much easier than $I$ thought it would be, because that's, honestly, Ms. Lundvall, how I looked at it.

As long as we're all clear on what we mean and what we're saying by granting this motion in limine is any discussions, any discussions, any documents, any, any evidence related to prior terms, anything, the terms and the contract would in any way be affected by what was done prior, that is not under the parol evidence, and I'm granting -- that would not be granted, would not be admitted because of the parol evidence.

It's not to be interpreted in any way that the parol evidence or this ruling would in any way limit testimony to determine the meaning of the contractual terms. One specifically we talked about is the term "reasonably informed," and I don't know if there's others, but obviously that's one I keyed on.

MR. JAMES J. JIMMERSON: That's a big one.
THE COURT: Because it came from the summary
judgment, so we're in agreement on that.
Oh, my goodness, that's nice. That's very nice.

Okay, have I gone through everything?
MS. LUNDVALL: I believe so.
THE COURT: Do you want me to -- I'm in my last pile, so hopefully we're done. I'm out of piles here.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Your Honor, just to confirm, the pretrial documents that you requested in advance of today, we'll be amending our list consistent with --

THE COURT: We also, we have the list from Kelly, but $I$ have a list $I$ put together for bench trials $I$ was gonna give to you today also, because $I$, since I've been doing so many, I've come up with a better way to handle it, so I am not -- so I actually have a list of that too, because you and $I$ know that pretrial isn't as helpful as some of this -- oh, not that, it isn't -- $I$ put a lot together. I understand the significance of pretrial. Please don't read it that $I$ don't, but do we have that list?

THE CLERK: Yes, I do.
THE COURT: I want to take the opportunity to give it to both of you.

MR. JAMES J. JIMMERSON: We appreciate it, your Honor.

THE COURT: And there's exhibit guidelines as well.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Your Honor, I do have one question, and this is an issue that's actually come up since we've received the documents.

To the extent that we would like to get
additional certified copies of the large versions of
the maps from the recorder's office --
THE COURT: Yes.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: -- they have stopped
producing those, so we have --
THE COURT: The County has?
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Yes.

THE COURT: Or the recorder's.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: As a cost saving
measure.

THE COURT: I was gonna say it costs --
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: I would imagine so.
To the extent they're still capable of doing it, can we get a Court order to the extent you would like
additional copies or they would like additional copies?
I know you have a certified copy.
MS. LUNDVALL: I have no idea what counsel is
asking for, but if he would like to enter into a stipulation with us and present it to you for an order, we would be happy to do that.

THE COURT: You're just concerned that the clerks's office, the recorder's office, I misspoke, the recorder's office.

MR. JAMES J. JIMMERSON: Would be compelled
to make a production of what we have so there's two or three copies and not just one.

THE COURT: I see, certified copies.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Exactly, your Honor.

THE COURT: Can we get a stipulation that one
certified copy is enough or --
MS. LUNDVALL: Absolutely.
THE COURT: That way you would not have the
requirement much more than one certified.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: That's perfectly
acceptable too, as long as we can make copies.
THE COURT: We got a stipulation on that.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Wonderful.
Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: I need two of these.
THE CLERK: I had, I have two. I want to
make sure that's what --
MS. LUNDVALL: And your Honor, the one
question that we had, when does your clerk wish for us to bring over our exhibits to be --

THE CLERK: If you have them ready a week before, that would be great. I was gonna call guys like a week and a half prior to the trial.

MS. LUNDVALL: Brian or someone at our office
will be responsible to bring them over.
THE COURT: Do you have another set?
THE CLERK: Yes.

THE COURT: This is what $I$ have come up with
for civil bench trials, and this is Kristin's.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Your Honor, can we approach the bench?

THE COURT: Sure. It helps you. It's kind of in addition to the regular stuff.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Thank you very much.
THE COURT: You're very welcome.
Thank you, counsel. I appreciate it.
Please get me the supplemental briefing.
MR. JAMES J. JIMMERSON: We will.

MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: We'll prepare the orders on the discovery motions and the dispositive motions.

THE COURT: You're gonna do it?
MS. LUNDVALL: The dispositive motion hasn't
been ruled upon jet.
MR. SHIPLEY: The stipulation, prepare the
stipulation.
MR. JAMES M. JIMMERSON: Yeah, we will.
THE COURT: Work it out.
MR. SHIPLEY: And the order on the compel.
MS. LUNDVALL: Thank you, Judge.
THE COURT: You're welcome.
It's nice to see you this morning, counsel.
* * * * * *
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