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# IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA 

## IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

years ago. Despite these various other settlements, the remaining Defendants in this action cite to no case or statute or other legal authority that would entitle them to any kind of off-set or claim of contribution in this matter. As a result, the Court should deny the remaining Defendants' Motion and uphold the judgment entered in this matter in the Plaintiffs' favor. In denying this Motion, the Court should also award Plaintiffs the reasonable attorneys' fee Plaintiffs have expended to oppose the Motion.

## FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND AND LEGAL ARGUMENT

The remaining Defendants erroneously believe they are entitled to an off-set or to contribution under NRS 17.245 as "joint tortfeasors" with the defendants that have settled out of this dispute. What the remaining Defendants fail to realize is that they are not "joint tortfeasors" with any of the settling defendants. In the Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 1, the Plaintiffs specifically alleged statutory and tort-based claims against Harry Reynolds and Deann Reynolds (in the First, Second and Third Causes of Action), who were the sellers of the property that formed the basis of the Second Amended Complaint. The Plaintiffs did not assert any tort-based claims against their own agent and his broker (Brian Kincannon, Robert Clement and Dickson Realty) or against the remaining Defendants (A.J. Johnson, James E. Johns, and JE Johns \& Associates), instead alleging only statutory claims against the realtors and the brokers that were named in the Second Amended Complaint. Therefore, Plaintiffs did not pursue any theories of joint tort liability against the sellers and any of the realtors or brokers named in the Second Amended Complaint. All liability stated against the remaining Defendants is statutory in nature, is based upon different facts than those claimed against the sellers and does not form joint tort liability between the remaining Defendants and any other defendant.

In their answer to the Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 2, the remaining Defendants did not claim as a defense or as an affirmative claim for relief that they were entitled to an off-set or to contribution from the other named defendants under NRS 17.225
through NRS 17.305. Additionally, regarding the two tort claims asserted against the sellers of the property for negligence and fraud (the Second and Third Causes of Action), the remaining Defendants correctly stated in their answer that these claims did not apply to them, so they did not provide any answers to the allegations of the Second and Third Causes of Action of the Second Amended Complaint. Id. Conversely, when Brian Kincannon, Robert Clement and Dickson Realty answered the Second Amended Complaint, a copy of that answer being attached hereto as Exhibit 3, these settling defendants specifically alleged as an affirmative defense in their answer that they were entitled to contribution from third-parties (Eleventh Affirmative Defense). In the Cross-Claim that these settling defendants filed concurrently with their answer in this matter, Brian Kincannon, Robert Clement and Dickson Realty asserted a right to claim contribution and indemnity arising from the remaining Defendants' conduct, thereby preserving those claims. Id. By not alleging a right to an off-set in their answer, the remaining Defendants have waived any such claims at this very late stage of this case.

The issue of joint tort liability being raised to permit an off-set or contribution under NRS 17.225 through NRS 17.305 was previously raised with this Court in Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine No. 2, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 4. Upon considering the arguments in Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine No. 2, which are incorporated into this Opposition by this reference, and any arguments in opposition to that motion, the Court granted Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine No. 2, concluding that Plaintiffs' "claims are purely statutory, and the statutes involved do not contain provisions for joint liability or contribution. Further, the Defendants have not cited any binding authority that would entitle them to offset the $\$ 7500$ (which is the amount of the settlement with the Plaintiffs' realtor)." Also, in this Order, the Court found that "Defendants acknowledge that the only basis for liability against the Defendants is statutory. . ." and that "Defendants argue[d] that they are entitled in the amount of $\$ 7500$ to prevent a double recovery by the Plaintiffs." Id. The Court did not buy the remaining Defendants' argument related to an off-set the
first time the remaining Defendants made it and should not at this time.
The one case cited by the remaining Defendants in their Motion related to this issue is distinguishable from the facts established at the trial of this matter because in this cited case, the right to contribution and to a set-off or indemnity among joint tortfeasors was the issue decided. In The Doctors Co. v. Vincent, 120 Nev. 644, 98 P.3d 681 (2004), the only cased cited on this issue in the Motion, the Nevada Supreme Court reviewed and issued opinions related to contribution and indemnity among joint tortfeasors, both allegedly responsible for the same injury. In this regard, the Supreme Court concluded that a party must extinguish all joint tort liability in a settlement if it wished to preserve its right to contribution but that a party did not need to extinguish all joint tort liability in a settlement if it wished to pursue claims of total indemnity. Id. at 646-647. The Doctors Co. case has no bearing on this litigation and the remaining Defendants do not show how this cited case would apply in this matter. Moreover, as noted in the Court's order on Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine No. 3, the remaining Defendants have admitted, in prior pleadings with this Court, that the only source of liability against the remaining Defendants is statutory and there is no joint tort liability to determine. The AA Primo Builders, LLC v. Washington case also cited in the remaining Defendants' Motion has no bearing on issues of contribution or a right to an off-set or indemnity, but instead deals with the manner and nature of a motion to amend or alter a judgment under NRCP 59(e), and whether such motions, if improperly brought, do not toll the time to appeal set forth in NRAP 4. Nothing in AA Primo provides for a right of contribution, indemnity or an off-set.

Because this Court already dealt with the remaining Defendants' claim that they are entitled to an off-set or contribution under NRS 17.225 through NRS 17.305 when the Court granted Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine No. 2, because the remaining Defendants did not preserve the right to claim an off-set or to assert claims of contribution in their answer, and because this case does not deal with the determination
and apportionment of joint tort liability, in that the claims are purely statutory in nature against the remaining Defendants, the remaining Defendants are not entitled to an order amending or altering the judgment. Plaintiffs obtained a judgment against these remaining Defendants in the principal amount of $\$ 75,780.79$, with interest of $\$ 19,121.48$ awarded as of September 25,2018 , which well exceeds the $\$ 5,000.00$ offer of judgment the remaining Defendants made in this case. No off-set for settlements reached with other defendants should be granted and the Court should uphold the judgment in favor of Plaintiffs and award Plaintiffs the attorney's fees expended to oppose the remaining Defendants' Motion.

## AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NRS 239B. 030

The undersigned attorney does hereby affirm that the preceding document does not contain the social security number of any persons.
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# IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA 

## IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

JOHN LINDBERG, an individual; MICHAL LINDBERG, an individual; and JUDITH L. LINDBERG, an individual,

Plaintiffs,
v.

HARRY RICHARD REYNOLDS, an individual; DEANN REYNOLDS, an individual; J.E. JOHNS \& ASSOCIATES, a Nevada business entity; JAMES E. JOHNS, an individual; A.J. JOHNSON, an individual; BRIAN F.
KINCANNON, an individual; GROUP ONE, INC., a Nevada corporation dba Keller Williams Realty; ROBERT CLEMENT, an individual; and DOES 3 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

## SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT

Plaintiffs, JOHN LINDBERG, MICHAL LINDBERG, and JUDITH L. LINDBERG
(collectively "Lindbergs"), by and through their counsel of record, John D. Moore, Esq., Moore Law Group, PC, for their Second Amended Complaint against Defendants, allege as follows:

## PARTIES

1. At all times material to this Complaint, the Lindbergs were and are individuals and
residents of Washoe County, Nevada. JUDITH L. LINDBERG is JOHN LINDBERG's mother. JOHN LINDBERG and MICHAL LINDBERG were and are husband and wife.
2. At all times material to this Complaint, Defendants HARRY RICHARD REYNOLDS ("Harry Reynolds"), and DEANN REYNOLDS (collectively "Sellers"), were and are individuals and residents of Washoe County, Nevada.
3. On information and belief, at all times material to this Complaint, Defendant J.E. JOHNS \& ASSOCIATES was and is a Nevada business entity of unknown type, not registered with the Nevada Secretary of State, doing business in Washoe County, Nevada.
4. On information and belief, at all times material to this Complaint, Defendant JAMES E. JOHNS was and is an individual and resident of Washoe County, Nevada, and was at all times pertinent hereto a Nevada licensed real estate broker. Defendants J.E. JOHNS \& ASSOCIATES and JAMES E. JOHNS collectively are referred to herein as "Johns."
5. On information and belief, at all times material to this Complaint, Defendant A.J. JOHNSON ("Johnson") was and is an individual and resident of Washoe County, Nevada, and was at all times pertinent hereto a Nevada licensed real estate salesperson.
6. On information and belief, at all times material to this Complaint, Defendant Johnson acted as a salesperson subject to the supervision of his broker, JAMES E. JOHNS.
7. On information and belief, at all times material to this Complaint, Defendant GROUP ONE, INC., was a Nevada corporation doing business as KELLER WILLIAMS REALTY ("Keller Williams"), and ROBERT CLEMENT ("Clement") was and is an individual and resident of Minden County, Nevada, and was at all times pertinent hereto a Nevada licensed real estate broker.
8. On information and belief, at all times material to this Complaint, Defendant BRIAN F. KINCANNON ("Kincannon") was and is an individual and resident of Washoe County, Nevada, and was at all times pertinent hereto a Nevada licensed real estate salesperson.
9. On information and belief, at all times material to this Complaint, Defendant Kincannon acted as a salesperson subject to the supervision of his broker, Clement.
10. Defendants DOES 3 through 10 are sued herein under fictitious names because the true names and capacities of said Defendants are not known by the Lindbergs, who will ask leave of this Court to amend this Complaint to set forth the same at such time as they become known. The Lindbergs are informed and believe that Defendants DOES 3 through 10 were owners, real estate agents, real estate brokers, contractors, subcontractors, individuals, co-conspirators or third party beneficiaries with respect to the real property and/or sale referenced herein, and as such are responsible for the Lindbergs' injuries and damages.
11. At all times material to this Complaint, each of the Defendants was the agent, coconspirator, employee, partner or affiliate of each of the remaining Defendants, and each was at all times acting within the purpose and scope and in furtherance of said agency, employment or conspiracy and for the benefit of each of the remaining Defendants.

## FACTS

12. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the preceding Paragraphs of this Complaint as if set forth at length herein.
13. In approximately September, 2012, Sellers offered their residential real property for sale, which property was located at 20957 Eaton Road, Pleasant Valley, Nevada 89521, and further described as Parcel 2 of Parcel Map No. 292 for John and Marie Brown, according to the map thereof, filed in the office of the County Recorder of Washoe County, State of Nevada, on July 27, 1976; (APN\# 045-337-11) (the "Property").
14. In approximately late 2012, Johns and Johnson listed the Property for sale under MLS\# 120014058, on behalf of their clients, the Sellers.
15. At least one listing for the Property stated that the Property "Total Living Space" was 3,880 square feet, and that the Property included an "INLAW QUARTERS OR GUEST HOUSE."
16. In approximately January, 2013, the Lindbergs became interested in the Property, and began negotiating the purchase price and other terms through their own real estate agent, Kincannon, and his broker, Clement.
17. The Lindbergs read and relied on the information provided by Harry Richard Reynolds, Johns, and Johnson that the Property "Total Living Space" was 3,880 square feet, and that the Property included an "INLAW QUARTERS OR GUEST HOUSE."
18. Defendant, Harry Richard Reynolds, showed Plaintiff, John Lindberg the Property, and specifically showed Mr. Lindberg a two-story building that was detached from the main house, and appeared to be a stand-alone guest house. Harry Richard Reynolds also showed John Lindberg a separate garage and attached converted bonus room. Harry Richard Reynolds affirmatively represented to John Lindberg that these buildings could be used for residential living, and that the apparent garage could be used as a typical garage.
19. Prior to the closing on the sale of the Property to the Lindbergs, the Sellers initialed and signed a form entitled, "Sellers Real Property Disclosure Form" (the "Form"). That form consisted in part of numbered questions regarding the status or condition of the Property, with columns of check-boxes to the right for Sellers to check, "YES," "NO," or "N/A" as to each numbered question.
20. On page 2 of the Form, question number 1(c), asked, "Any construction, modification, alterations, or repairs made without required state, city, or county building permits?" The check-box to the right of that question indicates a "NO" answer.
21. Both Sellers initialed page 2 of the Form, and both signed the Form on page 4. The hand-printed date September 21, 2012 appears next to both of the Sellers' signatures on the Form.
22. In reliance on all of Defendants' representations regarding the Property, on or about February 28, 2013, the Lindbergs closed on the sale of the Property.
23. The Lindbergs thereafter discovered (1) that the separate building at the Property that appeared to be (and was represented by Defendants to be) a detached two-story "In-Law" quarters, in fact had never been permitted for residential occupancy; and (2) that the separate building at the Property that appeared to be (and was represented by Defendants to be) a detached garage / bonus room, in fact had not been permitted for residential occupancy, or even for use as a garage. The Lindbergs discovered that Sellers had pulled a permit for certain construction of the separate buildings,
but that no such construction had been finalized, and no permits were obtained.
24. The Lindbergs also discovered that the square footage of living space at the property was falsely overrepresented as 3,880 square feet, and that utilities such as the septic system and electrical system serving the Property, were undersized, and inadequate to properly serve the Property.
25. As a proximate and foreseeable result of the statements and other conduct of the Defendants, the Lindbergs have been required, and will in the future be required, to engage contractors, design professionals, inspectors, and other professionals to assess and determine the true status and condition of the Property, and to remediate and correct aspects of the condition of the Property. The Lindbergs have incurred other damages and injuries, subject to proof at trial.
26. As a proximate and foreseeable result of the statements and other conduct of Defendants, the Lindbergs have been required, and will in the future be required, to incur costs to repair or replace defective portions of the Property that were not disclosed by Defendants.
27. The conduct of the Defendants and the above-described damages sustained by the Lindbergs have caused a diminution in the market value of the Property, and a loss of use of the Property.
28. As a proximate and foreseeable result of the conduct of the Defendants, the Lindbergs foreseeably have become involved in litigation with third parties.
29. As a proximate and foreseeable result of the conduct of the Defendants, the Lindbergs have incurred attorney's fees as damages, in an amount subject to proof at trial.

## FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION <br> (Action Pursuant to NRS 113.150 -Defendant Sellers)

30. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the preceding Paragraphs of this Complaint as if set forth at length herein.
31. The Sellers failed to provide truthful and correct disclosures required by NRS 113.130, proximately causing damages to the Lindbergs as described herein.
32. As a result of the Sellers' failure to provide truthful and correct disclosures required by

NRS 113.130 to the Lindbergs, the Lindbergs have a cause of action against the Sellers under NRS 113.150 to recover treble the costs of correcting the undisclosed defects in the Property, and for related court costs and reasonable attorney's fees.

## SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION <br> (Negligence - Defendant Sellers)

33. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the preceding Paragraphs of this Complaint as if set forth at length herein.
34. In the communication of information to the Lindbergs, Sellers each had a duty to exercise such care, skill, prudence and diligence that a reasonably prudent person would exercise.
35. In the communication of information to the Lindbergs, Sellers breached their duty to exercise such care, skill, prudence and diligence that a reasonably prudent person would exercise.
36. The negligent conduct of the Sellers proximately caused damages to Plaintiffs, as more fully described herein, in an amount in excess of $\$ 10,000$, and subject to proof at trial.

## THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION <br> (Fraud - Defendant Sellers)

37. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the preceding Paragraphs of this Complaint as if set forth at length herein.
38. The Sellers made the following false representations to the Lindbergs: (1) that the Property included an In-Law Quarters or Guest House; (2) that the Property included a detached garage / bonus room; (3) that Sellers were not aware of any "construction, modification, alterations, or repairs made without required state, city, or county building permits"; (4) that the property "Total Living Space" was 3,880 square feet; and (5) that the Property was free of known defects other than as stated in the Form. Additionally, Harry Richard Reynolds affirmatively represented to John Lindberg that the stand-alone building could be used as mother-in-law quarters.
39. The Sellers knew or believed that such representations were false, or had an insufficient basis of information for making the representations.
40. The Sellers intended to induce the Lindbergs to forego further investigation of the condition of the Property, and to purchase the Property in reliance on the false representations.
41. The Lindbergs in fact relied upon the Sellers' false representations by foregoing further investigation of the condition of the Property, and by purchasing the Property.
42. The Sellers' false representations proximately caused damages to Plaintiffs, as more fully described herein, in an amount in excess of $\$ 10,000$, and subject to proof at trial.
43. The Sellers' false representations were calculated, willful, oppressive and malicious and, therefore, Plaintiffs are entitled to punitive damages.

## FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Action Pursuant to NRS 645.252 and NRS 645.257 - Defendants Johns, Johnson, Clement, and Kincannon)
44. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the preceding Paragraphs of this Complaint as if set forth at length herein.
45. Defendants Johns, Johnson, Clement, and Kincannon each owed a duty to the Lindbergs to comply with NRS 645.252 in the course of the above-described sale of the Property.
46. Defendants Johns, Johnson, Clement, and Kincannon breached their duties to the Lindbergs to comply with NRS 645.252, in that they acted as agents in the above-described real estate transaction, and yet failed to exercise reasonable skill and care with respect to all parties to the transaction, and failed to disclose material and relevant facts, data, or information which they knew, or which by the exercise of reasonable care and diligence they should have known, relating to the Property.
47. As a proximate and foreseeable result of Johns', Johnson's, Clement's, and Kincannon's breaches of their duties to comply with NRS 645.252, Plaintiffs have a cause of action against these Nevada real estate licensees, pursuant to NRS 645.257, to recover their actual damages.
48. As a proximate and foreseeable result of Johns', Johnson's, Clement's, and Kincannon's breaches of their duties to comply with NRS 645.252, Plaintiffs have foreseeably become involved in litigation with Sellers, and consequently, Plaintiffs are entitled to recover their reasonable
attorney's fees, as damages.

## FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Action Pursuant to NRS 645.252, NAC 645.600, and NRS 645.257 - Defendants Johns and Clement)
49. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the preceding Paragraphs of this Complaint as if set forth at length herein.
50. Defendants Johns and Clement owed an additional duty to the Lindbergs, in part pursuant to NRS 645.252 and NAC 645.600 , to maintain adequate supervision of the agents practicing under them, and to use reasonable care in the supervision of their agents.
51. Defendants Johns and Clement breached their duties to the Lindbergs to maintain adequate supervision of their agents, and to use reasonable care in the supervision of their agents.
52. As a proximate and foreseeable result of Johns' and Clement's breaches of their duties to maintain adequate supervision of their agents, and to use reasonable care in the supervision of their agents, Plaintiffs have a cause of action against Johns and Clement, pursuant to NRS 645.257, to recover their actual damages.
53. As a proximate and foreseeable result of Defendants Johns' and Clement's breaches of their duties to maintain adequate supervision of their agents, and to use reasonable care in the supervision of their agents, Plaintiffs incurred damages as more fully described herein, in an amount in excess of $\$ 10,000$, and subject to proof at trial.
54. As a proximate and foreseeable result of Johns's breaches, Plaintiffs have foreseeably become involved in litigation with Sellers, and consequently, Plaintiffs are entitled to recover their reasonable attorney's fees, as damages.

WHEREFORE, Plaintifís demand judgment against Defendants as follows:

1. For compensatory general and special damages according to proof at trial in excess of \$10,000;
2. For punitive damages against Sellers according to proof at trial in excess of $\$ 10,000$;
3. For contractual and/or statutory interest, reasonable attorney's fees, attorney's fees as damages, and costs of suit; and
4. For such other relief as the Court deems proper.

## AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NBS 239B. 030

The undersigned does hereby affirm that the proceeding document does not contain the social security number of any persons.

DATED this
 day of May, 2016.

MOORE LAW GROUP, PC
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C. NICHOLAS PEREOS, ESQ.

Nevada Bar \#0000013
1610 MEADOW WOOD LANE, STE. 202
RENO, NV 89502
(775) 329-0678

ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANTS
J. E. JOHNS \& ASSOCIATES
\& A. J. JOHNSON

IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

JOHN LINDBERG, MICHAL LINDBERG, JUDITH L. LINDBERG

Plaintiffs,
vs.
HARRY RICHARD REYNOLDS, DEANN REYNOLDS, J. E. JOHNS \& ASSOCIATES, A. J. JOHNSON, KEN AMUNDSON, BRIAN F. KINCANNON

Defendants.

Case No. CV15-00281
Dept. No. 3

## ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT

Defendants, James E. Johns and A.J. Johnson answering the Second Amended Complaint, admits, denies and avers as follows:

## THE PARTIES

I
Defendants answering the "Parties" allegations of the Second Amended Complaint on file herein admits, denies and avers as follows:

1. Admit that Reynolds were residents of Washoe County, Nevada. Admit that James E. Johns was a resident of Washoe County, Nevada. These Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the
averments contained in paragraphs $2,4,7$ through 11, inclusive to the Second Amended Complaint.

## FACTS

।
Defendants answering the "Facts" of the Second Amended Complaint on file herein admits, denies and avers as follows:

1. Adopt by reference and make a part hereof each and all the admissions, denials contained hereinabove.
2. Admit that J.E. Johns \& Associates listed the property for sale on behalf of the sellers. Deny each, and every and other averments contained in paragraphs 14, 17, 18, 20 through 29 , inclusive.

## FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Answering the "First Cause of Action" of the Second Amended Complaint, these Defendants admits, denies and avers as follows:

1. Insofar as said first cause of action is not applicable to these Defendants, Defendants denies the same.

## SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

I
Answering the "Second Cause of Action" of the Second Amended Complaint, these Defendants admits, denies and avers as follows:

1. Insofar as the second cause of action is not applicable to these Defendants, these Defendants denies the same.

## THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

।
Answering the "Third Cause of Action" of the Second Amended Complaint, these Defendants admits, denies and avers as follows:

1. Insofar as this third cause of action is not applicable to these Defendants, these Defendants denies the same.

## FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

।
Answering the "Fourth Cause of Action" of the Second Amended Complaint, these Defendants admits, denies and avers as follows:

1. Adopt by reference and make a part hereof each and all the admissions, denials contained hereinabove.
2. Deny each, and every and all of the averments contained in paragraphs 46 through 48 of the fourth cause of action.

## FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

## 1

Answering the "Fifth Cause of Action" of the Second Amended Complaint, these Defendants admits, denies and avers as follows:

1. Adopt by reference and make a part hereof each and all the admissions, denials contained hereinabove.
2. Deny each, and every and all of the averments contained in paragraphs 50 through 54, inclusive of the fifth cause of action.

## FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Defendant James E. Johns is now deceased and this Court lacks jurisdiction.

## SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs have resolved its claim with regard to the remaining Defendants and these Defendants is entitled to a credit therefore.

## THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs were provided reports indicating problems with regard to the subject property and proceeded to close the escrow and assumed the risks by reason of the same.

## FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs received compensation for the losses alleged to have been sustained in the purchase of the property and the claim has been satisfied.

## FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs has waived any rights to collect for issues as to these Defendants by reason of the notice of deficiencies.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
Said complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

## SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

At all times herein mentioned, Plaintiffs negligently and carelessly conducted themselves in and about the matters averred in said complaint which said negligence and carelessness attributed to any and all lawsuits allegedly to be sustained by them.

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
Plaintiffs engaged independent contractors and consultants and relied on the materials provided to them.

## NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The duties owed to the Plaintiffs to adequately investigate and counsel the Plaintiffs were not by these Defendants.

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
The claims of the complaint are barred by justification.
ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
The claims of the complaint are barred by unjust enrichment.
TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
The claims of the complaint are barred by failure to act in a commercially reasonable manner.

## THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The claims of the complaint are barred by lack of consideration.

## FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The claims of the complaint are barred in whole or in part by waiver acquiescence and/or estoppel.

FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
The claims of the complaint are barred by unclean hands and bad faith.

## SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Recession is the remedy available to the Plaintiff.

Wherefore, these Defendants pray that Plaintiffs take nothing from said Complaint and that these Defendants have judgment against Plaintiffs for costs of suit and reasonable attorneys fees.

## AFFIRMATION

The undersigned affirms that the foregoing pleading does not contain a social security number.

DATED this $17^{\text {th }}$ day of IANUARY, 2018 C. NICHOLAS PEREOS, LTD.
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Attorneys for Defendants and Cross-Claimants BRIAN F. KINCANNON, ROBERT CLEMENT, and GROUP ONE, INC. dba KELLER WILLIAMS REALTY

IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

JOHN LINDBERG, an individual; MICHAL LINDBERG, an individual; and JUDITH L. ) LINDBERG, an individual,

Plaintiffs,
v.

HARRY RICHARD REYNOLDS, an individual; DEANN REYNOLDS, an () individual; J.E. JOHNS \& ASSOCIATES, a ) Nevada business entity; JAMES E. JOHNS, an) individual; A.J. JOHNSON, an individual; ) BRIAN F. KINCANNON, an individual; ) GROUP ONE, INC. dba KELLER WILLIAMS REALTY, a Nevada corporation; ) ROBERT CLEMENT, an individual; and DOES 3 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.
BRIAN F. KINCANNON, ROBERT
CLEMENT, and GROUP ONE, INC. dba KELLER WILLIAMS REALTY,

Cross-Claimants,
v.

CASE NO. CV15-00281
DEPT. NO.: 3

DEFENDANTS BRIAN F. KINCANNON, ROBERT CLEMENT, AND GROUP ONE, INC. dba KELLER WILLIAMS REALTY'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT AND CROSS-CLAIM

HARRY RICHARD REYNOLDS, DEANN ) REYNOLDS, J.E. JOHNS \& ASSOCIATES, ) JAMES E. JOHNS, and A.J. JOHNSON, and ) MOES 1 - 10, inclusive,

Cross-Defendants. $\qquad$

COMES NOW, Defendants BRIAN F. KINCANNON ("Kincannon"), ROBERT CLEMENT ("Clement"), and GROUP ONE, INC. dba KELLER WILLIAMS REALTY ("Keller Williams Realty") (collectively referred to herein as "Defendants") in the above-captioned action, by and through its attorneys of record of the law firm of Meyers McConnell Reisz Siderman, and for its Answer to Plaintiffs JOHN LINDBERG, MICHAEL LINDBERG, and JUDITH L.

LINDBERG's (referred to herein as "Plaintiffs") Second Amended Complaint (the "SAC") on file herein, admits, denies and alleges as follows:

## GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

1. Answering Paragraphs $1,2,3,4,5$, and 6 of the SAC, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein.
2. Answering Paragraph 7 of the SAC, Defendants admit the allegations.
3. Answering Paragraph 8 of the SAC , Defendants admit the allegations.
4. Answering Paragraph 9 of the SAC, Defendants admit the allegations.
5. Answering Paragraph 10 of the SAC, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.
6. Answering Paragraph 11 of the SAC, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.

## FACTS

7. In response to Paragraph 12 of the SAC , Defendants repeat and incorporate herein by reference their responses to the paragraphs alleged in Plaintiffs' SAC to the same extent Plaintiffs incorporate their allegations in the preceding paragraphs of the SAC into Paragraph 12.
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8. Answering Paragraph 13 of the SAC, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.
9. Answering Paragraph 14 of the SAC, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.
10. Answering Paragraph 15 of the SAC, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.
11. Answering Paragraph 16 of the SAC, Defendants admit that Kincannon was the real estate agent for John Lindberg and Michal Lindberg and engaged in negotiations for the purchase of the subject property on their behalf. Defendants deny the remainder of Paragraph 16.
12. Answering Paragraph 17 of the SAC, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.
13. Answering Paragraph 18 of the SAC, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.
14. Answering Paragraph 19 of the SAC, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.
15. Answering Paragraph 20 of the SAC, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.
16. Answering Paragraph 21 of the SAC, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.
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17. Answering Paragraph 22 of the SAC, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.
18. Answering Paragraph 23 of the SAC, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.
19. Answering Paragraph 24 of the SAC, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.
20. Answering Paragraph 25 of the SAC, to the extent this Paragraph is directed at Defendants, the allegations are denied. As to the remainder of Paragraph 25, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.
21. Answering Paragraph 26 of the SAC , to the extent this Paragraph is directed at Defendants, the allegations are denied. As to the remainder of Paragraph 26, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.
22. Answering Paragraph 27 of the SAC , to the extent this Paragraph is directed at Defendants, the allegations are denied. As to the remainder of Paragraph 27, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.
23. Answering Paragraph 28 of the SAC, to the extent this Paragraph is directed at Defendants, the allegations are denied. As to the remainder of Paragraph 28, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.
24. Answering Paragraph 29 of the SAC, to the extent this Paragraph is directed at Defendants, the allegations are denied. As to the remainder of Paragraph 29, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or
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falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.

## FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Action Pursuant to NRS 113.150 - Defendant Sellers)
25. In response to Paragraph 30 of the SAC, Defendants repeat and incorporate herein by reference their responses to the paragraphs alleged in Plaintiffs' SAC to the same extent Plaintiffs incorporate their allegations in the preceding paragraphs of the SAC into Paragraph 30.
26. Answering Paragraph 31 of the SAC, Defendants state that no allegations contained in Paragraph 31 are directed toward Defendants and therefore no response by Defendants is required. If a response is required, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.
27. Answering Paragraph 32 of the SAC, Defendants state that no allegations contained in Paragraph 32 are directed toward Defendants and therefore no response by Defendants is required. If a response is required, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.

## SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION (Negligence - Defendant Sellers)

28. In response to Paragraph 33 of the SAC, Defendants repeat and incorporate herein by reference their responses to the paragraphs alleged in Plaintiffs' SAC to the same extent Plaintiffs incorporate their allegations in the preceding paragraphs of the SAC into Paragraph 33.
29. Answering Paragraph 34 of the SAC, Defendants state that no allegations contained in Paragraph 34 are directed toward Defendants and therefore no response by Defendants is required. If a response is required, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.
30. Answering Paragraph 35 of the SAC, Defendants state that no allegations contained in Paragraph 35 are directed toward Defendants and therefore no response by Defendants is
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required. If a response is required, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.
31. Answering Paragraph 36 of the SAC, Defendants state that no allegations contained in Paragraph 36 are directed toward Defendants and therefore no response by Defendants is required. If a response is required, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.

## THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Fraud - Defendant Sellers)
32. In response to Paragraph 37 of the SAC, Defendants repeat and incorporate herein by reference their responses to the paragraphs alleged in Plaintiffs' SAC to the same extent Plaintiffs incorporate their allegations in the preceding paragraphs of the SAC into Paragraph 37.
33. Answering Paragraph 38 of the SAC, Defendants state that no allegations contained in Paragraph 38 are directed toward Defendants and therefore no response by Defendants is required. If a response is required, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.
34. Answering Paragraph 39 of the SAC, Defendants state that no allegations contained in Paragraph 39 are directed toward Defendants and therefore no response by Defendants is required. If a response is required, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.
35. Answering Paragraph 40 of the SAC, Defendants state that no allegations contained in Paragraph 40 are directed toward Defendants and therefore no response by Defendants is required. If a response is required, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.
36. Answering Paragraph 41 of the SAC, Defendants state that no allegations contained in Paragraph 41 are directed toward Defendants and therefore no response by Defendants is required. If a response is required, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.
37. Answering Paragraph 42 of the SAC, Defendants state that no allegations contained in Paragraph 42 are directed toward Defendants and therefore no response by Defendants is required. If a response is required, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.
38. Answering Paragraph 43 of the SAC, Defendants state that no allegations contained in Paragraph 43 are directed toward Defendants and therefore no response by Defendants is required. If a response is required, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.

## FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Action Pursuant to NRS 645.252 and NRS 645.257 Defendants Johns, Johnson, Clement, and Kincannon)
39. In response to Paragraph 44 of the SAC, Defendants repeat and incorporate herein by reference their responses to the paragraphs alleged in Plaintiffs' SAC to the same extent Plaintiffs incorporate their allegations in the preceding paragraphs of the SAC into Paragraph 44.
40. Answering Paragraph 45 of the SAC, Defendants deny the allegations.
41. Answering Paragraph 46 of the SAC, Defendants deny the allegations.
42. Answering Paragraph 47 of the SAC, Defendants deny the allegations.
43. Answering Paragraph 48 of the SAC, Defendants deny the allegations.

## FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Action Pursuant to NRS 645.252, NAC 645.600, and NRS 645.257 Defendants Johns and Clement)
44. In response to Paragraph 49 of the SAC , Defendants repeat and incorporate herein by
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reference their responses to the paragraphs alleged in Plaintiffs' SAC to the same extent Plaintiffs incorporate their allegations in the preceding paragraphs of the SAC into Paragraph 49.
45. Answering Paragraph 50 of the SAC , Defendants deny the allegations.
46. Answering Paragraph 51 of the SAC, Defendants deny the allegations.
47. Answering Paragraph 52 of the SAC, Defendants deny the allegations.
48. Answering Paragraph 53 of the SAC, Defendants deny the allegations.
49. Answering Paragraph 54 of the SAC, Defendants state that no allegations contained in Paragraph 54 are directed toward Defendants and therefore no response by Defendants is required. If a response is required, Defendants state that they do not have sufficient knowledge or information upon which to base a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained therein and therefore deny on that basis.
50. Answering the payer of the SAC, Defendants state that the allegations contain legal conclusions, which require no response. Defendants deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any relief whatsoever under any cause of action against Defendants and each of them.

## AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

## FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Defendants are informed, believe, and thereupon allege that the SAC filed by Plaintiffs fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against these answering Defendants.

## SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims are barred by the statute of limitations and/or repose, including each and every applicable statute of limitations, including but not limited to NRS $\$ \$ 11.010$ through 11.500, as applicable.

## THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs, though under a duty to do so, have failed and neglected to mitigate their alleged damages and therefore cannot recover against these answering Defendants, whether as alleged or otherwise.
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## FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The negligence, misconduct, and/or of Plaintiffs exceed that of these answering Defendants, if any, and Plaintiffs are thereby barred from any recovery against these answering Defendants.

## FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The claims of Plaintiffs are barred by the equitable doctrines of estoppel, waiver, laches, and/or unclean hands.

## SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The damages Plaintiffs allegedly sustained, if any, were caused by the negligent acts, errors, and/or omissions of third-parties over which these answering Defendants have no authority or control.

## SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

These answering Defendants have complied with all applicable laws, regulations, ordinances, and codes.

## EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

These answering Defendants performed all professional services and/or work in a professional manner and met or exceeded the standard of care at the time that services and/or work was performed.

## NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs expressly, voluntarily, and knowingly assumed all risks about which they complain in their SAC and therefore are barred either totally or to the extent of said assumption from any damages.

## TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

If Plaintiffs suffered or sustained any loss, injury, damage, or detriment, the same was directly and proximately caused or contributed to by Plaintiffs' conduct, acts, omissions, activities, carelessness, recklessness, negligence, and/or intentional misconduct, thereby completely or partially barring Plaintiffs' recovery herein.

## ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

These answering Defendants deny any legal responsibility, in any manner, for the damages and injuries claimed by Plaintiffs in the SAC; however, if Defendants are subjected to any liability to Plaintiffs, it will be due, in whole or in part, to the conduct, acts, omissions, activities, carelessness, recklessness, and/or negligence of others. Accordingly, any recovery obtained by Plaintiffs against these answering Defendants should be reduced in proportion to the respective negligence, fault, and legal responsibility of all other parties, persons, and entities, their agents, servants, and employees who contributed to and/or caused the injury or damages, in accordance with the law of comparative negligence. The liability of these answering Defendants, if any, is limited in direct proportion to the percentage of fault actually attributed to these answering Defendants.

## TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Defendants allege that Plaintiffs' unreasonable delay in the filing of the SAC and the notifying of these answering Defendants of the alleged defects at the subject property, and the basis for the causes of action alleged against these answering Defendants, has unduly and severely prejudiced these answering Defendants in its defense of these action, thereby barring or diminishing Plaintiffs' recovery herein under the doctrine of stoppels.

## THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

These answering Defendants allege that Plaintiffs have failed to join all necessary and indispensable parties to this lawsuit.

## FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

These answering Defendants allege that Plaintiffs, or other persons or entities other than Defendants, without the knowledge or consent of Defendants, altered the subject property, and to the extent that Plaintiffs have incurred or suffered any damages, which Defendants deny, such alleged damages were solely and proximately caused by such alteration.

## FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

These answering Defendants have retained the services of an attorney to defend this action and therefore are entitled to a reasonable sum for attorneys' fees together with the costs expended in
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this action.

## SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

These answering Defendants allege that the loss and damages, if any, which Plaintiffs allege were directly and proximately caused and/or contributed to by the negligence, carelessness or fault of Plaintiffs and, therefore, these answering Defendants are entitled to contribution apportioned to the percentage of negligence attributable to Plaintiffs.

## SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

These answering Defendants allege that the damages and injuries, if any, incurred by Plaintiffs, are not attributable to any act, conduct, or omission on the part of these answering Defendants.

## EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The damages sustained by Plaintiffs, if any, were proximately caused by the acts, omissions, negligence, fraud, and/or breach of obligations by persons other than these answering Defendants, including that of Plaintiffs, and beyond these answering Defendants' supervision and control.

## NINTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

These answering Defendants are informed and believe and thereupon allege that any claims or remedies alleged by the Plaintiffs have been waived in whole or in part.

## TWENTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

To the extent that any communications were made to Plaintiffs by these answering Defendants, such communications were truthful and accurate, to the best of these answering Defendants' knowledge.

## TWENTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

These answering Defendants deny that they made any misrepresentations; however, if it is found that these answering Defendants did so, any such misrepresentations were not material and/or relied upon.

## TWENTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

These answering Defendants did not interfere, whether intentionally or negligently, with any contractual obligation to any party in this matter.

## TWENTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

These answering Defendants are informed and believe, and thereon allege that Plaintiffs' damages, if any, were proximately caused by the intentional acts of persons or entities other than these answering Defendants that were not reasonably foreseeable. As a result, those reasonably unforeseeable intentional acts of others constitute a superseding, intervening act that operate to break the chain of causation of any negligent acts or omissions attributable to these answering Defendants, thereby relieving these answering Defendants of any liability to Plaintiffs.

## TWENTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

These answering Defendants have appropriately, completely, and fully performed and discharged any and all obligations and legal duties arising out of the matters alleged in the SAC.

## TWENTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

These answering Defendants are informed and believe, and on such information and belief allege, that these answering Defendants did not make any warranties or guaranties, expressed, implied, or apparent, upon which Plaintiffs may rely.

## TWENTY-SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

These answering Defendants hereby incorporate by reference those affirmative defenses enumerated in Rule 11 of the Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure as fully set forth herein. In the event further investigation or discovery reveals the applicability of any such defenses, Defendants reserve the right to seek leave of court to amend its answer to specifically assert the same. These Defendants preserve such other affirmative defenses that may become available to them by this Answer and do not waive any such or subsequent defenses. Such defenses are herein incorporated by reference for the specific purpose of not waiving same.

## PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Defendants pray for judgment as follows:
A. That Plaintiffs take nothing by virtue of their SAC herein;
B. For costs of suit; and
C. For such other and further relief as these Court deems just and proper.

## A.J. JOHNSON

Defendants/Cross-Claimants BRIAN F. KINCANNON ("Kincannon"), ROBERT CLEMENT ("Clement"), and GROUP ONE, INC. dba KELLER WILLIAMS REALTY ("Keller Williams Realty") (collectively referred to herein as "Cross-Claimants"), by and through their attorneys of record of the law firm of Meyers McConnell Reisz Siderman, as and for their CrossClaim against Defendants/Cross-Defendants HARRY RICHARD REYNOLDS, DEANN REYNOLDS, J.E. JOHNS \& ASSOCIATES, JAMES E. JOHNS, and A.J. JOHNSON ("CrossDefendants") alleges as follows:

1. At all times relevant hereto, Keller Williams Realty was a Nevada domestic corporation.
2. At all times relevant hereto, Kincannon was an individual and resident of Washoe County, Nevada, and a Nevada real estate salesperson associated with Keller Williams Realty.
3. At all times relevant hereto, Clement was an individual and resident of Minden County, Nevada, and a Nevada real estate broker associated with Keller Williams Realty.
4. On information and belief, at all times relevant hereto, Cross-Defendants HARRY RICHARD REYNOLDS and DEANN REYNOLDS (collectively "Reynolds") were individuals and residents of Washoe County, Nevada.
5. On information and belief, at all times relevant hereto, Cross-Defendant J.E. JOHNS \& ASSOCIATES ("J.E. Johns \& Associates") was a Nevada business entity of unknown time, doing business in Washoe County, Nevada.
6. On information and belief, at all times relevant hereto, Cross-Defendant JAMES E. JOHNS ("Johns") was an individual and resident of Washoe County and a Nevada licensed real estate broker associated with J.E. Johns \& Associates.
7. On information and belief, at all times relevant hereto, Cross-Defendant A.J. Johnson ("Johnson") was an individual and resident of Washoe County and a Nevada licensed real estate salesperson associated with J.E. Johns \& Associates
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8. MOES 1 through 10 are fictitious names of Cross-Defendants, whether individuals, corporations, partnerships, or other business entities, whose names and capacities are not presently known to Cross-Claimants, and when said true names and capacities are ascertained, CrossClaimants will seek leave of this Cross-Claim to allege their true names and capacities when and as ascertained, and will further ask leave to join said Cross-Defendants in these proceedings. MOES 1 through 10 are are either fully or partly responsible for Plaintiffs' injuries and damages, if any, and, as such, would owe indemnity to Cross-Claimants. As more particularly alleged in Plaintiffs' SAC, and any amendments thereto, these fictitiously named Cross-Defendants are alleged to have negligently, fraudulently, carelessly, and/or recklessly engaged in some manner, or been involved, in the real estate transaction that is the subject of this action.

## GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

9. On May 18, 2016, Plaintiffs filed a Second Amended Complaint in the County of Washoe, Nevada District Court, Case No. CV15-00281 against Cross-Claimants and CrossDefendants. Said SAC is incorporated herein by reference for purposes of this Cross-Claim; however, Cross-Claimants do not adopt as true or correct any of the allegations of the SAC.
10. Plaintiffs alleged in the SAC that, in approximately September 2012, CrossDefendants offered their residential real property for sale, which property was located at 20957 Eaton Road, Pleasant Valley, Nevada 89521, and further described as Parcel 2 of parcel Map No. 292 for John and Marie Brown, according to the map thereof, filed in the office of the County Recorder of Washoe County, State of Nevada, on July 27, 1976; (APN \#045-337-11) (the "Property").
11. Plaintiffs alleged in the SAC that J.E. Johns \& Associates, Johns, and Johnson listed the Property for sale under MLS \# 120014058, stating that the Property's "Total Living Space" was 3,880 square feet and included an "INLAW QUARTERS OR GUEST HOUSE."
12. Plaintiffs alleged in the SAC that the Reynolds affirmatively represented to them in the "Sellers Real Property Disclosure Form," and in other representations, that a detached two-story building at the Property could be used for residential living and a separate garage with an attached converted bonus room, could also be used for residential living or as a garage, and that both
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structures were constructed, modified, altered, or repaired with required permits.
13. Plaintiffs alleged in the SAC that, after they purchased the Property, they discovered that the (i) the detached two-story building was not permitted for residential occupancy and (ii) the separate garage with a converted a bonus room was not permitted for residential occupancy or even for use as a garage. Plaintiffs alleged in the SAC that the square footage of living space was falsely overrepresented in as 3,880 square feet.
14. Plaintiffs' alleged injuries and damages, if any, have arisen out of misrepresentations, nondisclosures, acts, or omissions by Cross-Defendants, and not from any act, error, or omission of Cross-Claimants. Cross-Claimants have denied, and deny, any responsibility for Plaintiffs' alleged damages.
15. Cross-Claimants have incurred and are incurring attorneys' fees, court costs, investigative costs, and other costs in connection with defending against the SAC, the exact amount of which is unknown at this time.

## FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

## (Equitable Indemnity - All Cross-Defendants)

16. Cross-Claimants repeat and reallege Paragraphs $1-15$ of the Cross-Claim as though fully set forth herein.
17. Cross-Claimants allege that they are in no way legally responsible for the injuries or damages alleged by Plaintiffs in this action. If Cross-Claimants are held to be liable for all or any part of Plaintiffs' injuries and/or damages, as presently alleged in the SAC, such liability is solely due to the conduct of Cross-Defendants as herein alleged. Cross-Claimants are entitled to be fully indemnified and held harmless by Cross-Defendants should Cross-Claimants be so found liable.
18. If Cross-Claimants are held liable to Plaintiffs for their alleged injuries and/or damages, such liability of Cross-Claimants are secondary and passive whereas the liability of CrossDefendants are primary and active and/or the direct and proximate result of their active and primary conduct.
19. It has been necessary for Cross-Claimants to defend against Plaintiffs' action. CrossClaimants are entitled to recover from Cross-Defendants their attorneys' fees and costs incurred in
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defense of Plaintiffs' action.

## SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

## (Express Indemnity - Cross-Defendants Reynolds)

20. Cross-Claimants repeat and reallege Paragraphs 1-19 of the Cross-Claim as though fully set forth herein.
21. Cross-Claimants allege that a contract or agreement exists between Cross-Claimants and Cross-Defendants Reynolds wherein Cross-Defendants Reynolds agree to defend and indemnify Cross-Claimants from any claim, demand, action, or proceeding resulting from any omission or alleged omission by Cross-Defendants Reynolds in their representations about the Property. Cross-Claimants previously tendered the defense of Plaintiffs' claims to CrossDefendants Reynolds, which Cross-Defendants Reynolds rejected.
22. If Cross-Claimants are held liable to Plaintiffs for all or any part of their alleged injuries and/or damages, then Cross-Claimants are entitled to full indemnity from CrossDefendants Reynolds pursuant to the express terms of the contract or agreement.
23. By reason of the express terms of the contract or agreement between CrossClaimants and Cross-Defendants Reynolds, Cross-Claimants are entitled to indemnity from CrossDefendants for all costs, attorney's fees, expenses, settlements, and/or judgments paid and incurred by Cross-Claimants in connection with Plaintiffs' action.

## THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Contribution and Apportionment - All Cross-Defendants)
24. Cross-Claimants repeat and reallege Paragraph 1-23 of the Cross-Claim as though fully set forth herein.
25. Cross-Claimants allege that they are in no way legally responsible for the injuries or damages alleged by Plaintiffs in this action. If Cross-Claimants are held to be liable for all or any part of Plaintiffs' injuries and/or damages, as presently alleged in the SAC, then Cross-Claimants are entitled to contribution from Cross-Defendants in an amount proportionate to the negligence and/or fault attributable to Cross-Defendants.
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26. It has been necessary for Cross-Claimants to defend against Plaintiffs' action. CrossClaimants are entitled to reimbursement from Cross-Defendants to the extent of their proportionate share of liability.

WHEREFORE, Cross-Claimants pray for relief as follows:

1. That Cross-Defendants be required to fully indemnify Cross-Claimants for any and all amounts found to be due and owing;
2. That Cross-Defendants be required to contribute to the payment of any and all amounts adjudged by this Court to be due and owing to Plaintiffs herein;
3. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and
4. For such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

## AFFIRMATION

Pursuant to NRS 239B.030, the undersigned affirms that this document does not contain the social security number of any person.

DATED: this 28th day of July, 2016.

## MEYERS MCCONNELL REISZ SIDERMAN

By:


Lori E. Siderman, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 007515
S. Seth Kershaw, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 10639
11620 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 800
Los Angeles, CA 90025
1745 Village Center Circle
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
Attorneys for Defendants and Cross-Claimants
BRIAN F. KINCANNON and GROUP ONE,
INC. dba KELLER WILLIAMS REALTY

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of Meyers, McConnell Reisz and Siderman and that on the 29th day of July, 2016, I caused the service of the foregoing to be served as follows:
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to the attorney(s) listed below at the address and/or facsimile number indicated below:

John D. Moore, Esq.
MOORE LAW GROUP, PC
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Attorney for Plaintiffs JOHN LINDBERG,
MICHAEL L. LINDBERG, and JUDITH L.
LINDBERG
Reno, Nevada 89509
Tel: (775) 336-1600
Fax: (775) 336-1601
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C. Nicholas Pereos, Esq.
C. NICHOLAS PEREOS, LTD.
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Tel: (775) 329-0678
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John D. Moore, Esq.
Nevada State Bar No. 8581
MOORE LAW GROUP, PC
3715 Lakeside Drive, Suite A
Reno, NV 89509
(775) 336-1600

Attorney for Plaintiffs
john@moore-lawgroup.com
IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

JOHN LINDBERG, an individual; MICHAL LINDBERG, an individual; and JUDITH L. LINDBERG, an individual,

> Plaintiffs,
v.

HARRY RICHARD REYNOLDS, an individual; DEANN REYNOLDS, an individual; J.E. JOHNS \& ASSOCIATES, a Nevada business entity; JAMES E. JOHNS, an individual; A.J. JOHNSON, an individual; BRIAN F. KINCANNON, an individual; GROUP ONE, INC., a Nevada corporation dba Keller Williams Realty; ROBERT CLEMENT, an individual; and DOES 3 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

## MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 2 TO EXCLUDE THE

 OFFER OF EVIDENCE OR ARGUMENT RELATED
## TO SETTLEMENTS REACHED WITH OTHER DEFENDANTS

Plaintiffs, John Lindberg, Michal Lindberg, and Judith L. Lindberg, ("Plaintiffs") hereby file this Motion in Limine No. 2 to Exclude the Offer of Evidence or Argument Related to Settlements Reached with Other Defendants. ("Motion"). In recent filings with this Court, including in the answer
that James E. Johns ${ }^{1}$ and A.J. Johnson ${ }^{2}$ filed to Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint in this matter on January 10, 2018, these Defendants have asserted that "Plaintiffs have resolved its [sic] claim with regard to the remaining Defendants and these Defendants is [sic] entitled to a credit therefore." Answer to Second Amended Complaint at Second Affirmative Defense, attached hereto as Exhibit 1. Defendants also claim in their Fourth Affirmative Defense that "Plaintiffs received compensation for the losses alleged to have been sustained in the purchase of the property and the claim has been satisfied." Id. In these affirmative defenses, these Defendants appear to be attempting to apply principles of contribution in an effort to create a credit for settlements already reached with other defendants that are no longer parties to this dispute. The Court should not allow Defendants to present evidence or argument of these other settlements with other defendants because such evidence or argument is not admissible to prove or disprove liability under NRS 48.105, Defendants have no right of contribution under a plain reading of NRS 17.255 , the disclosure of such evidence is irrelevant, and the disclosure of such evidence or argument, if relevant, would be overly prejudicial to Plaintiffs. For these various reasons, the Court should exclude evidence or argument of any settlements reached with any other defendants in this dispute.

## MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

## I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs filed a complaint on February 10, 2015 to vindicate their rights arising from the sale of property to Plaintiffs that took place on or about February 28, 2013. These claims arise under NRS 113.150 against the sellers of the property, Harry Richard Reynolds and Deann Reynolds, for their
$1 \quad$ Unfortunately, James E. Johns died on February 10, 2016. Mr. Johns' death was the subject of a suggestion of death on the record in or about March of 2016 and a motion to substitute party filed in or about April of 2016. The motion to substitute party was not opposed and in June of 2016, A.J. Johnson was substitute into this matter as the representative of the deceased James E. Johns.

2 JE Johns \& Associates has not yet answered Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint and Plaintiffs are seeking to understand this entity's position on this issue. Plaintiffs expect either an answer from this Defendant soon or Plamtiffs will file a default against this Defendant prior to trial.
failure to disclose various issues with the property in violation of NRS 113.130. Plaintiffs also asserted claims of negligent and fraudulent misrepresentation against the sellers. Plaintiffs' claims also arise under NRS 645.251, et seq., against the seller's realty agent and broker, A.J. Johnson, James E. Johns, and J.E. Johns \& Associates and against the buyer's realty agent and broker, Brian Kincannon, Robert Clement, and Group One, Inc., dba Keller Williams Realty for their failure to disclose information that they knew or that they should have known and because these realtor defendants did not act with reasonable skill and care in this transaction, which constitute statutory violations of NRS 645.252, NAC 645.600, and NRS 645.257.

For purposes of informing the Court only, the sellers and the buyers' realty agent and broker have resolved all claims Plaintiffs raised against them. The only remaining defendants in this case are the sellers' realty agents and broker, A.J. Johnson, James E. Johns and J.E. Johns \& Associates ("Defendants"). The claims against these remaining Defendants are statutory in nature, there are no joint tortfeasors, there is no alleged injury to person or property associated with these claims, there is no single injury alleged under any of the applicable statutes, and there is no right of contribution existing in favor of these Defendants. As such, these Defendants cannot lawfully point the finger at any other defendant to this case and cannot reduce their liability by any settlement reached with any other defendant.

Approximately one year after purchasing the property in question, John Lindberg discovered that two structures found on the property were not constructed with building permits, which is a fact Plaintiffs allege was known to the sellers of the property at the time of the sale. Accordingly, Plaintiffs sued the sellers under NRS 113.150 for their failure to disclose in a Seller's Real Property Disclosure form the fact that two of the buildings on the property were not permitted. Plaintiffs also sued the sellers for negligent and fraudulent misrepresentation. Plaintiffs also sued the remaining Defendants in this matter asserting that these Defendants knew or should have known that the septic system and well at the property were undersized, that the listing of the property as a single family residence was improper, and that the listing of the property as having 3,880 square feet was made in error, even
though the remaining Defendants knew the size of the combined living space found at the property and the remaining Defendants knew or should have known that the septic system and well were inadequate. Plaintiffs alleged that Defendants violated NRS 645.252, NAC 645.600 and NRS 645.257 because of these many failures. The remaining Defendants are not subject to the common law, as set forth under NRS 645.251, and their liability is based in statute.

If Plaintiffs proved their claims against the sellers of the property, their damages would be based in statute under NRS 113.150(4) in that Plaintiffs would be entitled to "recover from the seller treble the amount necessary to repair or replace the defective part of the property, together with court costs and reasonable attorney's fees." These damages are specific to the seller of real property and the seller's agent is not responsible to pay these damages arising from a seller's failure to disclose, unless the agent knew of the failure to disclose. If Plaintiffs prove their claims against the Defendants in this case, then liability and damages are established by a different statute, NRS 645.257. Under that statute, the Plaintiffs would be entitled to recover damages that are the "proximate result of a licensee's failure to perform any duties required by $\operatorname{NRS} 645.252,645.253$, or 645.254 , or the regulations adopted to carry out these sections. . ." and these damages would be limited to the "actual damages" suffered by the Plaintiffs.

Under these two separate statutes, the seller's liability and damages that may be assessed against the seller are not the same as those that may be assessed against the Defendants in this case, meaning that there is no single injury that would entitle the Defendants to contribution in this case. There is also not a right to contribution in this case because the injury is not to the Plaintiffs' person or property. The liability of the seller (for possible treble damages) and the liability of the Defendants (for actual damages) are statutory in nature. Because the damages that Plaintiffs may recover from each group of defendants in this case are different and are based in different statutes, there is no joint and several liability of two or more joint tortfeasors from which a single injury to person or property has been sustained, meaning that there is no right of contribution in favor of the Defendants against any other defendant in this dispute. NRS 17.225. Without such a right of contribution, the Defendants
cannot offset any amounts paid in settlement by any other defendant who paid to settle statutory claims that include statutory damages payable by that defendant only.

## II. LEGAL ARGUMENT

## a. There is no Right of Contribution that favors these Defendants.

Defendants' affirmative defenses outlining that they believe they are entitled to a credit for settlements from defendants who have resolved their statutory liability already in this case represents a fundamental misunderstanding of the right of contribution in Nevada. For a party to be entitled to contribution to offset a settlement from another defendant in any case, it must be shown that "two or more persons [became] jointly or severally liable in tort for the same injury to person or property or for the same wrongful death. .." NRS 17.225. Absent from this case are any allegations that any party to this dispute is a joint tortfeasor, as the claims are statutorily based and are unique to each defendant, or that there has been a single injury to person or to property resulting from any defendants' violation of the specific statutes referenced in this matter. There simply is no right of contribution between the Defendants and any defendant that has settled its statutory liability to the Plaintiffs. In their second and fourth affirmative defenses, these Defendants do not suggest any other way they would be entitled to a credit for a settlement between the Plaintiffs and any other defendant. There simply is not a right to a credit under the circumstances in this case. Accordingly, evidence of these settlements should not be introduced at trial.

## b. Evidence of a Settlement of Any Kind is inadmissible to Disprove or to Prove Liability.

In accordance with NRS 48.105, "[e]vidence of. . . furnishing. . . or accepting a valuable consideration in compromising. . . a claim which was disputed as to either validity or amount, is not admissible to prove liability for or invalidity of the claim or its amount." (Emphasis added). The Defendants here are seeking to offer evidence of settlements with other defendants to this matter to offset their own liability, and thereby disprove that they are liable for Plaintiffs' damages. The introduction of evidence of a settlement to disprove the Defendants' liability is impermissible. The Court should not allow the Defendants to offer any evidence of settlement at any stage of this case or
to argue that the Defendants' liability is somehow offset or credited with any amounts arising from settlements from other defendants. Such evidence and argument would be improper.
c. Evidence of Settlements reached by Other Defendants in this Case is Irrelevant.

Under NRS 48.015, "relevant evidence" is defined as "evidence having any tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action more or less probable than it would be without the evidence." Under NRS 48.025, "relevant evidence" is admissible at trial while irrelevant evidence is inadmissible. In this case, evidence of a settlement of statutory claims that created a unique set of statutory damages against a singular defendant prove nothing regarding the claims raised against these Defendants. The claims raised against the Defendants are based solely upon what these Defendants knew or should have known or whether these Defendants exercised reasonable care under the provisions of NRS 645.252. A settlement with a defendant seller of property whose liability is premised on NRS 113.150 proves nothing of consequence in the separate statutory claims raised against these Defendants. There simply is no relevance supporting the admission of evidence or argument related to any of the settlements reached with any other defendants in this matter. Accordingly, the Court should exclude such evidence at trial.
d. The Danger of Undue Prejudice outweighs any Probative Value found in the Admission of Evidence or Argument related to Settlements with other Defendants.

Plaintiffs can see only three reasons to submit evidence or argument related to settlements reached with other defendants in this case, which include; (1) to unfairly prejudice the Plaintiffs; (2) to confuse the issues; and (3) to mislead the jury. As such, evidence or argument related to settlements reached with other defendants in this case should be inadmissible under NRS 48.035, because the probative value of such evidence is outweighed by the three concerns associated with this evidence. Evidence of a settlement with the Plaintiffs would unfairly prejudice the Plaintiffs because the jury may determine that the Plaintiffs have received enough money because of these settlements, which is not a proper basis to deny Plaintiffs' claims if Defendants violated NRS 645.252. The introduction of
this evidence would confuse the issues, in that the jury might believe that they must determine if the Plaintiffs are entitled to any additional damages other than what they have received through settlements, which is also not a proper basis for denying liability. Finally, the jury would be misled by the introduction of evidence of settlements with other Defendants because the presentation of this evidence serves no purposes but to make it appear as though Plaintiffs have been made whole, when the damages that arise from Defendants' violations of NRS 645.252 are unique to these Defendants and arise solely from their misdeeds and not from the misdeed of any other Defendant. Accordingly, even if relevant (which it is not), evidence of settlements with other Defendants in this matter should be excluded as overly prejudicial, confusing, and misleading.

## III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated herein, the Court should not allow the introduction at trial of evidence or argument that Defendants' liability may be credited or offset by any settlements reached with other defendants in this matter. Evidence of such settlements also should not be introduced at trial.

## AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NRS 239B. 030

The undersigned attorney does hereby affirm that the preceding document does not contain the social security number of any persons

DATED this ith $^{\text {day }}$ of February, 2018.
MOORE LAW GROUP, PC


## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of Moore Law Group, PC, and that on February 9, 2018, I caused the foregoing document to be served on all parties to this action by: placing an original or true copy thereof in a sealed, postage prepaid, envelope in the United States mail at Reno, Nevada.
_ personal delivery

- facsimile (fax)
- Federal Express/UPS or other overnight delivery
__ Reno/Carson Messenger Service
XX E-service via flex filing system
to the following:
C. Nicholas Pereos

1610 Meadow Wood Lane, Suite 202
Reno, NV 89502


An Employee of Moore Law Group, PC
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## EXHIBIT 1

CODE: 1140
C. NICHOLAS PEREOS, ESQ.

Nevada Bar \#0000013
1610 MEADOW WOOD LANE, STE. 202
RENO, NV 89502
(775) 329-0678

ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANTS
J. E. JOHNS \& ASSOCIATES
\& A. J. JOHNSON

IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

JOHN LINDBERG, MICHAL LINDBERG, JUDITH L. LINDBERG

Plaintiffs,
vs.
HARRY RICHARD REYNOLDS, DEANN REYNOLDS, J. E. JOHNS \& ASSOCIATES, A. J. JOHNSON, KEN AMUNDSON, BRIAN F. KINCANNON

Defendants.

Case No. CV15-00281
Dept. No. 3

## ANSWER TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT

Defendants, James E. Johns and A.J. Johnson answering the Second Amended Complaint, admits, denies and avers as follows:

## THE PARTIES

I
Defendants answering the "Parties" allegations of the Second Amended Complaint on file herein admits, denies and avers as follows:

1. Admit that Reynolds were residents of Washoe County, Nevada. Admit that James E. Johns was a resident of Washoe County, Nevada. These Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the
averments contained in paragraphs $2,4,7$ through 11, inclusive to the Second Amended Complaint.

## FACTS

।
Defendants answering the "Facts" of the Second Amended Complaint on file herein admits, denies and avers as follows:

1. Adopt by reference and make a part hereof each and all the admissions, denials contained hereinabove.
2. Admit that J.E. Johns \& Associates listed the property for sale on behalf of the sellers. Deny each, and every and other averments contained in paragraphs 14, 17, 18, 20 through 29 , inclusive.

## FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Answering the "First Cause of Action" of the Second Amended Complaint, these Defendants admits, denies and avers as follows:

1. Insofar as said first cause of action is not applicable to these Defendants, Defendants denies the same.

## SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

I
Answering the "Second Cause of Action" of the Second Amended Complaint, these Defendants admits, denies and avers as follows:

1. Insofar as the second cause of action is not applicable to these Defendants, these Defendants denies the same.

## THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

।
Answering the "Third Cause of Action" of the Second Amended Complaint, these Defendants admits, denies and avers as follows:

1. Insofar as this third cause of action is not applicable to these Defendants, these Defendants denies the same.

## FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

।
Answering the "Fourth Cause of Action" of the Second Amended Complaint, these Defendants admits, denies and avers as follows:

1. Adopt by reference and make a part hereof each and all the admissions, denials contained hereinabove.
2. Deny each, and every and all of the averments contained in paragraphs 46 through 48 of the fourth cause of action.

## FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

## 1

Answering the "Fifth Cause of Action" of the Second Amended Complaint, these Defendants admits, denies and avers as follows:

1. Adopt by reference and make a part hereof each and all the admissions, denials contained hereinabove.
2. Deny each, and every and all of the averments contained in paragraphs 50 through 54, inclusive of the fifth cause of action.

## FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Defendant James E. Johns is now deceased and this Court lacks jurisdiction.

## SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs have resolved its claim with regard to the remaining Defendants and these Defendants is entitled to a credit therefore.

## THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs were provided reports indicating problems with regard to the subject property and proceeded to close the escrow and assumed the risks by reason of the same.

## FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs received compensation for the losses alleged to have been sustained in the purchase of the property and the claim has been satisfied.

## FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs has waived any rights to collect for issues as to these Defendants by reason of the notice of deficiencies.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
Said complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

## SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

At all times herein mentioned, Plaintiffs negligently and carelessly conducted themselves in and about the matters averred in said complaint which said negligence and carelessness attributed to any and all lawsuits allegedly to be sustained by them.

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
Plaintiffs engaged independent contractors and consultants and relied on the materials provided to them.

## NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The duties owed to the Plaintiffs to adequately investigate and counsel the Plaintiffs were not by these Defendants.

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
The claims of the complaint are barred by justification.
ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
The claims of the complaint are barred by unjust enrichment.
TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
The claims of the complaint are barred by failure to act in a commercially reasonable manner.

## THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The claims of the complaint are barred by lack of consideration.

## FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The claims of the complaint are barred in whole or in part by waiver acquiescence and/or estoppel.

FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
The claims of the complaint are barred by unclean hands and bad faith.

## SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Recession is the remedy available to the Plaintiff.

Wherefore, these Defendants pray that Plaintiffs take nothing from said Complaint and that these Defendants have judgment against Plaintiffs for costs of suit and reasonable attorneys fees.

## AFFIRMATION

The undersigned affirms that the foregoing pleading does not contain a social security number.

DATED this $17^{\text {th }}$ day of IANUAKY, 2018 C. NICHOLAS PEREOS, LTD.


## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY ELECTRONIC FILING

PURSUANT TO NEVADA RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 5 (b), I certify that I am an employee of C. NICHOLAS PEREOS, LTD., and that on the date listed below, I caused to be served a true copy of the foregoing pleading on all parties to this action by electronically filing the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF system which served the following parties electronically:

John D. Moore, Esq.
MOORE LAW GROUP, PC 3715 Lakeside Drive, Suite A Reno, NV 89509




| 1 | * I N D E X * |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | WITNESSES: | DIRECT | CROSS | REDIRECT | RECROSS |
| 4 | For the Plaintiff: |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | JOHN LINDBERG | 15 | 68 | 79 | -- |
| 6 | AMINA JOHNSON JOHNS | 80 | 142 | 147 | - - |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | For the Defendant: |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | -- |  |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sharp Reporting Services 775-530-7477 |  |  |  |  | RA 0282 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

MONDAY, AUGUST 20TH, 2018; RENO, NEVADA - ○O○-

THE COURT: Good morning. Be seated please. This is CV15-00281, entitled John Lindberg versus Harry Reynolds, et al.

This particular case involves Johns, Johnson.
And would you state your appearances please?
MR. MOORE: John Moore on behalf of the plaintiffs.

MR. HALL: Glade Hall on behalf of the remaining defendants, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Counsel, Mr. Moore, your motion for sanctions, $I$ just saw that ten minutes ago. Okay. I'm not about to rule. And he has time to file a response to it.

MR. MOORE: I understand, your Honor.
THE COURT: You may begin.
MR. MOORE: Okay. Great. Your Honor, this case is a perfect example of why in Nevada consumers who are purchasing real property rely on realtors and why they hire realty agents.

It is also a perfect example as to why there are statutes that are enacted by the Nevada legislature to govern the practice of realtors and to outline what
they must do, things that they must disclose, things that they must acknowledge, things of that nature.

Those statutes are established and they
create in Nevada on the parts of realtors to act with reasonable care, to act in cases where they will disclose information that is known to them or that should have been known to them and where they also will act reasonably with regards to all parties to the transaction.

This case is different from an
attorney/client relationship where the attorney owes certain duties to the court, the attorney owes certain duties to the opposing parties and the attorneys also owe duties to their client.

In this case, realtors owed duties to
everybody in the transaction. Whereas in an attorney/client privilege situation they may only owe --

THE COURT: Counsel, it sounds like you are arguing your position.

MR. MOORE: I'm going forward with an opening statement. Do you want me to limit my argument, your Honor?

THE COURT: Well, argue at the end, not before. Just tell me what you are going to prove.

MR. MOORE: Here in this case we are going to establish and present evidence that in this situation the remaining defendants that are here in this case knew or should have known the exact square footage of the property that was sold. The evidence will also show that the remaining defendants were aware of the square footage because prior to listing the property for sale, the owners in this case obtained an appraisal. The appraisal outlines many things, including the square footage of the property.

The square footage of the living space found here as shown in these documents will demonstrate that the square footage is 3,640 square feet. But the listing was in two instances for 3,880 square feet.

The original listing in September of 2012 has that as a square footage for living space. And the second real estate --

THE COURT: When you say has 'that,' that refers to which figure?

MR. MOORE: 3,880, the larger amount. And then in December of 2012 there was a second listing that showed 3,880 square feet, which was incorrect. This appraisal was in the possession of the remaining defendants as shown by various documents including the
appraisal itself, including a listing input form prepared by one of the remaining defendants in this case, as well as an e-mail where this appraisal is referenced during the negotiations between the parties.

So under the relevant statutes we will show that the square footage was known to the remaining defendants.

The second issue relates to an septic system at the property. During the sales transaction the evidence will show that my client had certain questions related to the septic system. And it will be shown through documents and other items that the disclosures that were related to the septic system were improper.

Under what will be shown, it will show that the disclosure of 15 -- the 15,000-gallon tank was done in error.

And it will also be shown that the actual size of the septic system is only a thousand gallons. And after my clients purchased this property when they became aware of this issue, they had an obligation put upon them by Washoe County that they had to enlarge the septic system so that it would comply with the applicable codes that were in place related to the septic system.

So my clients will testify and John Lindberg
will testify about the specifics of this transaction; that he did have questions; that prior to the purchase he was not aware of the precise square footage.

He did not know that it was improperly
listed. He'll testify that when he first went to Washoe County to try to move some electrical up to a barn or shack on the upper part of the property a year after he purchased the property, that Washoe County said, "Hey, wait a minute. The barn you are proposing to take that electrical to is not permanent. The mother-in-law quarters where your mother is now living was not permitted, and we need you to take steps to make this right."

Initially the worry was that they might have to tear all this down; that washoe county might not allow that to happen, those unpermitted portions of the property to remain in place.

And so my clients went through that process.
They retained somebody who would help them, who would help them put together what they needed to do to make these two unpermitted pieces of property permitted and legal according to Washoe County.

And they had to pay certain amounts of money.
They had to pay to enlarge the septic system
approximately $\$ 27,000$. They had to pay some additional money to make the electrical system up to code, which are amounts that we are not going to be looking to recover in this case.

They also were required to go through and get boundary line surveys and get architectural plans and other items that were required by washoe county before they would allow them to enlarge the septic system. They also purchased a piece of property thinking it was much larger than it actually was, to the tune of approximately 240 square feet.

And so with all this evidence, your Honor, coming back to why we hire realtors, we'll demonstrate that in this case the realtors here just messed up. It is that simple.

And we are looking for an opportunity to
present what we believe are the facts of this case and to -- we thank you for your time here today, your Honor.

THE COURT: Did you sue the owners -- or the sellers rather?

MR. MOORE: Yes.
THE COURT: And what happened with that?
MR. MOORE: The case was resolved.
THE COURT: For how much?

MR. MOORE: That's something you would like to know? \$50,000.

THE COURT: Because you are saying that your clients suffered $X$ amount of dollars in damages.

MR. MOORE: Correct.
THE COURT: And you are not saying that they are responsible for it 100 percent jointly and severally.

MR. MOORE: We argued and $I$ think this court has ruled that there are different claims that have been raised here and there isn't joint and several liability.

THE COURT: Some of them are.
MR. MOORE: What we have presented is -against the seller NRS 130 requires that the seller disclose certain things.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. MOORE: And if they don't they can be responsible for triple damages.

THE COURT: That's separately to the sellers.
MR. MOORE: Exactly. And we settled those claims against that seller for $\$ 50,000$.

The claims raised against --
THE COURT: So you are saying the $\$ 15,000$ or 15 plus is part of the $\$ 100,000$ that you are saying they are damaged?

MR. MOORE: No, we believe that, if we had pursued our claims against the sellers all the way to conclusion, because it cost more than the $\$ 27,000$ to fix all the problems out there. It cost closer to $\$ 40,000$. So our claims against the seller would have been $\$ 120,000$ under statute plus the cost to fix, $\$ 160,000$.

So, your Honor, we have settled those claims with the seller. But those claims in and of themselves aren't related to the failure to disclose under a different statute. NRS 645 has different requirements.

And under that statute the realtor is
responsible for the costs associated with repairs that are occasioned by a failure to disclose by the realtor.

THE COURT: So, in a nutshell, I'm sure you will get into this. If $I$ want to sell a house and $I$ tell the realtor it is 4,000 square feet, the realtor is responsible under our law to measure it and make sure it is 4,000 square feet?

MR. MOORE: That's not my argument. My argument is, if the realtor knows that it's not 4,000 square feet, which the evidence in this case will show, they have to disclose that it is not. So, if the realtor knows it is not 4,000 square feet, regardless of what their client has told them, they have an obligation
under the statute to disclose that.
THE COURT: All right. And as far as the septic system, they don't have an obligation to dig it up and test it?

MR. MOORE: No. We are not going to argue that. What we'll present through an expert witness is that under the facts of this case, you know the size of the lot. You know that there are three buildings on the lot. You know that there are significant additions that have been made to this property.

Those are all red flags that should have led the realtor to know that the septic system is only a thousand gallon tank and was not appropriate. We are not saying that they had to dig anything up. We are saying all the evidence that was presented that was known to this realtor should have led this realtor to also know that the septic system was not appropriate in size.

THE COURT: But your clients had property before this property that had a septic on it.

MR. MOORE: Correct.
THE COURT: Isn't a 15,000 gallon tank, that's a pretty big tank.

MR. MOORE: It is very big. And, your Honor, we didn't only sue the seller's realtor or in this case
we also brought claims against my client's realtor for the same issues. The documents presented to both realtors in this case should have led to a much different result. That's why we brought a claim against our own realtor. And we resolved that claim with our own realtor.

THE COURT: For how much?
MR. MOORE: \$7,500.
THE COURT: All right.
MR. MOORE: And our realtor certainly,
certainly should have seen some red flags in the documents that were disclosed to her and should have -that's getting back to the beginning of my opening, that is why we bring in realtors. That is why we hire them. We hire them for a reason: To help us out, to get us through all the minutia. And they owe us obligations. They have to disclose things. And, if they fail to do so, they are responsible for the damages associated with it.

One of the elements of damages that we'll seek to prove in this case, your Honor, is that -- the price we paid for the house was about $\$ 99$ a square foot.

Under existing law we are entitled to an abatement because we didn't buy that big of a house.

That's not the responsibility of our realtor. That's the responsibility of the seller's realtor to pay that amount. So, your Honor, we are here today, we are seeking to present our case and will do so as expeditiously as possible. And, if you have any other questions, let me know.

THE COURT: Well, that abatement amount is $\$ 22,760$.

MR. MOORE: \$23,000.
THE COURT: And you recognize that's against
the seller?
MR. MOORE: No. The agent. The agent.
THE COURT: All right.
Mr. Hall.
MR. HALL: My answer, your Honor, very quick and simple. During the course of this escrow all of the issues that are now raised by the plaintiff were raised, dealt with in some manner and waived at close of escrow. There is an ambiguous waiver. If you know it is there, what do you want to do about it? You can demand that it be fixed or you can walk. Those are the alternatives that the buyer has.

And in each of the alleged disclosures of misinformation, they were remedied. The square foot of
the septic was known. The square foot of each of the structures was known.

THE COURT: Before closing?
MR. HALL: Before close of escrow. That's our case, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Moore, call your first witness.

MR. MOORE: Your Honor, I would like to exercise the exclusionary rule. Also I would like to know who we have in the audience because $I$ don't -- I don't recognize anybody as being a part of the case.

THE COURT: Are there any witnesses out there? I see -- all right. Do you have any witnesses, Mr. Hall?

MR. HALL: Not that $I$ know of. Just family and friends and a realtor.

MR. MOORE: No problem. Your Honor, we call John Lindberg.

- ○○○-

JOHN LINDBERG
produced as a witness on behalf of the Plaintiff, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

## DIRECT EXAMINATION:

BY MR. MOORE:
Q Good morning, John. Could you please state your full name and spell your last name for the record?

A John Charles Lindberg. Last name is $L-i-n-d-b-e-r-g$.

Q Mr. Lindberg, why are you here today?
A To recoup some of the damage I incurred by buying this property.

Q Getting to when you purchased the property, why were you in 2012, late 2012, looking to purchase another piece of property?

A We wanted a bigger place.
Q What were some of the things you were looking for?

A A place that had a mother-in-law quarter where we could bring my mom and put her up. A place big enough to put horses.

Q Why were those important to you?
A The place that we lived at before was a triplex. We lived in one unit, two bedrooms each, two-and-a-half bedrooms. My mom lived on the end. I rented out the middle one. And it was just really small and we wanted to bring mom along with us to help take
care of her.
Q And where were you looking to buy property?
A In the Washoe Valley area.
Q This property in particular when did you first become aware that it was for sale?

A My wife saw it online sometime in October of 2012.

Q And what steps did you take after seeing it online to look at the property?

A We looked at several different properties. Drove by that one, decided we liked it. Just the way it looked. And got a hold of a business acquaintance Brian Kincannon to help us purchase the property.

Q And after you contacted Mr. Kincannon, did you retain him?

A We did.
Q And what steps did you take -- before hiring Mr. Kincannon, had you been by the property at all?

A Yeah. Like I said, we drove by it. Got the little flier thing out of the box.

Q What about the property attracted you to it?
A The landscaping, the yard, the mother-in-law quarters, the area in back where we could keep our horses and the size.

Q And then you retained your realtor. What steps did you take after retaining Mr. Kincannon to move towards potentially purchasing the property?

A He took us in the house to look at it. We went and looked at it. The owners weren't there. He had a key for the lockbox on the front door. We looked at it and kind of decided that we would like to move forward with it.

Q And what steps did you take after you decided that you would like to move forward with it?

A We just went forward with the buying process and had Kincannon get a hold of their realtor. We did a second walkthrough. Just $I$ guess the normal stuff where you make an offer and a counteroffer and that type of thing.

Q We'll walk through all that as we're going. But I just want to get the basics right now out. And what we will next do is start looking at some of the exhibits. Are these the exhibits for the witness? THE CLERK: Yes.

MR. MOORE: May I approach the witness, your
Honor?
THE COURT: You may.
MR. MOORE: And, Mr. Lindberg, would you go

```
ahead and turn to Exhibit 1? Mr. Lindberg, do you
recognize Exhibit One?
    A Yes.
    Q What is it?
    A It is a disclosure form.
    Q On the last page of Exhibit One is it signed
```

by you?

A Yes.

Q And, Mr. Lindberg, when do you recall first seeing this document?

A I guess it was in February, January, February when we were going through the buying process.

Q Would it have been at the time approximately when you signed the document?

A Yeah, there was quite a lot of stuff to look at.

Q And that date is February 28th, 2013?

A That sounds right, yes.
Q In this disclosure is there anything of concern to you that was disclosed?

A No.
Q Was there anything disclosed to you about any discrepancies in the septic?

A No.

Q Was there anything disclosed to you in this form that some of the work was not permitted?

A $\quad$ No.
Q Was there anything disclosed in this form that perhaps the property listing incorrectly identified the square foot of the property?

A No.
Q Anything in this form that caused you to raise your eyebrows in any way at the time you were buying the house?

A No.
Q During this process did you receive any documents that caused you to question the listed size of the square footage of the house?

A No.
Q During this process did you receive any documents that caused you to question the size of the septic?

A I had some questions. I got an e-mail that said that there was a 15,000-gallon septic.

Q And we'll look at that e-mail as we are going
along. Anything else that was disclosed to you in this form or any other documents that you saw and that you reviewed that caused you to question any of the
information that had been disclosed to you?
A No.
Q Can you look at Exhibit 2, the next in order?
THE COURT: Do you want that in?
MR. MOORE: We would seek to move in the exhibit.

THE COURT: Admitted.
BY MR. MOORE:
Q Perhaps should we just now --
Do we want to ask now, are there any
objections to any of our exhibits?
MR. HALL: Not that $I$ am currently aware of.
MR. MOORE: Should I just go through the process then with each exhibit, your Honor?

THE COURT: Well, if he is not going to object, just start using them.

MR. MOORE: And if he does object --
THE COURT: If it comes along, we'll take it.
MR. MOORE: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: Good.
BY MR. MOORE:
Q Can you turn over to Exhibit 2, John?
A I'm here.

Q John, do you recognize this document?

A I do.

Q What is it?

A I believe it is a listing, an MLS listing.

Q Did you see this document before closing?
A I don't recall. I think I did. Yeah. It was on the website $I$ believe.

Q Let's go ahead while we're on this exhibit. Can you go ahead and turn to Exhibit 6?

A Okay.
Q John, do you recognize Exhibit 6?

A Yes.

Q Do you see your signature -- or your initials?

A Yes.

Q Is this a listing similar to Exhibit 2 but in

```
a different form?
```

A Yes.

Q Is this a document that you saw during this transaction?

A Yes.

Q And you initialled it; is that correct?

A Right. Yes.

Q Looking at Exhibit 2 and Exhibit 6, do you see any material discrepancies between these two

```
exhibits?
```

A No.
Q They look the same but just a different form; is that right?

A It is a different format.
Q We will rely more on Exhibit 6, because that's the one that you have actually seen. You are at Exhibit 6 now?

A Yes.

Q Do you see there listed on Exhibit 6 the total square foot -- total living space of 3880 square feet?

A I do.

Q Do you see that the source of that is from the assessor?

A Yes.
Q Do you also see the acreage as 1.12 acres?
A That's correct, yes.

Q Do you also see that it is listed that it is a single family residential structure?

A Yes.
Q Do you see that Jim Johns is listed as the realtor?

A I do.

Q And looking at this document during the closing process did you rely on this document?

A Yes.

Q And did you believe that the items listed here were correctly listed?

A I did.
Q Go ahead and turn to Exhibit 3. Actually let's start with Exhibit 4.

Do you recognize Exhibit 4?
A I do.
Q What is it?
A That's an offer, counteroffer.
Q So is this the offer that you and your wife and your mother made to purchase the property?

A It is.
Q Is it signed by you on the last page of that exhibit marked at the bottom KW 15?

A It is.

Q And how much did you offer to buy the house for?

A We offered -- they wanted four. We counter offered for 375 .

Q So you made an initial offer for 375 ?
A Yes.

Q After you made this initial offer was there ever a counteroffer made?

A Yes, they came back at 385.
Q Looking at Exhibit 3, do you recognize that document?

A Yes, I do.
Q And is that -- what is that document?
A That's I believe their counteroffer.
Q And for how much is the counteroffer?
A 385.
Q During the negotiations did you become aware from your realtor as to why a counteroffer was made?

A Yeah.
MR. HALL: Hearsay, your Honor.
MR. MOORE: Not offered for the truth of the matter asserted.

THE COURT: Overruled.
BY MR. MOORE:
Q You can go ahead.
THE COURT: You are asking him what the other people thought?

MR. MOORE: If he ever became aware during the process of why a counteroffer was made. And I'm not offering it for the truth of the matter asserted.

THE COURT: Okay.
THE WITNESS: Yes. I'm aware they came back at 385.

BY MR. MOORE:

Q And did your realtor ever explain to you why that was?

A I think they wanted to get as close to the appraised value as they could get.

Q And during that process, as things were going along, was the appraised value shared with you?

A Yes.
Q And did you notice that the appraised value came in higher than the counteroffer?

A I did.
Q And so after knowing the appraised value what steps did you take --

THE COURT: Excuse me, counsel. When you say were you familiar with the appraised value, is that just a number or did they see the appraisal?

MR. MOORE: It is a number and we are not sure if the appraisal was ever shared with our realtor.

THE COURT: Ask him.
BY MR. MOORE:
Q Do you know if the appraisal in this case was
ever shared with your realtor?
A I don't know at what point it was, no, I don't know.

Q But at some point you became aware that the appraised value was at $\$ 400,000$ ?

A Yeah. I think he is the one that gave me the appraisal when we were at his office during the offers and counteroffers.

Q Did you look at the appraisal in any way to determine the square footage of the property?

A I just looked at the value.
Q Did you look at it to determine if there was anything irregular about the property?

A I glanced through it. But I'm not an expert on any of that stuff.

Q So you saw the price. And what steps did you take after that?

A We made the offer for 375. And then they came back at 385.

Q And what did you do in response to this counteroffer?

A We decided to go ahead and get the property.
Q So looking at Exhibit 3, did you sign this document?

A No, not this one.
Q Exhibit 3.
A Exhibit 3. Yes, I did.
Q You signed it on January 4th, 2013?
A Yes.
Q And your wife also signed it on that date?
A That's correct.
Q After accepting this, what steps did you then take to purchase the property?

A We went about getting the loan and coming up with a down payment. Just decided to move on with buying the property.

Q And when do you recall closing on the property?

A I think it was about, oh, a month or so, month-and-a-half later. I think February.

Q And what issues were reviewed during the closing process?

A There was no issues reviewed during the closing process.

Q Did you have any inspections done on the property?

A We did.
Q What inspections did you have?

A The owner paid for them. But it was septic, well, bug inspection. Home inspector guy.

Q Did any of these documents that you reviewed during this process, did any of them alert you to the true size of the property?

A No.

Q Did your realtor ever discuss any of these documents with you to indicate to you that there might be an issue with the listed size of the property?

A No.

Q I won't go through these inspections. They are -- we would move to have them admitted as exhibits 8 and $7--7,8$ and 9. And $I$ may go with any others. I just want to make sure since we are not going to go through, them if there are any objections.

MR. HALL: One moment, please. No objection to -- that was 7, 8 and 9?

THE COURT: Yes. 7, 8, 9.
MR. HALL: No objection.

BY MR. MOORE:

Q And you mentioned during this process, Mr. Lindberg --

THE COURT: Admitted.

BY MR. MOORE:
Q -- that you raised some questions about the septic?

A Right.
Q Do you recall what those questions were?
A I asked how big the septic tank was. How big
the leach line was.
Q Why did you raise those concerns?
A At the triplex where $I$ was living currently $I$ have two 1,000-gallon tanks and about 85 feet of leach line.

It is about $\$ 700$ per thousand gallon tank, something like that, to pump them. So I was trying to figure out maintenance costs in my head. Also at the triplex $I$ had not a whole lot of trees, but enough where I had to have the -- they got into the leach line, the roots, so $I$ had to have it cleaned out.

So I was just concerned with this property, kind of just wanted to know where the leach line was. There is a ton more trees, probably 40 more trees, that could have affected it. So $I$ was just thinking, trying to figure out what it would cost me down the road.

Q And when did you request information about that? It was during the process of trying to buy the
home?
A Yes.
Q And what do you recall the responses being to your question?

A They came back and said there was a 15,000 gallon septic tank and $I$ think 70 feet of leach ine or something like that.

Q And did that cause you any concerns seeing something that large?

A Yeah. Well, you know, I thought to myself, "Well, Geez, it is going to cost $\$ 7,000$ to pump the tank."

Q And what did you learn -- did you learn during this process that the tank wasn't that large?

A I did.
Q When did you learn that?
A I got an e-mail response from my realtor that came from the listing agent.

Q Did anybody in this process say to you that -- well, the size of this tank may cause a concern?

A No.
Q Did anyone inform you that the tank might be inappropriately sized for a structure that had two living quarters on it, two separate living buildings?

A No.
THE COURT: Excuse me, counsel. You are talking about misrepresentation as to size and then you are talking about an inappropriate, insufficient size for the property.

MR. MOORE: Right.
THE COURT: Exhibit 9 is an invoice from Waters and it shows a thousand gallons.

MR. MOORE: Correct.
THE COURT: And it is signed by your client.
MR. MOORE: Yes.
THE COURT: So he was aware before close of escrow that it was only a thousand gallons.

MR. MOORE: That's not our claim here, your Honor. Our claim is that with all of this information available to realtors, both of the realtors in this case, there should have been red flags raised to them and they should have realized and should have known during the process that this septic system wasn't appropriate.

This has all been disclosed certainly. But the last step is they should have known that this septic wasn't appropriate for this property.

THE COURT: It is listed as a single family
residence, right?

MR. MOORE: But it has multiple structures on it.

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead. MR. MOORE: Okay.

Q When did you move into the property after you purchased it?

A It was in February sometime or March, beginning of March.

Q After you moved in was there a time when you discovered that there were issues related to the mother-in-law's quarters?

A Yeah.
THE COURT: Excuse me. I just thought of something.

MR. MOORE: Yes.
THE COURT: If he was told that there was a 15,000-gallon tank and this report shows that there was a thousand gallon tank and he is concerned about a 15, 000-gallon leach line and the pumping expense, now he finds out that there is a thousand gallons, didn't he ask questions?

BY MR. MOORE:
Q Did you determine through this process that it was a thousand gallons?

A Yes. This inspection came in probably 3 or 4 weeks after I asked the e-mail question. And I got the e-mail question back that it was 15,000 and I said, "Holy cow. That's really big. Are you sure"? And then $I$ got another e-mail response saying that, no, they were incorrect with that.

Q Right. So you weren't necessarily concerned in the difference between 15,000 and the 1,000 ; is that right?

A Other than the fact of paying $\$ 7,000$ to empty one versus \$700.

THE COURT: But you got the report?
THE WITNESS: After $I$ got the e-mail
information.
THE COURT: But before close of escrow?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. MOORE: So at this time he is not concerned that it will cost a lot of money to clean it out. But he has no idea that it's not appropriate for the size.

THE WITNESS: To serve the mother-in-law
quarters.
BY MR. MOORE:
Q During this process before you moved into the
house, did you have any concerns about the size of the septic?

A No.
Q When did you first learn that the size of the septic might be inappropriate for this property?

A Well, about a year after $I$ moved in, $I$ went to -- they had some -- not very well done electricity run up to the barn, storage shed, whatever you want to call it up above. So I pulled an electrical permit to upgrade the electricity to do it right with a panel. And then $I$ was informed by the county that neither that structure nor the mother-in-law quarters was permitted.

Q How did you find out that it wasn't permitted? Was that someone at the county?

A Yes.
Q What did you do when you learned that it hadn't been permitted?

A I called a friend of mine, a general contractor friend of mine, and asked him for help.

Q Who did you call?
A Ron Cohen.
Q Why did you call Ron?
A I have known him for 20 years and he is a general contractor and knows how to deal with the county
and building things and permits.
Q What kind of assistance were you looking for when you hired Ron?

A Just all the logistical technical. I didn't know how to begin or start the process to fix the situation.

Q Had you ever in the past had to go to the county and try to retroactively obtain a permit?

A No.
Q And what about the process was concerning to you?

A It was just all a little overwhelming. I didn't really know where to begin or what to do.

Q What did you think when you first heard from the county that you had buildings on your property that weren't permitted?

A I thought they were going to red tag my mom's house and throw her out and make me tear down the upper building.

Q Was that ever something that was of concern to you that they might actually not approve this construction?

A Absolutely.
Q So go ahead and turn to Exhibit 10, if you
would.
Actually let's start with Exhibit 11. Mother-in-law quarters, do you recognize Exhibit 11?

A I do.

Q What is it?
A It is an invoice from Ron at Building
Tectonics.
Q What was the purpose of this invoice?
A To let me know the cost that I might be incurring to correct this.

Q And what did Ron believe might be the cost that you might incur to correct issues at the property?

A He said it could be anywhere from $\$ 50,000$ to $\$ 150,000$ depending if they made me tear the one building down.

Q Now, looking at this invoice from Building Tectonics what were some of the things that he was proposing to do? Was he proposing to do any construction for you?

A That only came up if they were going to make us tear down the upper house or the shed, barn.

Q So what is he disclosing here? Is he disclosing the cost to you that might be incurred just to get through the process of getting permits?

A Yes.

Q And what was the price that he thought it might cost to do just that?

A I think that would be around $\$ 50,000$.

Q What was your response to that?
A I was stunned. Worried.

Q Looking at Exhibit 10, what did they tell you at the county about the shop on the upper part of the property?

A They said it was built illegally and was never permitted.

Q And what did you ask Ron to do in regards to the shop?

A Give me a cost for removal and replacement.

Q And what is Exhibit 10?

A Just exactly that. A cost for the demo and a cost to put up new construction.

Q When you saw this, what were your thoughts?

A I was a little overwhelmed. That's a lot of money.

Q Ultimately what happened with the shop?
A The county ended up letting us keep it. They issued us an electrical permit once $I$ met all the requirements for the electrical permit.

Q So --
A They signed off on it.
Q Was Exhibit 10 a worst case scenario if the county says, "We are not going to let this go through"?

A Yes.
THE COURT: Counsel, 11 is an invoice. But
that's not really an invoice, from what $I$ heard.
MR. MOORE: It is an estimate.
THE COURT: An estimate. And then the $\$ 80,000$
or the $\$ 90,000$ from Exhibit 10 .
MR. MOORE: Didn't end up happening.
THE COURT: That didn't happen either.
MR. MOORE: We are painting the worse case scenario here and the thoughts going through my client's mind.

THE COURT: But we don't compensate for that.
MR. MOORE: I get it, your Honor. I just want a clear picture of everything that happened.

THE COURT: All right.
BY MR. MOORE:
Q After obtaining the worst case scenario from Ron, what steps did you then take to get this unpermitted -- these unpermitted structures permitted?

A We started going through the process with the
county, got a hold of them and found out what they needed us to do.

Q And what was required of you to get an appropriate permit?

A I had to hire an architect, make drawings. I had to hire a survey company to come out and do boundaries, map the septic tank, my well, the neighbor's well, the neighbor's boundary lines.

I had to pay the closed out permits for my mom's house. The mother-in-law quarters was originally permitted as a garage.

And the people took it upon themselves to just drop the permit process back in the 90's and turn it into a mother-in-law quarters. So $I$ had to pay all the past late fees and all of that stuff from them not closing out the permit.

Q Did you have to fill out any forms?
A Yeah. Quite a lot of them.
Q Did you have to attend any hearings?
A I did.
Q Did you have to follow the instructions of
Washoe County?
A I did. We had to get a septic guy on board and make drawings for our new septic system and get that
approved through Health and Safety at the county.
Q Go ahead and look at Exhibit 12. What is Exhibit 12?

A It is an e-mail from Ron telling me that $I$ needed to pay $\$ 934$.

Q What was that for?
A A permit.
Q And looking at Exhibit 13, did you pay that permit?

A I did.
Q What is Exhibit 13?
A It is a credit card receipt.
Q And why was that required?
A So that the county would review our request.
Q Could you turn all the way to Exhibit 42?
Exhibit 42, do you recognize that?
A I do.
Q What is it?
A It is the permit.
Q Is that an application that you filled out to get this property properly permitted?

A An application for the permit, yes.
Q And what did you have to disclose to the county that you were going to do in this permit?

A Trying to get the mother-in-law quarters up to code and in par with what the county wanted?

Q And what requirements did they make of you? Did they require that you enlarge the septic system?

A They did. They required that we bring it up to electrical code, fire and safety code. They required that we abandon the downstairs living area and only use it for storage. They required a survey, water testing to make sure that the well wasn't contaminated.

Lots of fees, architects, things of that nature.

Q Let's go ahead and look at Exhibit 14 as well. And, John, what's Exhibit 14?

A It is an application for a variance.

Q What is the variance related to?

A Allowing the mother-in-law quarters to exist.
Q The variance, was it related to increasing the size of the septic?

A Yes.

Q Do you see at the top of Exhibit 14 it says
\$934?

A $\quad$ I do.

Q Is that the $\$ 934$ that was paid that is shown in Exhibit 13?

A Yes, I believe it was. There was a lot of fees associated with the whole process. But, yes, that's what that one was for.

Q Looking at Exhibit 15, the next exhibit, what is Exhibit 15?

A That is from Tri-State Survey.
Q And what did Tri-State Surveying do for you so you could obtain a variance related to the septic and related to the mother-in-law quarters?

A They mapped out my well location, all the neighbor's wells, the property lines, boundaries for setbacks and certain distances for leach lines to other people's wells.

Q Why did they do that?
A Because there was a health and safety concern that, if $I$ enlarged the septic tank, it might ruin someone else's well.

Q Why was this survey a requirement?
A It was one of the things the county wanted. Health and Safety wanted to move forward with the approval of the variance.

Q And what was the total amount of the surveyed amount that you -- that you paid to the surveyor?

A I don't recall. I just recall being angry
about it. I thought it was about $\$ 5,000$ total.
Q And if you add up the totals here, it adds up to about $\$ 4,500$. Would you agree with that?

A Yeah.

Q And did you pay that amount?
A I did.
Q Next in order, Exhibit 16, do you see Exhibit 16?

A I do.

Q What is it?
A It is invoices from the architectural firm.
Q And why was an architect brought in?
A To make drawings of the existing barn, shed, the mother-in-law quarters. And eventually we had to do a -- I don't remember if it was him that did it. We had to basically do a topography of the property to show the hills and all the trees and everything else for the county.

Q Did they also indicate the location of the septic and the proposed new septic system?

A They did.
Q And why did you have to bring an architect into this?

A It was required by the county to have

```
drawings for review.
    Q And what was the total paid to this architect
to prepare these drawings as required by the county?
    A I want to say it was about $5,000 or $6,000.
    Q And did you pay those amounts?
    A I did.
    Q Does Exhibit 16 show that those amounts were
paid?
A Yes.
Q Looking at Exhibit 17, what's Exhibit 17?
A It is a receipt from the county.
Q And what is it related to?
A The permitting.
Q Do you see at the top the applicant is Harry and Deann Reynold? Do you know why that's listed as such?
```

A Because the mother-in-law quarters that was permitted as a garage was pulled by them. And I believe these fees are what $I$ paid from reopening it in 2014 back to the 90's or whenever he abandon the process.

Q That's the first page of Exhibit 17. Exhibit 18, what is that?

A That's the permit.
Q The second page, LIND 0019 is Exhibit 17.

A Yes.

Q What does that show?
A Payment.

Q Is that your mother's signature?

A It is.

Q And is that to pay the $\$ 1,830$ to reopen an old permit?

A Yes, it is.

Q Look at the next page of Exhibit 17. It is marked $\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{D} 002$ at the bottom. Do you see that?

A I do.

Q This shows an additional -- what was this document that we are looking at?

A It is a receipt.

Q What is it for?

A More of the permitting fees and plan check and things to do with the county.

Q Looking at the next page -- what does that show. The LIND 0021?

A A receipt for those fees paid.

Q And those amounts were paid?

A They were.
Q Could you turn to Exhibit 18 ? What is

Exhibit 18?

A It looks like a building permit.
Q And it is -- do you see in the middle permit description where it outlines trip permit for brought floors to attempt to final out expired permits 94-175996-3555?

A $\quad$ I do.
Q Were these two permits -- are those the
closed ones that you talked about earlier?
A I believe so. I think so. I don't remember exactly which permit was for what.

Q And they outline in here a fee of $\$ 90$ is that correct?

A That is right.
Q Could you turn to Exhibit 21? What is Exhibit 21?

A A receipt.
Q For the $\$ 90$ ?

A Yes.

Q For this permit we are showing in 18?
A That's correct.

Q Looking at Exhibit 20, do you see Exhibit 20?
A I do.

Q Do you recognize it? What is it?
A It is something from the county about
corrections with reference to the permitting process.
Q And what are they noting as corrections here in this document?

A That it wasn't -- it was supposed to be for a detached garage, not a two-story accessory dwelling.

Q And it says there at the bottom, "Need to apply for proper permits for this conversion." Do you see that?

A Right.
Q Look at Exhibit 22. Do you recognize that exhibit?

A I do.
Q What is it?

A It is more fees for the county.
Q And here they indicate that there has been a $\$ 1,200$ payment made and there is a balance due of \$5,095.77 on this permit.

Was that balance paid?
A Yes.
Q And for the work description on this document what is being indicated would be done for this?

A We are going to convert the existing storage building into a mother-in-law quarters.

Q And they also indicate that the size will be

```
reduced to 934 square feet?
```

A Right.
Q Looking at Exhibit 24, would you turn to that exhibit?

THE COURT: Was the balance paid on that?
THE WITNESS: Yes. On the permitting, yes.
THE COURT: What exhibit is the receipt
showing -- the receipts are all in evidence?
MR. MOORE: I don't know if we have one. I'll be honest about that one. I don't know if we have one. If we do, we'll get to it for sure. I don't know that there is a receipt.

THE WITNESS: I'm sure we have one somewhere. They are not going to let you walk out of there without paying.

BY MR. MOORE:
Q Looking at Exhibit 24, do you recognize that?
A I do.

Q What is it?
A That's a permit request.
Q Is that the original permit for the property?
A It is.
Q And in the permit description in the middle of the first page of Exhibit 24, what does it say the
permit is for?

A It is for a garage and storage.

Q Go ahead and look at Exhibit 25. Do you recognize this item?

A Yes. It is a permit application request from the Reynoldes.

Q Are you on Exhibit 25?
A I believe I am. Yes.

Q Do you notice in there they notice a
violation. Do you see towards the bottom?

A I do.

Q Was this something that you received a notice of a violation when you were first attempting to run electrical up to the shop?

A I didn't get this violation, no.

Q But when you ran it up to try to run
electrical --

A Yes.

Q -- what did the county do? How did they inform you that there was a problem?

A Well, my general contractor, Ron, did the research. The county had lost all of their records, paper records, for whatever reason. And Ronnie found them. I don't know how. Microfilm or something. I have
no idea. But he found all of these old permits, corrections from Sawyer, the guy that Reynolds brought it from, assumed some of the permits in the middle of this construction and never followed through with them.

Q Do you see on this document on 25 in the middle where it talks about, "August 18th, 2015. Inspector complaint appears to have never had been investigated. Submittal receipt for panel and separate meter at building. Unable to issue until complaint is addressed."

How did the county inform you that there was a problem when you first were trying to get electrical to the building?

A That's right. Somebody a couple of doors down had complained that he was doing illegal construction that wasn't permitted. And I guess the county went out and issued a violation against him. And he never responded to that, stemming from the fact that he never closed out the permits in the 09's or whatever.

Q What did the county tell you about this issue? I think we have already covered it.

A That these structures were illegal.
Q Looking at the second page Lindberg 0042 down at the bottom, were you also informed by the county that
there were potential issues with zoning in allowing for a structure of this size at the property?

A $\quad$ I was told by them.

Q And what did they say?

A They said that when it was built you would have had to go in front of the Board of Commissioners for a variance. That they don't allow -- or they didn't at that time -- mother-in-law quarters without specific approval and it can only be half the size of your main residence.

Q Did it also indicate here on this page that you can only have one accessory building?

A Yes, it does.

Q At the property how many accessory buildings are there?

A There are three.

Q And in this case the property was listed as -- how was it listed? Was it listed as multi?

A Single family residence, dwelling, whatever you call it.

Q Looking at the next Exhibit, Exhibit 25, would you look at that?

A We are on Exhibit 25.

Q Sorry. 26. Do you recognize Exhibit 26?

A Yes.

Q What is that?

A That is a permit that was pulled by sawyer.

Q In 1992?

A Yes.

Q Looking at Exhibit 27 -- do you see anywhere on this, Exhibit 26, anything that indicates that there will be a conversion of any property into residential?

A $\quad \mathrm{No}$.

Q 27. If you could look at 27? What's? Exhibit 27?

A 27 is for what is now the mother-in-law quarters permit.

Q Looking at it, it indicates in the middle a 600-square-foot shop. Do you know what this is for?

A I believe it was for the house that eventually became my mom's home.

Q And do you see anything in there indicating that it will be residential?

A $\quad$ No.

Q Turn to Exhibit 29. What's Exhibit 29?

A Another receipt from the county.

Q And what's that related to?

A That is for the road impact fee.

Q What did the county require related to the road impact fee?

A I had to buy these credits from developers in order to $I$ guess give them the money for the extra traffic on the road for a mother-in-law quarters.

Q And what did you do in response to this document?

A Bought the credits from a list of people they said were selling them, developers. And then paid the fees to the county.

Q And what is this? What is this document?
A It is a receipt.
Q And you paid this amount?
A I did.
Q Turn to Exhibit 30. What is Exhibit 30?
A That's an agenda.
THE COURT: Excuse me. Go back to 29. What's the amount? 2129 or 3329.

MR. MOORE: 2129 .
THE COURT: Is the total.
MR. MOORE: Is the total. And I believe they take into account a previous amount paid of the $\$ 1,200$, if you recall, your Honor, from a previous receipt.

THE COURT: The plan review. Okay. That was

```
part of the 6200?
                    THE WITNESS: Correct.
BY MR. MOORE:
    Q What is Exhibit 30?
    A This is an agenda for the meeting with the
Health and Safety Department on getting the variance
granted.
    Q Why was this meeting held?
    A For the -- to fix the septic system.
    Q When was this meeting held?
    A In February of 2016.
    Q And when did you start the process of seeking
a variance, if you recall, in looking at all the variance
documents?
    A Gosh, I don't know. The whole thing took a
couple of years. I want to say some time in 2015.
    Q And was it all resolved in February of 2016?
A No.
Q Did you attend this meeting?
A I did.
Q And what was the result of this meeting?
A They gave us some specific instructions,
things to do, to accomplish. Tests to be done.
Q And those things --
```

```
    A I had to resubmit stuff.
    Q And the things they indicated, are those the
things that we talked about, you needed to get plans and
a survey?
    A Right.
    Q All of those things?
    A Right.
    Q And why were those required by the county?
    A To bring it up to code, today's code.
    Q Look at Exhibit 31. Do you recognize that?
    A I do.
    Q What is Exhibit 31?
    A It is an e-mail from the guy at the county,
Wes, giving us a variance pack and telling us what other
things we need to do.
    Q And what was this e-mail from the county in
response to?
    A Me just kind of complaining about the time it
was taking.
    Q And when did you send your e-mail about the
time that it was taking?
    A In May.
    Q Of 2016?
    A Of 2016, yes.
```

 the variance with conditions.

Q And we have already talked about those conditions, correct?

A Correct.
Q What's the date of this approval?
A June 1st, 2016.
Q Once you got approval from the county, what steps did you take to move forward to complete the
conditions that they had set forth?
A I did what they told me to do. Got the things that they needed and then called for inspections.

Q Looking at Exhibit 34, what is that document?
A That is a cashed check from me to the county.
Q And what's the amount?
A $\quad \$ 2129.23$.
Q Was this check to pay items that we have
looked at already?
A Yes.
Q Looking at Exhibit 35 --
THE COURT: Is that for the variance process and making the conditions met?

MR. MOORE: I believe it is part of the permit, your Honor. It says at the bottom 15-1410. I think it is finalizing the permit?

THE WITNESS: That was the permit.
MR. MOORE: For the variance. Yes.
BY MR. MOORE:
Q Exhibit 35 can you turn there?
A I'm there.
Q What is Exhibit 35?
A That is an estimate from the septic system.
Q Did you end up using this company to replace
the septic?
A I did. He subbed it out to a guy that does his dirt work.

Q Did you end up paying \$8,500?
A I believe I paid a little bit more than that. But, yes.

Q Exhibit 36. What is Exhibit 36 ?
A That is -- for some work I had done on the well.

Q Why did you do that work on the well?
A I put a hand pump on the well.
Q Was that required by Washoe County?
A No.

Q That's not something that we are looking at. Look at Exhibit 38 .

A I do.
Q What is Exhibit 38?
A That is for the septic tank installation, the guy that was subbed out to install, and dirt work.

Q What is the total amount of this invoice for the dirt work?

A I believe it was 9750?
$\$ 6,500$ extra is 3,250 and another $\$ 550$.
So -- closer to ten grand I think.

Q Now --

A That is not a very good copy.

Q It is not. And eventually though looking at Exhibit 39 I want to show some checks that you paid to Montner Excavating?

A Okay.
Q Do you see these checks?

A I do.

Q Does this represent the amount you paid to Montner Excavating to install the enlarged septic system?

A Yes, I believe so.

Q And it totals \$7,050?

MR. MOORE: Montner was just paid the $\$ 7,050$.

But from everything -- all the records we have --

THE COURT: That sounds about right. All right.

MR. MOORE: So the $\$ 8,500$ was not actually paid. My client got a better deal.

THE COURT: All right.

BY MR. MOORE:

Q Looking at Exhibit 40, what is that?
THE COURT: Excuse me, counsel. This is a -if you are starting a new thing, let's take our lunch break at this time. Be back at one o'clock.
(At this time the noon recess was taken.) THE COURT: Mr. Moore, you may continue. MR. MOORE: Thank you, your Honor.

Q John, right before we recessed for lunch we were going to turn to Exhibit 40. Could you go ahead and turn there?

A I'm there.

Q Do you recognize Exhibit 40?
A I do.
Q What is it?
A It is an invoice from Tectonics.
Q What is the purpose of this invoice?
A It was to pay Ron Cohen for his assistance in getting me through all this permitting and dealing with the county.

Q Earlier we looked at a document that showed that Ron gave you an estimate of what might be necessary to the tune of $\$ 50,000$. Why did you end up only paying $\$ 5,000$ ?

A I paid all the fees associated with the construction and the county and the upgrades and stuff. And this is what he told me $I$ owed him for his help.

Q What exactly did Ron do to help you?

A Made numerous contacts with the County, county officials. Helped me fill out the permits. Sent e-mails. Attended meetings with me. Just offered his expertise.

Q Could you turn to Exhibit 45? Do you recognize this document, these documents?

A Yes.

Q What is Exhibit 45?

A Invoices from your law office.

Q And what are they dated from?

A March of 2016 starting in March and then the months thereafter all the way through January of 2017 .

Q And were these invoices paid?

A No.

Q Why not?

A Because you are taking this case on a contingency.

Q Looking at Exhibit 46. Do you see Exhibit 46?

A Yes.

Q What is Exhibit 46?

A Invoices from Sean Brohan's office.

Q And how are they dated?

A March 2015, November 2015, all the way
through November of 2016.
Q And were these invoices paid?
A Yes.
Q And do you know offhand the total amount you paid to Mr. Brohan?

A I think it was somewhere around $\$ 12,000$ or \$15, 000 .

THE COURT: What did he do?
MR. MOORE: Off the record?

THE COURT: On the record. What did he do?
MR. MOORE: He screwed up the case. I got in
this case, your Honor, in March of 2016 . It was at the point where it was going to be dismissed by a court appointed arbitrator. Not court appointed, but a court annexed arbitrator. The case was not appropriate for arbitration. I took multiple steps to get it taken out of that program. He didn't show up at the arbitration.

THE COURT: You are not charging the defendant for the fees, are you?

MR. MOORE: We are arguing that attorney's fees and costs are -- were caused by the issues that are related to this case. So --

THE COURT: Wasn't he disbarred?
MR. MOORE: Essentially, yes.

THE WITNESS: He is only suspended.
THE COURT: For how long?
MR. MOORE: For 18 months. An 18 -month
suspension is essentially disbarment unless he can prove to the Bar that he is entitled to be brought back.

THE COURT: Isn't that a result of picking a bad lawyer basically?

MR. MOORE: Unfortunately. Unfortunately.
THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.
BY MR. MOORE:
Q Let's go ahead and look at Exhibit 48. Do you recognize Exhibit 48?

A I do.
Q What is it?
A It is the drawing -- and topography from the architect, the buildings and what appears to be where we propose to put the septic.

Q That was going to be my next question. What does it show related to the septic?

A It shows a future back-up system. Topography where we plan to do the improvements for the septic tank and it shows my mother's house, the in law's quarters and the storage building up above.

Q Are these plans that you paid for to obtain

```
the permit?
```

A They are.
Q To get the mother-in-law quarters legal?
A That's correct.
Q Let's look at Exhibit 50. Do you recognize Exhibit 50?

A I do.
Q What is Exhibit 50?

A Invoices from your office.
Q And have those invoices been paid?
A Yes.
THE COURT: Counsel, the redactions, what are they?

MR. MOORE: The majority of those were communications between attorney/client.

THE COURT: You have the client's name
redacted. Why would you do that?
MR. MOORE: Just to not -- reveal any privileged information, your Honor.

THE COURT: But you are sending it to John
Lindberg.
MR. MOORE: Correct.
THE COURT: Why would you redact his name if that's his name in the document?

MR. MOORE: But it is -- not redacted from the bill-to section, your Honor. I'm only redacting items that may have revealed attorney-client communications or strategies of my office.

THE COURT: All right.
BY MR. MOORE:
Q And these invoices from which date until when?

A It looks like February '17 through December of '17.

Q Have you received any invoices from my office after December of 2017?

A I don't believe so.
THE COURT: What's the total of 50?
MR. MOORE: I don't know offhand, your Honor.
I believe it is -- I can just do it real quickly.
THE COURT: Do you have a receipt for these or just the billings?

MR. MOORE: These are just the billings.
THE COURT: Don't worry about it. Was he
paying as he goes or are you doing it in the end?
MR. MOORE: Costs are being paid, your Honor.
THE COURT: Are these all costs?
MR. MOORE: No. Attorney's fees are not being
paid. As he said previously, I'm -- I've been retained on a contingency.

THE COURT: Am I going to get a number for the costs?

MR. MOORE: The costs are -- in exhibit -- the two exhibits we looked at from my office. We can break those out for your Honor. No problem. They are in there.

BY MR. MOORE:
Q John, during this transaction do you know what the realtors were paid as a commission?

MR. HALL: Objection, relevance.
MR. MOORE: Your Honor, under the circumstances, payment of a commission to these realtors we believe is something that was inappropriate and, if need be, we would request that those be returned to my client.

THE COURT: All right. For that purpose I'll let that in. But the transaction was completed. You are saying they just did it the wrong way.

MR. MOORE: Right.
THE COURT: For what it's worth, what is it worth?

THE WITNESS: I believe Brian Kincannon got --

THE COURT: Don't you have a record of it rather than 'believe?'

MR. MOORE: We do.

THE COURT: Please. Go with the record.

BY MR. MOORE:

Q I'll show that to our next witness, your

Honor. Under the circumstances I don't believe I have any further questions.

THE COURT: All right. Cross examine.
CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. HALL:
Q Sir, the billings that you have been showing us here for the last few exhibits are 2017 billings?

A Whatever the date is of any of these billings.

Q And how long ago was the real estate transaction closed, escrow closed?

A I believe February of 2013.

Q And when did you first start discovering the problems that you have been describing?

A About a year after I closed on the property when $I$ tried to pull an electrical permit.

Q So the problem was with some electrical component on your property that wasn't functioning?

A It wasn't that it wasn't functioning. It just wasn't done correctly. There was PVC conduit running underground from my mom's electrical box along the fence up to the upper house. And just ran into the house, didn't run into its own panel. Didn't have its own wires to the upper house, which I'm calling the barn, the shed.

And so I wanted to make that safe.
Q And it was a year after you got into the property that you discovered this situation?

A Correct. When I pulled the permit I discovered a lot of things.

Q That you hadn't known about before?
A That's correct.
Q And they were defects in the property itself, correct?

A Yeah, I guess. I don't know if the property was a defect. Just the way that everything was done.

THE COURT: When you say property, what do you mean? The property is the land and the improvements are the buildings. Are you talking about the buildings or a combination?

BY MR. HALL:
Q Did you want me to clarify?

A Yes.
THE COURT: So he understands what the question is. Because $I$ don't.

BY MR. HALL:

Q I'm speaking about the real estate now. The problems that you have been describing here were problems that were found in the structures on the real estate that you purchased in the subject transaction?

A Yeah. With the permitting process, to speak to the permitting process, yes.

THE COURT: Tell us again in simple terms.
You are on the property for a year, I take it?
THE WITNESS: Right.
THE COURT: Then you say, "Hey, I want to fix something with the mother-in-law quarters."

THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: You got a permit to do it?
THE WITNESS: I applied for a permit.
THE COURT: You applied for a permit. They came out and said no?

THE WITNESS: The county came out and told me what I needed to do. I did what they asked me to do. They came out and said that the property wasn't -- the building wasn't permitted. There was a complaint on the
property from 2010 or whatever it was, whatever year, and that I had to correct all the issues with the building and the mother-in-law quarters before I could get -before $I$ could even move any further. They told me 'no' on the permit for the electrical upgrade and said, "Oh, by the way, the mother-in-law quarters is built illegally as well."

THE COURT: Okay. That started the nightmare, right?

THE WITNESS: That started the whole can of worms. BY MR. HALL:

Q And what do you recall of that issue being discussed during the period of time within which the real estate purchase between the Reynoldes and the Lindbergs occurred?

A There was no discussion about any of that.
Q So that was just something that you discovered after the transaction was over?

A Correct.
Q Okay. Did the problem with the initial misidentification of the size of the septic system have any affect on the issues that you are now describing?

A Other than $I$ had to bring everything up to
code and get it permitted for what it actually was instead of what it was supposed to be. It was supposed to be a garage.

Q In your Complaint you have alleged that one of the bases for your right to recover damages is that it was misrepresented initially to you what the size of the septic tank was.

A That was 1 of 3 issues. It was mislisted as far as $I$ was concerned. The septic tank was not correct.

Q But the size of the tank was revealed to you before you closed escrow on the transaction?

A That's correct. But I learned a lot about the whole process going through it. I had no idea what size a septic tank needed to be for three bedrooms versus four bedrooms.

Q Right. Understood. But my point is there is no logical connection between the problem determining the size of the septic tank and these issues that you are now finding as defects in the structures on the property itself?

A It goes to speak for a pattern of not doing your duty of care as far as I'm concerned. That's what -- did it affect me? Yes, of course.

Q Well, even assuming that there was a breach
in the duty of care during the real estate transaction, if the duty of care breach relates to the septic system and you have a problem with the electric system in one of the homes, how does that entitle you to damages under the rules that apply in the real estate transaction?

MR. MOORE: Objection. Argumentative.
THE COURT: Sustained. It asks for a legal
conclusion.
BY MR. HALL:
Q During the real estate transaction, there were appraisals done, correct?

A I believe so, yes.
Q And your purchase price was 385,000?
A That was their counteroffer, yes.
Q And that was --
A What we paid.
Q Right there with the two appraisals that went on the property, correct?

A I made the counteroffer at Brian Kincannon's office based on the appraisal he had received from the broker. I never had a copy of the appraisal until after the whole transaction was completed.

Q Are you aware now that the --
THE COURT: Wait a minute. Before you said
you had the appraisal before the close of escrow. THE WITNESS: Brian Kincannon showed me the proposal in his office and said, "Look, it is worth $\$ 400,000$. The appraisal came back $\$ 400,000 . "$ I said, "We'll offer \$375." They came back with \$385,000. THE COURT: You knew about it before you closed escrow?

THE WITNESS: I knew about the appraisal for $\$ 400,000$.

THE COURT: And you saw it?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MR. HALL:
Q Actually you were -- if we accept the appraisal report as true, you made a good deal for the $\$ 10,000$ or are $\$ 15,000$ ?

A That was my impression at the time, yeah.
Q And were you aware that the appraisal that was made was based on the square footage of the single family residence structure home?

A $\quad$ No.
MR. MOORE: Object to form.
THE COURT: What was that?
MR. MOORE: Object to form. I don't know that it's clear, your Honor.

THE COURT: You can repeat it or rephrase it.
BY MR. HALL:
Q Let me just -- if $I$ can clarify.
You have had the appraisal report for some time now?

A Yes.
Q And you have read it now?
A Right. I have looked at it.
Q Do you think you understand it?
A Pretty much.
Q Isn't it true that the appraisal value only
takes into account the square footage value of the single family residence on the property?

MR. MOORE: I believe it misstates the document, your Honor. That would be my objection.

THE COURT: Well, I don't know. I don't have the appraisal. He is asking the person who read it.

THE WITNESS: The listing showed pictures of all of the rooms of the mother-in-law quarters and it even listed the upper house barn as a bonus room/office.

So all the pictures of those areas were listed on the MLS. I didn't know to compare all of that and look at the square footage. I wasn't aware of the square footage being less than it actually was until the
can of worms got opened. BY MR. HALL:

Q But when the can of worms got opened, it got closed back up with an accurate measurement, correct?

A It was over a year after the purchase was done.

Q That you got the accurate measurement?
A That $I$ knew that the square footage was not what it was.

Q You say that you knew the square footage was not what you thought it was?

A A year after $I$ closed.
Q What is the square footage?
A I believe it is 3640 . The listing said 3880 . And then, if you take away the bottom of the mother-in-law quarters that we were forced to abandon, that takes a couple hundred more square feet off the complete square footage of the house.

Q If I may ask it this way?
You had an appraisal on the home, the entire property. The appraiser was aware, was he not, that the uses -- the two additional structures or at least one of the additional structures was improper?

MR. MOORE: Calls for speculation.

THE COURT: Again, you are talking about a document that $I$ don't have. And maybe it is speculation. Maybe it is not. It depends how it was written up. But you said something that surprised me. The square footage, 3640, you are saying that that also included the mother-in-law quarters area?

THE WITNESS: I'm saying that it showed all of these rooms in the mother-in-law quarters, in the main house and the upper barn and shed as part of the sale.

THE COURT: And you believed that all of them
were 3640?
THE WITNESS: Yeah. I believed it was what the listing said, which was 3880 total square footage. THE COURT: That's 240 extra. The mother-in-law quarters is bigger than that, right? THE WITNESS: Yeah. The mother-in-law
quarters $I$ think is 1400 or something like that square feet. It has an upstairs and downstairs.

THE COURT: How big is your house?
THE WITNESS: Mine is 2180 I think.
MR. MOORE: There are two houses, your Honor.
One is 2180 and the other one is about 1460. We will go over this with Miss Johnson during her testimony.

THE COURT: That's -- there are two houses on
the property.
MR. MOORE: That's the whole problem; that the second house, the mother-in-law quarters, was not permitted.

THE COURT: I thought you were talking about a little structure. You are talking about a big -- two buildings?

THE WITNESS: There are actually three buildings.

MR. MOORE: And, your Honor, it showed in the Origins A architectural plans, it shows both buildings.

THE COURT: You went through all that so fast I didn't get a chance to look at it.

MR. MOORE: I'm sorry, your Honor.

THE COURT: The trier of fact has to digest.

We are talking about two buildings?
THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: That's 48, I guess.

BY MR. HALL:

Q Are you ready?
A Yes.

Q My real point here is -- let me frame it to you as a question.

Is there anything in the issue that arose
during the real estate transaction when my client was a broker in that action that had any effect on the expenses that you are now incurring to make improvements to the property you bought?

A Nothing during the transaction.
Q That's all the questions I'll ask.
THE COURT: All right.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
MR. MOORE:may I proceed, your Honor?
THE COURT: Go ahead.
BY MR. MOORE:
Q I believe that last question that you were asked, you did not learn of anything during the transaction that was disclosed to you that caused you to incur these expenses going forward?

A That is correct.
Q Everything about this transaction that was not disclosed to you during the transaction you learned after the transaction itself?

A After $I$ pulled the electrical upgrade permit for the barn/shed everything came out.

Q Which is one year approximately after you purchased the property?

A That is correct.

MR. MOORE: No further questions.

MR. HALL: Nothing further from me, your

Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir. You may step down.

MR. MOORE: Your Honor, we would call A J
Johnson.
THE COURT: Those three names they are all the same entity or what?

MR. MOORE: Your Honor, there are three remaining defendants. I'll let the witness be sworn first.

AMINA CARMAZZI JOHNSON JOHNS
produced as a witness on behalf of the Plaintiff, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

## DIRECT EXAMINATION:

MR. MOORE: J E Johns \& Associates is an entity. There has been a default entered against that entity. A J Johnson, the defendant, who is a realtor in this transaction and her deceased husband, James E Johns,
for which --
THE COURT: For which there is a default.
BY MR. MOORE:
Q Good afternoon, Miss Johnson.
A Good afternoon.
Q Would you please turn to Exhibit 2? It should be right in front of you.

A --

THE CLERK: Counsel, can $I$ have the witness spell her first and last name for the record?

THE WITNESS: Sure. My complete legal name is Amina, A-M-I-N-A, Marie Carmazzi Johnson Johns, $C-A-R-M-A-Z-Z-I$.

BY MR. MOORE:
Q Is it all right if $I$ call you Miss Johnson?
A Sure.
Q Thank you. Miss Johnson, are you looking at Exhibit 2?

A I am.
Q Looking at Exhibit 2 do you see in the middle it indicates total living space as 3880 square feet?

A I do.
Q That's for two buildings on the structure, correct?

A Yes.

Q One is in the approximate amount of 2180 square feet, correct?

A Well, $\quad$ believe that this is including three separate buildings, the square footage.

Q I'll get to that in a moment. So it is your belief that this is three separate buildings?

A Correct. And this, understand, is not my listing; but, yes.

Q This listing is by James E Johns?

A Yes.

Q And Mr. Johns though he was the listing agent in this case didn't do much work in this case; is that right?

A No. He did all of the work in this case.

Q You acted as the realtor in this case for the most part?

A I was the agent that listed the listing prior to this listing. And I communicated on behalf of Mr. Johns while he was sick, yes, and through e-mails to Mr. Kincannon and Miss Tammy Kincannon -- or Miss Tammy Kincannon, yes.

Q Isn't it true that most of the e-mails produced in this case are from you to Mr. Kincannon?

A The first transaction before the offer was received, yes.

Q There was a transaction before the offer in this case was received?

A No. There was -- there was an offer on this property and the people couldn't qualify so we didn't get that far. But when $I$ refer to the transaction before, Mr. Kincannon and $I$ had conversations and e-mails back and forth before he wrote an offer on Mr. John's listing asking me questions, yes.

Q I'm curious. I'm curious. You just said some things that caught my attention. You said there was an offer made on this case before my clients made an offer; is that correct?

A Right. It just was an offer. They submitted a pre-approval letter. They couldn't qualify, so it never went any further.

Q Was it a written offer?
A I believe it was.
THE COURT: What's your relationship with
Mr. Johns?
THE WITNESS: He was my husband.
THE COURT: Husband. And he was the broker?
THE WITNESS: He was the broker and I was the
licensed real estate agent, yes.
BY MR. MOORE:
Q Miss Johnson, you recall responding to discovery in this case, don't you?

A Responding to discovery. Please -- I don't understand what you are asking.

Q Through your former attorney's office, Nick Pereos, there were times when you were asked to make documents and other things available in this case?

A Yes.

Q And he on your behalf responded to discovery; isn't that right?

A I assume so.
Q Did you review his responses before they were sent out?

A The discovery and a lot of the information went to my deceased husband, Jim. I picked this up at the end.

Q And is there any reason to believe that after your husband had died that you did not respond or review discovery responses in this case?

A Honestly, during that time after my husband passed, I was in no position or condition to do anything. But I would assume that Mr. Pereos had communicated with
my husband, who was my broker and received everything. So I got to Mr. Pereos anything that I may have had.

Q After your husband died did you deal with Mr. Pereos directly?

A Yes. Only for a short period of time.
Q Your husband died in 2017; isn't that correct?

A He died in 2016.
Q 2016. So you've been dealing with this case yourself since 2016?

A Yes. For about a year -- because I was incapacitated for about a year.

Q So from 2017 until now you have been dealing with this case?

A Yes.
Q Do you recall responding to discovery in early 2018 in this case?

A Yes.

Q Do you recall reviewing any discovery responses that were sent out by your attorney, Nick Pereos, before they were sent out?

A Not all of them, no. That was the problem that we had was communication.

Q Do you recall being informed by Mr. Pereos
that at some time during this transaction that you were requested to produce all offers the defendant Harry and Deann Reynolds received from any prospective buyers located at the property at 2957 Eaton that were received on or after September 1st, 2012, until the close of escrow on or about February 28th, 2013?

A I can't remember. Possibly. But I can't remember.

Q If you had been asked that question by
Mr. Pereos would you have produced the offer that we were just talking about right now?

A Absolutely.
Q In looking at your response prepared by your attorney, Nick Pereos, if you would like to turn to Exhibit 72, you could.

THE COURT: Is that in the book?
MR. MOORE: It is in the new book. I
apologize. I'll approach the witness with the second book.

BY MR. MOORE:
Q And if you could turn to Request For Production number 3? It is on page two of Exhibit 72. Do you see that?

A Yes.

Q In that request for production I'm going to go ahead and read into the record the request for production and response. The request for production number three.
"Produce all offers of the defendants Harry and Deann Reynolds receive from any prospective buyers of the property located at 2957 Eaton that were received on or after September 1st, 2012, until the close of escrow on or about February 28th, $2013 . "$

And your response to number three is,
"None." Did I read that correctly?

A Yes, you did.
Q Do you see the last page on this request. Is that signed by Nick Pereos?

A I would assume so. I have no idea.

Q Actually it is page four. Do you see where there is a signature for Mr. Pereos?

A Yes.

Q Do you see that it's signed?

A Yes.

Q Do you see where it is indicated that he is the attorney for the defendant?

A Yes.

Q Getting back to Exhibit 2. Let's look at
this listing. It indicates that the agent is James E. Johns; is that correct?

A Hold on just a moment. Yes.
Q He is your broker; isn't that right?
A He was, yes.
Q The listing price is \$399,900?
A Yes.
Q And on the first page where it says zoning actual, it says single family; is that correct?

A Correct.
Q And the source of the zoning is the assessor; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q Looking at the square footage, source of the square footage on this listing, you also indicate that it is the assessor?

A He did, yes.
Q And that it's 1.12 acres; is that right?
A Correct.
Q Turning to the next page, if we could look at that. This states in the middle there is a section for some comments. And right in the middle of that section in the second sentence it says, "Three separate units on the property. In-law quarters or guest house, office or
studio or tack room or office." Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q That's actually correct, isn't it? There are three separate units?

A Buildings, yes.
Q You understand the zoning requirements for this area, don't you?

A I go off of the assessor's, yes.
Q You understand for this area that there is only permitted one residential building and one accessory building in this location; isn't that right?

A No.
Q Looking at Exhibit 54, if we could. That's in the first binder.

A Okay.
Q Looking at 54 the first two pages is essentially the same as Exhibit 2 that we just looked at; is that correct?

A Correct.
Q And in Exhibit 2 -- and you can refresh yourself, if you need to, here on Exhibit 54. In the first two pages -- it doesn't split up how the square footage was identified, does it?

A Not in his listing, no.

Q But there was a listing from September; isn't that true?

A That is correct.

Q And that was done by you?

A That is correct.

Q It is dated September 21, 2012; is that
correct?

A That is correct. Is it in here?

Q Look at the third page of Exhibit 54. Do you see the listing by you?

A Yes.

Q It says bedroom, number of bedrooms. Lists the square footage?

THE COURT: What's the Bates number?

MR. MOORE: The Bates number is R E Y 0003 and 4, your Honor.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

BY MR. MOORE:

Q Do you see there it also shows the total living space is 3880 square feet?

A Actually this one shows 2180.

Q Are you looking at R E Y 000003? It is at the bottom. Do you see the little numbers $R E$ ?

A Am I missing something? I'm sorry. R E Y.

```
00003. Yes.
```

Q Do you see a 3880?
A Yes.
Q And the source of the square footage is the assessor?

A Sort of, yes.
Q And the acreage is 1.12 acres?
A Correct.
Q And it is listing zoning actual is single family?

A Yes.
Q And source of the zoning is the assessor?
A Yes.
Q And it is dated September 21, 2012, correct?
A Correct.
Q At 3:52 p.m.?
A Correct.
Q And the listed price is 399,999?
THE COURT: Where is that date, counsel?
MR. MOORE: It is at the bottom, your Honor, on the right side, listing date. Towards the middle actually of the document under listing date, September 21st, 2012 .

THE COURT: Got it. And you asked her if this

```
is your listing?
```

                                    THE WITNESS: Correct.
                            THE COURT: This is before your husband died?
                    THE WITNESS: Correct.
                    THE COURT: Okay.
    BY MR. MOORE:
Q And in this listing the first page is almost identical to Exhibit 2, right?

A Mr. Johns?

Q Right.
A Yes.
Q The only real difference is it lists him as the agent in the first one and you as the agent in the next?

A Incorrect.
Q There are a few other differences?
A Right.

Q But there is nothing huge or materially different?

A On mine it outlines the square footage of each unit. His does not.

Q I was going to get to that next. The first page though of these two is pretty close?

A Correct.

Q The next page of your listing R E Y 00004, says two homes for the price of one, correct? Is that a yes?

A That is correct.
Q It does not say three units, correct?
A Correct.
Q Also it indicates that the main house is 2180 square feet?

A Correct.

Q And the in-law quarters is 1700 square feet which adds up to 3880 ?

A Correct.
Q Where did you obtain that information?
A Well, when $I$ took this listing, the seller gave me the information on the square footage because they had had permits and had the in-law quarters completed. It is on the seller's real property disclosure statement. So I had a concern with it. So I called my board and the attorney for the Reno Board of Realtors and asked them how $I$ was to do this.

And they said that, if the seller gave me the overall square foot, $I$ could put it in there. But to cover my bottom $I$ should outline what the seller is giving me for the other square footage in my listing.

Q Do you see anywhere in here that the seller gave you this?

A It is in my listing.
Q Is it?

A It is.
Q Where?
A It is in my listing input form.
Q Okay. But it is not in the listing itself?
A Because when the computer picks it up it doesn't tell you where you get it. The assessor gave me the information for the zoning. And that's why my listing will say assessor. In my listing it will also say the seller gave me the information on the square footage and the appraiser in my listing gave me the value.

Q But, Miss Johnson, you changed this listing within a couple of hours, didn't you?

A Because when $I$ put it -- a couple of hours? Possibly. Because when $I$ put it in at the 2188 it was before $I$ had the opportunity to talk with the attorney to the Board of Realtors, Linda Conger, who was with our board -- because the seller was upset because I did not put in the square footage she gave me.

Q You originally put in 3880; isn't that
correct?
A On -- well, there was -- there was a dispute going back and forth. Yes. Yes.

Q So on September 21, 2012 at 3:52 p.m. you listed the total living space as 3880?

A Correct.
Q But you then changed it two hours later to 2180 ?

A That's correct.
Q And it stayed -- this listing -- until it was removed in December; isn't that correct?

A That is correct.
Q And you removed it in December to list the higher square footage because you wanted to attract more buyers; isn't that right?

A No. Incorrect. No. This was changed -that's square footage -- the first square footage was on September 21, at 352 .

The second square footage was on September 21 at 552. That's when $I$ was able to -- I had a concern of putting it in for the square footage. And he put it in at 388 .

I had a concern until $I$ was able to talk to the board and my attorney for the Reno Board of Realtors.

I changed it back at which time Mr. Johns did it at the 3880 because they told us as long as we identified it. If the seller stated that, we could put it in at that.

Q It was listed for three months at 2180 square feet?

A No.
Q September 2012 until December 2012.
A It is right here on mine. September 12th, 2012 at 352 for 3880 until December 1st.

Q But then two hours later you lowered it to 2180 ?

A Because $I$ was not able to get back with the attorney for the Reno Board of Realtors. Actually what it is, is they just said either way I would be okay. So both of those listings have it outlined in the square footage. I had a discrepancy with it because the seller was giving me that information.

Q Prior to this transaction even being listed you had received an appraisal in this case; isn't that correct?

A Prior to my listing, yes.
Q You had received an appraisal?
A I never received it personally, no. Never.

Q Let's go ahead and turn in the second binder, Exhibit 60 .

A Exhibit?

Q Exhibit 60 .

A Okay.
THE COURT: Counsel, the close of escrow was 2013?

MR. MOORE: February 28th, 2013.
THE COURT: Who was acting on which listing?
MR. MOORE: The December listing. But we'll
go into some documents that go further on that shows Miss Johnson's further involvement.

Q Exhibit 60, Miss Johnson, I'm showing you for identification. This is residential listing info form?

A That's correct.
Q It is your handwriting mostly?
A That is correct.

Q And it is three pages, correct?
A That is correct.

Q On the third page is your signature at the very bottom?

A That is correct.
Q In this form -- this form is dated September 21st, 2012; is that correct?

A That is correct.
Q The same date you did the initial listing?
A Correct. But $I$ held it for a few days, yes.
Q And the same day that you did the second
listing?
A Correct.
Q Looking at this document it shows the price that you will try to list it for is $\$ 399,999$, correct?

A Correct.
Q It lists the total living space as
2180 square feet and 1700 square feet; is that correct?
A Plus 600.
Q $\quad 600$ is the barn, isn't it?
A That's just the square footage the seller gave me. He said he added 600 square feet onto the back of the in-law quarters.

Q But your listing, the first two listings from September 21st of 2012, Exhibit 54, both show the 2180 for the main house and 1700 for the living quarters; is that correct?

A That's incorrect.
Q Look at --
A It does say 1740. And it doesn't add the 600. Because the 600 was a converted tack room into an
office with electricity to it, power, yes.
Q That's at the very top of the property, is it not?

A It is.
Q That's not attached to the living quarters?
A No. Neither is the guest house.
Q All right. It is not attached to the guest house either?

A Correct.
Q I'm just clarifying what you just stated on direct.

2180 square feet you listed as for the main house?

A Which I got off of the assessors.
Q And 1700 square feet as the guest house?
A Which I got from the seller, correct.
Q 600 square feet is -- the barn?
A I'm assuming that came from the seller, yes.
Q But it is the barn?
A It is the office/tack room, which the pictures will show in the appraisal.

Q So you mentioned in this form that you got the 2108 square feet from the assessor?

A Yes.

Q And the 1700 from your client. Looking at this form, source of square feet, you check owner and appraiser, don't you?

A Correct.

Q You don't check assessor?
A No, because when you input it into the computer it picks up -- on this form.

Q My question is a yes or no, ma'am.
A Show me where you are asking me the question. Which page?

Q Under the source of square footage you do not check the box?

THE COURT: What page is that?
MR. MOORE: The very first page of Exhibit 60 . Marked at the bottom REY 27 --

A I put owner and appraiser.
Q You did not say assessor?
A No. The commuter picks it up.

Q This is hand marked.
THE COURT: What am I looking at here?
THE WITNESS: The listing.
MR. MOORE: If you see the total living space, 2180 and 1700.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MOORE: And 600. Right next to that is source of square feet and it is marked owner and praiser but not assessor.

THE COURT: All right.

THE WITNESS: The assessor is actually in the listing, in the MLS listing sheet.

Q But you didn't put it on this form?
A Not on this form, nope.

Q Because you never went and checked with the assessor; isn't that right?

A That's incorrect.

Q Let's go ahead and look at the next page, if we could -- the third page that you signed at the end, it says main house 2180 approximately.

And, your Honor, for your reference it is towards the upper third of that last page. It is in handwriting.

THE COURT: Got it.

BY MR. MOORE:

Q Is that correct?

A 2180 approximately, yes.
Q And the second house 1700 approximately?

A Correct.

Q And the garage 600 approximately?

A Yes.

Q On that third page it also says underneath all that handwriting -- this is your handwriting, right?

A Yes.

Q It says underneath that, "Agent requests appraisal be done to verify pertinent info." Do you see that?

A Yes.

THE COURT: Wait. I don't see that. Where is that?

MR. MOORE: It is right under the main house, 2180, approximately. I read that correctly?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

BY MR. MOORE:

Q This document is listed below R E Y 27229 . Do you know who produced this document in this case?

A This particular document?

Q Yes.

A That came from me.

Q This came from you?

A Uh-huh (affirmative). When I sit down and take a listing with the seller, I write it out for the seller. I ask them questions; they give me answers. For instance, is there any $H$ O A, amenities, stains, drapes,
dishwasher. We check off the boxes together, yes.
Q I will represent to you that this document, this copy of this document, was not produced by you. It was produced by the Reynoldes, the sellers, in this case. Do you have any reason to believe otherwise?

A This document was produced by the Reynoldes. They got a copy of it. They could have produced it.

Q I'll show you the parts of this form that you produced to us, Exhibit 68.

A Okay.
Q Looking at Exhibit 68, do you see that document?

A Yes.

Q Do you see at the bottom it has different numbers. JJVL 004 . Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q Not REY 00027. Do you see that?
A Yes.

Q I'll represent to you in this case that these were the documents that we received from your attorney -- and there are only two of the three pages. Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q Do you have any reason to believe that your
attorney did not produce the third page in this case?
A I do not. But -- even this is my
handwriting. This information is typed in here. I will honestly -- this is not the listing agreement. And the biggest problem that Mr . Pereos and I had is he was losing documents.

Q Do you see right in the middle where the total living space is identified? Do you see that?

A It looks like -- it is difficult, but it looks like 2160 plus 600 something underneath.

Q Do you know why that's blacked out?
A No.
Q Did you black that out?
A No.
Q Did your attorney black that out?
A Not that $I$ know of, no. It looks like somebody highlighted.

Q Do you see there is no third page produced by your attorney?

A I do.
Q The third page that was provided by the Reynoldes in this case indicates that the main house has a certain square footage and the second house has a certain square footage. And that the agent did ask for
an appraisal. Do you know why you would not produce the third page in this matter?

A Unless Mr. Pereos lost it, I have no idea. But this -- I can't answer that. I don't know.

Q Do you know why anyone would try to mark out the actual total living space shown in this form?

A I don't know.
THE COURT: Counsel, I see 2180 , 17 something and 600 .

MR. MOORE: Fortunately, you can somewhat see it. But if we hadn't had the other form, your Honor, I don't know that we would have been able to. Looking at it --

THE COURT: I can see 17. 1700 and 600.
MR. MOORE: I agree. The one I'm looking at I can't see it. It might just be me. I don't know.

Q But in this case the third page, do you know why your attorney wouldn't produce the third page of this form?

A No. Because he had it on the other --
Q Would you turn to page Exhibit 63?
A Okay.
Q Do you see this document?
A Do I see it?

```
    Q Yes.
    A Yes.
    Q Do you see how it is Bates stamped -- the
```

numbers at the bottom are REY, again. Do you see that?
A Yes.
Q It goes from 6 to REY --
THE COURT: 89.
MR. MOORE: 89. Thank you, your Honor.
Q REY 89.
Do you recognize this document?
A I received this document through this
lawsuit, yes.
Q You had never seen it before?
A No.
Q The appraisal is about 22 or 23 pages long.
It goes from 67 to 89?
A I would assume so. Okay.
Q Do you see here under -- it is the fourth
page of that exhibit, 63, it is marked at the bottom REY
000070 . Do you see that?
A Yes.
Q Do you see in here where it lists -- in the
middle on the left side -- gross living area, 2180 square
feet. Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q Then at the bottom of this appraisal you see there is a bunch of written-out information. In the second paragraph it says, "The subject also has the utility of a guest house. The guest house is 1460 square feet. Washoe County assessor shows the guest house and a loft above the guest house. Over time the guest house has been improved to be more in line with the quality of the main residence. However, the improvements may or may not be legal. And for appraisal purposes we are living it little value. With that said since the market improved area typically has outbuildings, unfinished or unfinished barns, guest houses, the improvement to the subject are conforming to the area and they contribute to the overall marketability of the subject property." Did I read that correct?

A Correct.
Q Also in here he also lists a price per square foot, doesn't he. The appraiser?

A Where do you see that?
Q I'll go ahead and show you. It is up towards the middle third of the document.

$$
\text { It says, "The sales price } 138.33 \text { dot per }
$$

square foot." Do you see that?

A 138.33, yes.
Q If you multiply 138.33 by 2100 that does not equal 399,000, does it?

A - -

Q 2180 times 138.33.
301,559.40. Isn't that correct?
A I would assume so. I didn't do this.
Q I'm going through that exercise because your attorney said earlier this appraisal didn't take into account the guest house.

```
Clearly it didn't; isn't that correct?
```

A It says gross living area, 20 -- he gave little to no value to the guest house. It was 2180 square feet that he did the gross living space. It says, although there are two properties on the property, the guest house is 1460. He didn't give the whole value. He gave it little to no value -- actually, I'm sorry. I believe $I$ saw that on the buyer's appraisal.

Q If you divided $\$ 399,999$, which was the listed price, the appraisal price in this case actually comes in higher, doesn't it?

A Appraisals are out of my area of expertise. I can only go by what they tell me is the value of the property.

Q The appraisal came in at about $\$ 406,000$ ?
A That is what my sellers conveyed to me.
That's why $I$ told them to have an appraisal done.
Q That equals to an amount in excess of $\$ 185 \mathrm{a}$ square foot, isn't that correct, if it were 2180 square feet.

A Again, I'm not an appraiser. I would assume what you are saying is correct.

Q So would you also assume that this appraiser gave some value to the 1460 -square foot guest house?

A I assume he gave it some value.
Q To the tune of $\$ 98,000$ i is that correct?
A I would not know that. I'm not an appraiser.
May I tell you how this all came about?
Q I haven't asked that question.
A Okay.
Q And he goes through this appraisal. He has various items that he shows comparables. He shows the size. He shows photos, other items. He then at the very end shows where he got the 2180 square feet at the document that says REY 00083. And then beyond that at REY 000086 --

A Let me see what 83 is please.
Q It is an assessor's page. And then he

```
went --
```

            THE COURT: Is it an exhibit?
            MR. MOORE: At REY 00083.
            Q And then at REY 00086 he actually goes
                through measurements, doesn't he?
    A I have not seen this. But -- 86. I would assume so. That's his job.

Q And he lists square footage for the living area as 2180 square feet at the bottom?

A Correct.
Q And 1740 for the remaining square footage, right?

A This is -- I assume so, yes.
Q That's actually -- that's -- sorry. I apologize, your Honor. I misspoke. 1740 plus 440 is the total square footage of the one building?

A I'm sorry. 1740 is the total square footage and 440 is what?

Q If you add 1740, which is the certain area of the house, and then a second area, the living area of the house, is 440. So total added up is 2180. And then he has the math --

A I'm confused.
So the 2120 -- 2180 is the main house. 1740
is the guest house?
Q That's -- I misspoke. I misspoke. He breaks out the living area of the main house as 2180 square feet total. And then he shows his math to the right of that which is 1740 square feet plus 440 which totals 2180 if you add it up. Strike -- let's not look at that section anymore. I butchered that and I'll admit it.

Let's go ahead and -- he has the guest house delineated. It is on REY 000086.

A Okay. It is all cut off. That's why -- you can't see it.

THE COURT: Mine is cut off too.
BY MR. MOORE:
Q Do you see in the middle where it says the guest house has two levels. One is 20 feet by 50 feet?

A I'm sorry. Where do you see that?
Q It is on the right side.
A Okay. 20 feet by 50 feet.
Q It is the larger portion of the guest house.
A I don't know how to read this. It says 20 by
22 --
Q We will move on. Do you know who produced this document in this case?

A Who produced to the sellers?

Q Exhibit 63, after this lawsuit was filed, do you know who produced this?

A After this lawsuit was filed who produced it? I would assume the sellers.

Q And if you had produced the appraisal, that would mean that it was in your file; is that correct?

A I never had this appraisal in my file. I have never even seen this appraisal until this lawsuit.

Q Looking at the next exhibit, Exhibit 65 --

A Yes.

Q -- I'll represent to you that this has certain portions of the appraisal that was produced by the Reynoldes but excludes certain portions including the calculation of square footage items that we just reviewed.

A Okay.
Q That other items appear to be highlighted or darkened on certain pages.

A It is not -- I can't read those areas that are blacked out.

Q Do you see at the bottom JJVL 0031 to JJVL 045? 31 through JJVL 45.

A I see 31.

Q Do you see all the way through 45,

Exhibit 64?
A Yes.
Q This document was produced by your attorney in this case. Do you know that?

A He probably got it from the other attorney. He didn't get it from me.

Q Did you know it was represented as part of your file?

A No, it was not. It was never in my file.
Q Do you know why portions that we just read about the property as built is in a condition where you are unable to read it?

A I'm sorry. I don't understand what you just said.

Q Do you understand why on page three there are portions that are darkened out?

A No, I don't.
Q Do you know why there is no information related to the calculations done by this appraisal in Exhibit 64?

A No, because I have never seen this. When an appraisal is done for somebody, it is the property of the person who it is done for. For instance, when the appraisal is done for the Lindbergs to get financing for
their property, it doesn't go to other agents. They purchased it. If the Reynoldes purchased this appraisal then it was their property. It didn't come to me or Mr. Kincannon. It was their property. And the purposes for this appraisal was to determine price, because I did not believe that that property was valued -- the value that they wanted to list it for. So what I did is I recommended that they get an appraisal done, which $I$ gave them three names: Richard Lace, Jim Bailey and John Rafael. They chose the person they wanted to have the appraisal done with. And it was for purposes of value of the property only.

They had already been adamant about their square footage. So when they received this they called me up. That's why $I$ was holding the listing out. And they said the property appraised for $\$ 400,000$. So I believed them. If it did or did not, I do not know. What I told them to do is, "Fine. Leave a copy of that appraisal on your table so any potential buyer can see it sitting there." That's what I advise all my clients to do. But they never sent it to me. Q In the listing form that we looked at it is in your handwriting though, Miss Johnson. You indicate that you verified the information in the listing form
with -- from an appraisal?
A No, I got --
Q Is that a yes or no?
A Yes, from them, from the sellers.
Q Thank you.
A Appraisal, yes.
Q In this case you communicated with Brian Kincannon and you informed him that you had an appraisal; isn't that right?

A What I said is that there is an appraisal available if they had issues regarding the price.

Yes. And we would be happy to supply them -meaning the sellers when $I$ said 'we' -- if they wanted to see a copy. But they had already seen it because that was the brochure information sitting on the table when any potential buyer went and looked at the property, yes.

Q How do you know they had seen it? Did you hear Mr. -- Mr. Lindberg testify that he saw it when he went in the house because it was left on a counter?

A No, he said that he saw some fliers. I don't do fliers on my property. So the only flier that he could have seen would have been the MLS listing which he signed on or this appraisal. I don't do fliers on my property.

Q He also testified that he received -- at least the pricing information about this appraisal from his realtor; is that correct?

A Possibly. I don't represent Mr. Lindberg nor did I.

Q Let's go ahead and look at Exhibit 69 if we could. Do you see Exhibit 69 marked at the bottom JJVL 048 ?

A I do.

Q It goes from 48 to 52; is that correct?

A That is correct.

Q Look at the last page of that document, JJVL 052. Do you see that?

A Yes.

Q It is an e-mail from you?

A It is.

Q To Brian Kincannon, correct?

A Yes.

Q Dated January 4th, 2013; is that right?

A Yes.

Q I'm going to go ahead and read it.
"January 4th, 2013. Brian, I'll be your point of contact on this file for Jim Johns. The sellers have elected to counter only because the, paren, the
wall, septic -- "
A 'Well.'
Q "Well, septic, buildings and pellet stoves are all in good condition," close paren. "They have an appraisal for $\$ 400,000$ and are willing to share with the buyers. Thank you. AJ. Paren, see attached." Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q Did I read that correctly?
A Yes.
Q You attached that to the appraisal?
A $\quad$ No.
Q How did Mr. Kincannon get portions of this appraisal through this transaction?

A I would assume through the lawsuit. I did not have access to this appraisal.

Q Your e-mail references the appraisal and says see attached, does it not?

A But it doesn't say attached is the appraisal, yes. It was mentioning probably this attachment, the answer to his questions, after $I$ got a response from the seller.

Mr. Kincannon sent me an e-mail prior to them making an offer at Mr. Kincannon asking these questions
on behalf of his seller. This was in January. I contacted the seller because she is busy and she is a doctor. And this is my handwriting.

I asked him these questions. How many tanks?
He tells me one tank, 15,000. Obviously it
was 1500, not 15,000. An error on my part. We go on and answer all these questions. The attachment wee these two pages, I'm assuming. There was no appraisal ever attached to this document.

Q The document we are looking at, the one that's important for this discussion right now, JJVL 052, it says nothing about, "Here is my response to your questions about the septic," does it?

A $\quad$ No.
Q I will --
A I think you are confusing the two.
THE COURT: We'll take a break at this time.
MR. MOORE: I want to find the actual e-mail.
THE COURT: We'll take a break until 2:30.
(At this time a recess was taken.)
THE COURT: Be seated. Continue.
MR. MOORE: Thank you, your Honor.
Q Miss Johnson, just before we left we were looking at Exhibit 69 and you expressed your belief that
the information that is indicated as being attached to the e-mail we were looking at from January 4th, 2013, is information about the septic system, correct?

A No. What $I$ said is the exhibit the JJVL 049 , which they asked the questions for on the 3 rd , when I answered his e-mail on the 4th, that page was attached.

Q JJVL 049?
A Correct.
Q And so you are saying that you are providing information responsive to the request about the septic in your January 4 th e-mail that is listed at the bottom of JJVL 052?

A I'm saying that that one document is the attachment that you are probably seeing. I cannot be 100 percent positive. But $I$ would have sent it back to him with the answers. That's how that got back to him.

Q You answered issues about the septic tank the day before, did you not?

A I'm confused.
Q Look at Exhibit 70, if you would.
A Exhibit 70?
Q Yes.
A Okay.
Q The first page we have -- a fax from you
dated January 3rd, 2013?
A Uh-huh.
THE COURT: Instead of saying 'uh-huh,' you a say yes or no.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MR. MOORE:
Q And it is directed to Deann Reynolds?
A Yes.

Q And there are a number of questions about the septic system that are on page two of that exhibit, correct?

A That is correct.
Q And that was also faxed to Miss Reynolds?
A It was probably e-mailed, correct, or faxed yes. I am sorry.

Q And then the next page we have some handwriting about these issues. That is your handwriting, right?

A That is right.
Q Miss Reynolds called you and informed you of the issues; is that right?

A You mean responded to these questions?
Q Yes.
A Mr. Reynolds did.

Q You wrote down his responses?

A That is correct.

Q Go ahead and look at JJVL 110 .

A Yes.

Q In this e-mail you actually respond to all the questions outlined by my clients about the septic, about the pellet stove, about other items that are listed in this e-mail to you from January 3rd; isn't that correct?

A Yes.

Q You outline that the tank is 15,000 gallons?

It serves both houses. There is 200 plus feet of leach line. It was last cleaned out two years ago. And it is located on the west side of the house?

A That would have come from the seller, correct.

Q And you also indicated that there were items responsive about the well and propane and other items?

A That is correct.

Q And you don't have any attachment to this e-mail, do you?

A No.

Q Miss Johnson, in this case how much of a commission did you earn?

A Me? I didn't get any commission.

Q How much of a commission did JE Johns \& Associates earn?

A I would say approximately $\$ 11,000$.
Q Do you know by percentage what it is?
A Probably two-and-a-half percent.
Q And looking at 71 if we could. You have that document in front of you?

A Yes.

Q Looking at these interrogatories, these
are -- if you look at the third page of these
interrogatories, it is the loth day -- I believe that's as of January, 2018. Do you see that on the last page?

A Where it says affirmation?

Q Yes.

A Yes.

Q And it is verified by you, correct?

A That is correct.

Q And you signed this document under penalty of perjury; is that right?

A That is correct.
Q And in this document in response to interrogatory number three, you are asked to identify the commission you received as a result of this realty
transaction?

A Correct.
Q Response number three is, "I personally received no commission. J E Johns \& Associates received a 2.5 commission."

A Yes.
Q Did I read that correctly?
A Yes.

Q A 2.5 percent commission would be about $\$ 9,600$ i is that right?

A I would -- but I doubt that that's correct because that's not what the title company -- 11,500.

Q I just did math here and it shows that you -for a commission, if it were two-and-a-half percent of 385,000 it would be $\$ 9,625$. Do you have any reason to disagree with that?

A I wouldn't. But $I$ was not the broker.
Q You were -- JE Johns \& Associates was actually paid a three percent commission; is that correct?

A That is not correct.
Q Looking at Exhibit 66 -- what do you have in front of you?

A My information from my file. The offer and
acceptance, the reports. They are all in the -- in the stuff that was given to you?

Q May I see it?
A It is up to my counsel.
Commission and title instructions from the title company out of my file that they were provided.

Here is the buyer's inspection report that they got a structural inspection done prior to closing escrow. And my notes, which you would have received my notes, footnotes to myself. That's in here.

MR. MOORE: May I approach, your Honor?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. MOORE: Your Honor, there are items here I don't recognize. May I request to make copies?

THE WITNESS: I had to redo my file because Mr. Pereos wouldn't supply them to me. So those are documents that $I$ provided to him; that $I$ brought with me that $I$ could basically have.

MR. HALL: I don't object to them making a copy.

MR. MOORE: I don't know how to do this. Should $I$ keep these documents and make copies and bring back the originals tomorrow? Or -- get in touch with my staff and see if we can get them done today?

MR. HALL: If you take them out, I would like to number them.

MR. MOORE: I agree.
THE COURT: What are they?
THE WITNESS: All of those documents -- but
probably three them -- they are footnotes to me. But all
those documents are documents that are in all these that Mr. Pereos was given.

One is the offer and acceptance and the counteroffer.

One is the appraisal from Mr. Lace that I retrieved -- that $I$ received during the court process that $I$ was able to retrieve.

One is a partial appraisal from the buyer's appraiser.

One is a title report from the title company that's in here.

They are just documents that were in my files that Mr. Pereos should have given to you.

MR. MOORE: There is more than that?
THE WITNESS: The only thing that is new that's in there is a recent -- a certified market analysis so that $I$ could show you what Mr. Lindberg may have seen from his agents and to show what the value of
the property is today. That's the only thing that you would not have.

MR. MOORE: Notes and other things, your Honor.

THE WITNESS: They are just notes to myself. THE COURT: You are mumbling.

MR. MOORE: They are notes and other things.
THE COURT: I'll return them to the witness.
THE WITNESS: They are just notes to myself so I could remember things. Thank you.

BY MR. MOORE:
Q So we were asking about a commission. Isn't it accurate in this case that JE Johns \& Associates received a three percent commission?

A No. And, Mr. Moore, I was not the broker. The commission goes to the broker. Mr. Johns was the broker. It was up to him how he was -- I cannot discuss commissions with anybody. It is up to the broker to decide those commissions. It is listed in the MLS as 2.5.

Q And you signed a document in this case, verified under oath, under penalty of perjury that JE Johns \& Associates received a two-and-a-half percent commission. They received a three percent commission.

A That is not correct.
Q Let's go ahead and look at Exhibit 66. THE COURT: Isn't the ordinary, customary six percent?

THE WITNESS: Some companies offer five percent. In this case I don't know why Mr. Johns wouldn't have offered two-and-a-half, two-and-a-half. The standard commission is six percent. Sometimes if you have a seller that is purchasing another home or you -for whatever reason -- the broker, not the agent, can decide what the commission is going to be. But it goes to the brokerage not to the agent.

THE COURT: Okay. Look at that exhibit that shows 11 percent -- or six percent. $\$ 11,000$ each?

THE WITNESS: And again --
MR. MOORE: Look at the next page, Miss
Johnson. That's your signature on it?
THE WITNESS: That's actually my signature for Mr. Johns, correct.

Q You are saying your husband forged your signature?

A No. That's my signature.
Q Okay. Signed by you?
A Yes.
 AJ Johnson?

A Yes.
Q It lists your e-mail?
A That is correct.
Q An e-mail with which you have been
communicating with Mr. Kincannon?
A Both myself and Mr. Johns, yes.
Q Are you saying Mr. Johns sent some e-mails on your account?

A Yes.
Q He signed it off as AJ?
A He signed it as AJ.
Q If he did that, he would have done that with your knowledge and consent?

A He was my husband.
Q Yes or no.
A Yes.
Q So in this case JE Johns \& Associates actually earned a three percent commission, correct?

A Let me see where the commission is. It says 2.5 .

THE COURT: Where does it say 2.5?
THE WITNESS: On the listing agreement.
BY MR. MOORE:
Q Looking at Exhibit 66?
THE COURT: What's she looking at? What are you looking at?

THE WITNESS: My listing input agreement.
THE COURT: Is that an exhibit?
MR. MOORE: It is Exhibit 60 .
THE COURT: 60?
THE WITNESS: If you look on the MLS listing
it will show that each party is offered -- it will show
2.5 .
THE COURT: Commission 2.5?
THE WITNESS: Right.
THE COURT: Okay.
BY MR. MOORE:
Q But that's not what happened in this case,
right?

A No - - I don't know.

THE COURT: Exhibit 66 .

BY MR. MOORE:

Q If you would look at Exhibit 66, which you signed, it shows a commission of $\$ 11,500$, right?

A Yes, and I don't know why that would have been.

Q But you signed it?

A Yes.

Q And JE Johns was paid that amount?
A I would assume so, yes. I'll have to see the sales price.

Q 385,000 .

A Again this was a broker. I don't know what kind of deals he made with the Reynoldes. He is the broker.

Q Let's look at additional e-mails from this case. Look at Exhibit 55 in the first binder. Go ahead and look at 55.

A All of 55? All three pages?
Q Yes.

A Okay.

THE COURT: Which pages are you interested in? What's your question?

BY MR. MOORE:

Q Looking at all these documents that you have produced just now, all of these e-mails are from your e-mail account; is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q The majority of these are signed off by AJ?

A That's correct.

Q The majority of these, if not all, are sent by you?

A Probably, yes.
Q These are multiple processes?
A Yes.

Q Let's look at Exhibit 70 which is in the
second binder that you just had. Again, these are e-mails from you, faxes, e-mails from your account to Brian Kincannon; isn't that right?

A Yes.
Q Do you see any e-mails in anything that we have just looked at in either Exhibit 55 or Exhibit 70 that is from your husband's e-mail account to Brian Kincannon?

A No. Because AJ or JJ -- or AJ -- while he was out in the field, because $I$ was bedridden, so they would have come from my laptop.

Q And you were responding to the majority of Mr. Kincannon's questions?

A That's correct.
Q There are dozens of e-mails in Exhibit 70; is that not right?

A That is correct. Including Tammy Kincannon's. His wife was responding to me, as his assistant, to me, yes, off of Mr. Kincannon's e-mail address also.

Q So in responding to these e-mails you were acting as a realtor in this matter?

A I was acting as assistant to the broker, yes. Yes, I have to have a real estate license, yes.

Q You are licensed in the State of Nevada?
A I am.
Q You have taken classes related to your requirements as a realtor?

A I have.
Q And you have taken classes that indicate that you shouldn't disclose information unless you are absolutely certain about it?

A Actually, in the offer and acceptance that a buyer submits to us, if it's in our area of expertise or it if it comes from the seller we can disclose that information. If it is out of our area of expertise, as Mr. Kincannon -- as the buyer pointed out, he went to his gentleman, his architect or whoever, to get his expertise on it.

We have to comply with those contracts. So if it's out of our area of expertise, meaning if he asks questions from a seller, $I$ can ask the seller those questions and say, "Do you have any information pertinent to this?"

Is it correct? I don't know. It is coming through the seller.

But through the contract that was submitted inside these forms, which $I$ got from my file, there is an
offer and acceptance in there that was sent by the buyers to the sellers stating the terms of which they want to comply with.

In that form is all their inspections. In that form is also stating -- if $I$ may, your Honor, can $I$ read it?

THE COURT: Okay.
THE WITNESS: And $I$ believe you have a copy of this, Mr. Moore, in here.
"Any the offer, that is the buyer's offer, when they submit and say they want certain inspections done within a 21-day period, that's coming from the buyer stating to the seller that they are going to have those inspections done. Any and all correspondence or information that's a part of this transaction is in this contract." And it says verification of information.
"Any information relating to square footage, land or its use and/or improvements of the land are approximates or estimates only. And neither the seller nor the brokers involving may make any representations -the brokers involved make any representations or guarantees regarding the accuracy. Any oral or written representations by the sellers or the brokers regarding age or improvements, size or square footage and parcel
buildings or location of properties may not be accurate. Apparent boundary lines indicate such as fences, hedges, walls, barriers may not represent the true boundary lines. Brokers are not obligated to investigate the status or permits, zoning or code compliances. Buyers dissatisfied any conditions or concerns that may -may -- conditions with that of any important or critical element to the purchasers decisions. Buyer has not received or relied upon any representation by either broker or the seller with respect to the condition of the property. Buyer has not received or relied on -- buyer has for the property contained in this agreement or any attachments. The information contained it the multiple listing service, computer advertisement and feature sheets pertaining to the property are not warranted or guaranteed by the brokers. Errors and/or omissions of inputting information while uncommon or possible buyer shall be responsible for verifying and securing accuracy of pertinent information."

And then deposits of all funds shall be deemed final acceptance. In this form this buyer asked for inspections to be done.

He asked for a pest, which was done, which had a lot of issues on it. He asked for a home
inspection to be done which would have addressed his issue with the electrical. It would have addressed any of that.

He asked -- he waived his heating, his cooling. He waived -- he asked for a well. He asked for well quality, which had some issues with the quality of the water and it had some issues with the well, which was repaired by the seller. He waived his survey. The septic report he had done was given to him. However, the buyer never, ever was at any of these inspections other than the structural and the pest. He and his agent did not attend the inspections for the well, septic -- the septic or the well pumping or the water quality. They were not there.

Q Move to strike, your Honor. It is nonresponsive.

MR. HALL: I think it was responsive, your Honor. It was extensive, but it was responsive.

THE COURT: You asked her and you have taken classes that indicate that you shouldn't disclose information unless you are absolutely certain about it. And then she went on and asked if she could read it and I said go ahead. So it will stick.

BY MR. MOORE:
Q Could you answer my question?
A I'm sorry?
Q Do you take classes that indicate as a realtor that you are only supposed to disclose information not in your area of expertise if you know it for certain?

A We are only able -- to answer your question, again. We are only able to communicate within our area of expertise, not on information that is given to us by a seller.

Q You said something a moment ago that my client ordered the septic inspection in this case; is that right?

A He requested the septic inspection in his offer. The seller unfortunately -- because they have to pay for it. They will only allow them to order it. But it was a buyer's inspection.

Q So it was requested by my client, but it was not paid for by him?

A I don't know. No. It was paid for by the seller.

Q And you received a copy of that report, correct?

A At this time Mr. Johns was at the inspection. But, yes, the buyer's agent and then eventually the seller's agent would get a copy if there were any issues. Specifically for the well and septic there were issues at the site. So I believe they addressed them at the site.

Q You e-mailed that septic report to Brian Kincannon?

A I did.

Q So you later received a copy of it?
A I did.
Q And it was indicated that it was sent to your client?

A Right. It was sent to Miss Reynolds and title, yes.

Q And it also lists that it was received by JE Johns \& Associates?

A And Mr. Kincannon should have gotten a copy of it.

Q When you received this and saw that the septic only had a thousand gallons that didn't cause any red flags?

A No, it did not. Because $I$ forwarded it on to the person who wanted the report. It was Mr. Kincannon
and his buyer's report.
Q Earlier in this case your client had told you it was a 15,000-gallon tank?

A Correct. But I didn't actually see the septic report. It was sent to me by title and I forwarded it on to make sure that $M r$. Kincannon got it. I didn't actually look at the report. Because Mr. Johns was handling this.

Q It was in your file though?
A Yes.
Q And after the septic report was received and it showed the size, you didn't take any steps to try to correct any issues or any misinformation that had been provided; is that right?

A Inside the buyer's offer and acceptance under information regarding -- and you have this -- private well and septic, it specifically states, "If you are buying a home with a private well and/or septic it is the buyer's responsibility to have the system checked by a licensed professional and to verify costs associated with it. It is the buyer's advise to check with your appropriate agencies."

That is out of my area of expertise.
Q And you took no steps to correct any
misinformation that was provided about the septic?
A I forwarded it on to the buyer. I have sold properties in the past with a thousand gallon tank on a four bedroom house. So, no, it was up to the buyer to research it. He said he had property in Washoe Valley. He was familiar with septic tanks and how many they needed. He stated he had two on his of a thousand gallon tanks. It is out of my area of expertise. That's why a buyer hires professionals. I can't do appraisals. I can't walk off square footage. It is out of my area of expertise. I am not a structural home inspector.

I am not a pest inspector. I can advise these people if they were my clients.

Mr. Kincannon and Mrs. Kincannon and his mother were not my clients.

Q You would agree with me that under the statutes of Nevada you owe obligations to everybody in this transaction?

A Once I found out about it $I$ forwarded it on to Mr. Kincannon.

Q You keep wanting to answer different questions.

A Okay. I'm sorry.
Q My question is you understand that in Nevada

```
you owe obligations to everybody in this transaction?
A I do.
Q You have to disclose to everybody in this transaction information that you know?
A I did.
Q Okay. Is that a yes or no?
A Yes.
Q And you also have to disclose all information
``` that you should have known?

A I didn't know it before this inspection.
Q But you should have known. My question is you have an obligation as a realtor to disclose all information that you should have known?

A If I would have known.
Q My question, ma'am --
A Yes, yes. If I would have known, yes.
Q No. It is not if you would have known. It is that you should have known; is that right?

A It is out of my area of expertise. I had to rely on the seller.

Q Under Nevada law you are required to disclose all information that you should have known?

A Yes, you are absolutely correct.
Q I am going to review my notes, your Honor. I
may be done.
THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR. MOORE: No further questions, your Honor. THE COURT: All right.

MR. HALL: May \(I\) have just a moment, your
Honor?
THE COURT: Sure.

\section*{CROSS EXAMINATION}

BY MR. HALL:
Q I'll ask you, somewhere in these six forms that go into a real estate transaction, is there some language about wells and septic tanks in specific?

A That was the one \(I\) was explaining. This is a form that is attached to a buyer's offer. And it explains to them in this form that real estate agents are not -- we are not well people. We are not septic people. So they need to refer to people who have that area of expertise.

So if a buyer came to me and said, "I want to have a septic report -- or \(I\) want to have a septic done," I would say, "Let's call a professional. Let's get it done." I knew nothing about septics. There are houses with four bed rooms that are on a thousand gallon septic system. I have closed three of them. I'm like,
"Are they grandfathered in? What are they?"
I don't know. So when you order a well report or a septic report, you have to rely on the information that you receive from that expert. An example is when a buyer comes to me -- and, again, I was representing -- or Jim was representing the seller.

These reports are imperative because we are not the experts in these areas. We market a property to sell it. All we can rely on is the information that we get from a seller and pray to God that it's accurate.

If it's not accurate then they have to have an appraisal to get a loan, then they find the accuracy there. On the septic tank specifically, when it was done, there were no issues with the septic. The septic people never said, "There is another unit. How are you taking care of this?"

Even when the county -- Mr. Reynolds, he had all of his permits. On his Sellers of Property Disclosure Statement he said all of his permits were placed.

The county never came out and said, "Your septic was not big enough." They still gave him and approved his permits.

On the duties owed presented by the buyer and
his agent, it specifically says in here, "Advise the client to obtain advice from an expert relating to matters which are beyond the expertise of the licensee."

THE COURT: Let me ask you this. Do you have a copy of the document she is looking at?

MR. MOORE: It is the offer.
THE COURT: That's in your exhibits?
MR. MOORE: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay.
THE WITNESS: And there is also a --
THE COURT: What exhibit is that?
MR. MOORE: The offer is Exhibit 4.
THE COURT: Thank you. Any reference to any
document make sure you include the Exhibit Number, because that's the official record.

THE WITNESS: And \(I\) don't know where they are
in here. Mr. Pereos would not give me a copy of the file. So I don't know where they are.

THE COURT: It is Exhibit 4.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE COURT: Are you finished with that
question? I wanted to make sure that this is an exhibit that's here.

THE WITNESS: There are like four exhibits.

MR. HALL: I'm not hearing what's going on here. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Are you finished with that
question?
MR. HALL: No. I wanted to ask an additional
question.
Q Is it also not true that there is a statute in the State of Nevada that provides that real estate agents or brokers are not to conduct inspections of the condition of the property?

A There is. And it is also in our professional and ethical things. We are not allowed. It is under Article 11 of ours. We are not allowed to go out of our area of expertise.

Our job is to market. We use the marketing tools of a C M A, certified market analysis, or profile, which I have, to market the property. The information that we receive is strictly from an appraiser once it gets appraised or any inspections a buyer has or from the seller because they know their property better than \(I\).

So \(I\) can sit there and fight with the seller
all day long and say, "You are wrong."
But I don't know the square footage. In the old days the brokers used to be able to do -- they used
to be able to measure the square footage. They no longer allow you to do that. You can't go out and measure where -- it is against our protocol in our industry. You can't go out and measure properties. You can't -- you have to give them environmental contact lists, which this agent did.

In fact this agent even gave the Lindbergs a copy of the listing agreement and some sort of document that they pulled up because this isn't our form and they signed off on it as a check and --

As a checklist for -- check and balance thing at the end of the transaction before it closes, the escrow officer -- and she did this in this case -- asked the buyers if they received these documents, if they read them and accepted them.

And they initialled on every page. On the well, the septic, the structural report, the pest report the certificate for the wood stove, they said yeah. And she said, "Are you ready to close? Bring your funds to the able."

MR. HALL: I think that's all the questions \(I\) have, your Honor.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. MOORE:
Q Looking at Exhibit 4 I think it is in front of you -- and you read a bunch of waiver items --

A Excuse me. Let me pull up Exhibit 4.
Q Does this offer that you looked at and the waiver provisions that you just read at length waive any damages arising from a failure to disclose information that is known to a realtor?

A Under -- that is known to a realtor?
Q Yes.
A It says it holds us -- only the verbiage that I explained to you; that we are not held responsible for any of this.

Q Now, does it -- and you can answer my question.

A I'm not a lawyer.
Q Or you can continue to answer your own.
A I don't know.
Q Does the offer waive damages arising from a failure to disclose information that is known to a realtor?

A I don't believe there is a waiver in here.
Q What about Exhibit 3, the counteroffer, does that include any such language?

A No. Not that I --
Q The offer is one page?
A But you asked me to look at the offer also. So I would like to refer to it if \(I\) may.

All it says is, "The real estate broker is qualified to advise on real estate. The parties are advised to consult with appropriate professionals, including engineers, appraisers, lawyers, CPA's or others before finalizing this deal." So, no.

Q So your previous answer stands?
A It is no. It doesn't say anything about damages.

Q Does the offer waive damages arising from a failure to disclose information that a realtor should have known?

A Again, no. Not that \(I\) know.
Q What about the counteroffer in Exhibit 3?
A It wouldn't be in the counteroffer.
Q My client obtained appropriate inspections in this case, right?

A By his agent, with his agent, yes.
Q None of those disclosed that the square footage was incorrectly listed, right?

A Actually, not -- correct. This is a document
that \(I\) believe came from your file, which is not my document, that was pulled by either Mr. Lindberg or his agent where he was aware of the fact that the main house was 2880 and then he signed off on the difference of the 3880 on both of these pages on Mr. Johns's listing. That came from your file.

Q This isn't my client that signed the listing
in this case?
THE COURT: Counsel, which document?
MR. MOORE: I apologize, your Honor. I believe it is Exhibit 6 .

THE COURT: So whatever she was talking about, these documents, that's Exhibit 6?

MR. MOORE: I believe so.
THE COURT: Okay.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: Make sure.
MR. MOORE: I will.
THE COURT: It needs to be on the record.
THE WITNESS: One of those documents are not in Exhibit 6 because \(I\) don't know why.

BY MR. MOORE:
Q The first two pages are Exhibit 6. I don't recognize the third document. It is possible that it is
in our file. But all it is, it shows living area, 2180, acreage, single family. L D S and it is signed by my clients?

THE COURT: By whom?
MR. MOORE: By my clients, both of them.
Q That document right there doesn't waive any rights, does it?

A It is part of their due diligence. I don't think so. I don't know.

Q Is there anything in any of these three documents that would waive any rights that you see?

MR. HALL: Your Honor, I object. I think that's a legal question.

THE COURT: What's that? It is not necessarily objectionable. It is obvious what you are asking.

But my concern is that document that your client signed, if that's not in there. That should be in there. Do you want it in?

MR. MOORE: The third document?
THE COURT: The third document.
MR. HALL: Yes.
THE COURT: Sure. Why don't we have that marked. Whatever it is.

MR. MOORE: We could go 77. Next in order.
THE CLERK: That's correct. Exhibit 77.
THE COURT: Have that marked 77 and we'll put
that in.
BY MR. MOORE:
Q So getting back to my question, is there
anything disclosed to my client that showed that the square footage was anything other than 3880 square feet?

A His appraisal and that document that you just put in on 77 that was attached to his offer.

Q I am not sure about their appraisal.
MR. HALL: I have nothing further.
THE COURT: Ma'am, you may step down.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MR. MOORE: Your Honor, I anticipated that we would go a little longer today. So my next two witnesses are scheduled for tomorrow. I believe they will be short.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. MOORE: I hope to be done by noon. If not
a little afternoon.
THE COURT: Fair enough. Mr. Hall.
MR. HALL: I will welcome an early close. I was up until three o'clock this morning to get everything
done.
THE COURT: So we'll take an adjournment until -- tomorrow \(I\) have the criminal calendar.

MR. MOORE: Should we starts at 10:30 again?
THE CLERK: Your Honor, we have approximately
12 hearings tomorrow.
THE COURT: There are eight sentencings.
MR. MOORE: Do you want to start at 1:00?
THE COURT: Why don't we do that.
THE CLERK: One o'clock tomorrow.
```

(At this time the foregoing proceedings concluded.)

```

STATE OF NEVADA )

COUNTY OF WASHOE )

I, Joan Marie Dotson, Certified Shorthand Reporter of the Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, in and for the County of washoe, do hereby certify:

That \(I\) was present in Department No. 3 of the above-entitled Court and took stenotype notes of the proceedings entitled herein, and thereafter transcribed the same into typewriting as herein appears;

That the foregoing transcript is a full, true and correct transcription of my stenotype notes of said proceedings.

DATED: At Reno, Nevada, this 8th of April, 2019.
\(\qquad\)
/s/ Joan Marie Dotson

Joan Marie Dotson, CSR No. 102
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \# & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\$ 99_{[1]}-13: 22
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 12 [3] - 41:2, 41:3, } \\
& \text { 152:6 } \\
& \text { 12th }[1]-96: 9 \\
& \text { 13 } 3]-41: 8,41: 11, \\
& \text { 42:24 }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{2 0 0}[1]-121: 12 \\
& \mathbf{2 0 1 0}[1]-71: 1 \\
& \mathbf{2 0 1 2}[16]-6: 15,6: 21, \\
& 16: 11,17: 7,86: 5, \\
& \text { 87:8, 90:6, 91:14, }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{2 7 2 2 9}[1]-102: 15 \\
& \text { 2880 } 1]-149: 4 \\
& \text { 28th }[4]-19: 17,86: 6, \\
& 87: 9,97: 8 \\
& 29[3]-53: 21,54: 17
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline \#102 [1] - 1:22 & & & & \\
\hline \$ & & & & \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \$ 1,200[2]-48: 16, \\
& 54: 22
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { '17 [2] - 66:9, 66:10 } \\
& \text { 'believe [1] - 68:2 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 138.33[4]-107: 23, \\
& 108: 1,108: 2,108: 5
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 91:23, 95:4, 96:8, } \\
\text { 96:10, 97:24, 98:18 } \\
2013[11]-19: 17,28: 4,
\end{gathered}
\] & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 8 3 0}\)
\(\mathbf{\$ 1 0 , 0 0 0}-46: 6\)
[1] & 'that [1] - 6:18 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 14[3]-42: 12,42: 13, \\
& 42: 20
\end{aligned}
\] & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
68:18, 86:6, 87:9, 97:7, 97:8, 116:19, \\
116:22, 119:2, 120:1
\end{tabular}} & \\
\hline \$100,000 [1]-10:23 & \begin{tabular}{l}
'uh [1] - 120:3 \\
'uh-huh [1] - 120:3
\end{tabular} & \[
1^{1400}[1]-77: 17
\] & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
3[12]-1: 13,24: 7, \\
25: 4,27: 23,28: 2,
\end{gathered}
\]} \\
\hline \(\$ 11,000\)
\(127 \cdot 14\) & 'we' [1] - 115:13 & 142[1] - 3:6 & \[
2014[1]-45: 19
\] & \\
\hline 127:14
\(\mathbf{\$ 1 1 , 5 0 0}{ }_{[1]}-130: 16\) & 'well [1] - 117:2 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1460[3]-77: 2 \\
107: 5,108: 1
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 2015[4]-51: 6,55: 16, \\
& 62: 24
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 28:3, 34:1, 72:8, } \\
& \text { 86:22, 147:23, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \$12,000 [1] - 63:6 & / & 1460-square [1] 109:10 & & \[
\text { 148:17, } 153: 8
\] \\
\hline \(\mathbf{\$ 1 2 0 , 0 0 0}[1]-11: 5\)
\(\mathbf{\$ 1 5 , 0 0 0}[3]-10: 22\), & /s [1] - 153:18 & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 147[1]-3: 6 \\
& 15[6]-3: 5,7: 15, \\
& 10: 23,24: 17,43: 4, \\
& 43: 5
\end{aligned}
\]} & \[
57: 22,62: 11,63: 1 \text {, }
\]
63:12, 85:8, 85:9, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3,640[1]-6: 13 \\
& 3,880[3]-6: 14,6: 20,
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 63:7, 74:15
\(\mathbf{\$ 1 5 0 , 0 0 0}{ }^{[1]}\) - \(37: 14\) & 0 & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 63: 12,85: 8,85: 9, \\
& 85: 10
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3,880[3]-6: 14,6: 20, \\
& 6: 22
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \$160,000 [1] - 11:6
\(\$ 185[1]-109: 4\) & 000003 [1] - 90:22 & & & \begin{tabular}{l}
30 [3] - 54:15, 55:4 \\
301,559.40 [1] - 108:6
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \$185 [1] - 109:4
\(\mathbf{\$ 2 1 2 9 . 2 3}[1]-58: 7\) & \[
00003_{[1]}-91: 1
\]
\[
00004[11-93: 1
\] & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 15,000{ }_{[7]}-12: 21, \\
& 31: 5,34: 3,34: 8, \\
& 118: 5,118: 6,121: 11
\end{aligned}
\]} & 66:12, 68:13, 85:6, 85:13 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 301,559.40[1]-108: 6 \\
& 31[4]-56: 10,56: 12,
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \$22,760[1]-14:8 & \(00004[1]-93: 1\)
000070 [1] - 106:20 & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{2018[4]-1.19, 4.1,
85:17, 122:13} & 112:22, 112:23 \\
\hline \$23,000[1] - 14:9 & \[
000086 \text { [2] - 109:22, }
\] & 15,000-gallon [5] - & & \(32[2]-57: 4\) \\
\hline \$27,000[2]-9:1, 11:3 & 111:9 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 7: 15,20: 20,33: 17, \\
& 33: 19,139: 3
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 2_{2019}^{[1]}-153: 16 \\
& 20 T H[2]-1: 19, ~ 4: 1
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 33_{[2]}-57: 13 \\
& 3329[1]-54: 18
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline \$375 [1] - 74:5 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\(00027{ }^{[1]}\) - 103:17} & & & \\
\hline \$385,000 \({ }_{[1]}\) - 74:5 & & 15-1410 [1] - 58:15 & 21 [7]-47:14, 47:15, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 34[1]-58: 4 \\
& 35[3]-58: 11,58: 20,
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline \$399,900 [1] - 88:6 & 00083[1]-90:15 \({ }^{\text {[2] }}\)-109:21, & \(1500[1]\) - 118:6 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 90: 6,91: 14,95: 4, \\
& 95: 18,95: 19
\end{aligned}
\] & \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \$ 399,999[2]-98: 8, \\
& 108: 19
\end{aligned}
\] & 110:3 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
45: 7
\]} & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 95:18, 95:19 } \\
\text { 21-day [1] }-134: 12
\end{gathered}
\] & 35 [3] - 58:11, 58:20, 58:22 \\
\hline \$4,500 [1] - 44:3 & 00086 [1] - 110:4 & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 21-day }[1]-134: 12 \\
& \text { 2100 }{ }_{[1]}-108: 2
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 352[2]-95: 18,96: 10 \\
& 36[2]-59: 7
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \$40,000 [1] - 11:4 & 0019 [1]-45:24 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 17[7]-45: 10,45: 21 \\
& 45: 24,46: 9,105: 8 \\
& 105: 14
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{2 1 0 0}[1]-108: 2 \\
& \mathbf{2 1 0 8}{ }_{[1]}-99: 23
\end{aligned}
\]} & \(36[2]-59: 7\)
\(3640[3]-76: 14,77 \cdot 5\) \\
\hline \$400,000 [6]-27:5, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{0 0 2}[1]-46: 10 \\
& \mathbf{0 0 2 1}[1]-46: 19
\end{aligned}
\] & & & 77:11 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 74:4, 74:9, 114:16, } \\
& \text { 117:5 }
\end{aligned}
\] & 0031[1] - 112:21 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 105:14 } \\
& 1700[8]-93: 10,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 2120_{[1]}-110: 24 \\
& 2129[2]-54: 18,54: 19
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 375 \text { [3] - 24:22, 24:23, } \\
& 27: 18
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \$406,000 [1] - 109:1 & 004[1] - 103:15 & 98:11, 98:19, 99:15,
100:1, 100:23 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 2129[2]-54: 18,54: 19 \\
& 2160_{[1]}-104: 10
\end{aligned}
\] & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
38[2]-59: 15,59: 17
\]
\[
385[4]-25: 3,25: 10
\]} \\
\hline \$417.69 [1] - 57:8 & 0042[1] - 51:23 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 100:1, 100:23, } \\
& \text { 101:22, 105:14 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 2180[27]-77: 20, \\
& 77: 22,82: 3,90: 21,
\end{aligned}
\] & \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \$ 5,000[3]-44: 1,45: 4, \\
& 61: 20
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
048{ }_{[1]}-116: 8
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
1740[7]-98: 23 \\
110: 11,110: 15
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
93: 8,95: 8,96: 5,
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 385[4]-25: 3,25: 10, \\
& 26: 3,27: 19
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \$5,095.77 [1] - 48:17 & \[
049 \text { [2] - 119:4, 119:7 }
\] & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 110:17, 110:19, } \\
& \text { 110:24, 111:5 }
\end{aligned}
\]} & 96:12, 98:11, 98:18,
99:12, 100:23, & \[
\begin{gathered}
385,000[3]-73: 13 \\
123: 15,130: 24
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline \$50,000 [5] - 10:2, & \[
052 \text { [3] - 116:13, }
\] & & \multirow[b]{6}{*}{101:14, 101:21, 102:12, 105:8, 106:23, 108:5, 108:14, 109:5, 109:20, 110:9, 110:21, 110:24, 111:3, 111:5, 150:1} & \[
388\left[{ }_{[1]}-95: 22\right.
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 10: 20,37: 13,38: 4, \\
& 61: 19
\end{aligned}
\] & 09's [1]-51:19 & \multirow[t]{7}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 18 }{ }_{[5]}-45: 22,46: 23, \\
& \text { 46:24, 47:19, 64:3 } \\
& \text { 18-month }[1]-64: 3 \\
& \text { 18th }[1]-51: 6 \\
& \text { 1992 }{ }_{[1]}-53: 4 \\
& \text { 1:00 }{ }_{[1]}-152: 8 \\
& \text { 1st }[4]-57: 22,86: 5, \\
& 87: 8,96: 10
\end{aligned}
\]} & & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 3880[13]-23: 11, \\
& 76: 14,77: 13,81: 21, \\
& 90: 20,91: 2,93: 11, \\
& 94: 24,95: 5,96: 2, \\
& 96: 10,149: 5,151: 8
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline \$550 [1] - 59:23
\(\$ 6,000\) [1] - 45:4 & 1 & & & \\
\hline \$6,000 [1] - 4 : & & & & \\
\hline \$6,500 [1] - 59:23 & 1 [2]-19:1, 72:8 & & & \\
\hline \$7,000 [2]-31:11, & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{|l|l}
1,000 & {\([1]-34: 8\)} \\
\(1,000-\) gallon & \(1]-00[1]-152: 8\) \\
\(30: 10\) & 1st \([4]-57: 22,86: 5\), \\
\(1: 12\) & \(87: 8,96: 10\)
\end{tabular}} & & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\(39[1]-60: 4\)
\(399,000{ }_{[1]}-108: 3\)} \\
\hline 34:10 & & & 2188[1] - 94:19 & \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \$ 7,050[2]-60: 12, \\
& 60: 13
\end{aligned}
\] & & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 21st [3] - 91:23, 97:24, } \\
& 98: 18
\end{aligned}
\] & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 399,999[1]-91: 18 \\
& 3: 52[2]-91: 16,95: 4 \\
& 3 \text { rd }[3]-119: 5,120: 1, \\
& 121: 8
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline \$7,500[1] - 13:8 & \[
1.12[3]-23: 17,88: 18,
\] & 2 & 22 [3] - 48:10, 106:15, & \\
\hline \$700 [2] - 30:12, 34:11
\(\mathbf{\$ 8 , 5 0 0}[2]-59: 4\), & \[
\begin{gathered}
10[5]-36: 24,38: 7, \\
38: 15,39: 3,39: 10
\end{gathered}
\] & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\mathbf{2}[11]-21: 3,21: 22, \\
22: 15,22: 23,81: 6,
\end{gathered}
\]} & \(23^{[2]}-57: 8,106: 15\) & \\
\hline 60:17 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 100_{[2]}-10: 7,119: 15 \\
& 102[1]-153: 19
\end{aligned}
\]} & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 24[3]-49: 3,49: 17, \\
& 49: 24
\end{aligned}
\]} & \\
\hline \$80,000 [1] - 39:9 & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 81:18, 81:20, 87:24, } \\
& \text { 89:17, 89:20, } 92: 8
\end{aligned}
\] & & \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
4[8]-24: 8,24: 9,34: 2, \\
90: 16,144: 12, \\
144: 19,147: 2,147: 4 \\
4,000[4]-11: 16, \\
11: 18,11: 21,11: 23 \\
40[4]-30: 20,60: 21, \\
61: 6,61: 9
\end{gathered}
\]} \\
\hline \$9,600 [1] - 123:10 & 10:30 [2] - 1:19, 152:4 & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 2.5[7]-123: 5,123: 9, \\
& \text { 126:20, 129:16, } \\
& \text { 129:17, 130:5, 130:6 }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
240[2]-9: 11,77: 14 \\
25[5]-50: 3,50: 7, \\
51: 5,52: 21,52: 23
\end{gathered}
\]} & \\
\hline \$9,625 [1] - 123:15 & 10th [1] - 122:12 & & & \\
\hline \$90 [2] - 47:11, 47:17
\(\mathbf{\$ 9 0 , 0 0 0}\) [1] - 39:10 & 11 [5] - 37:2, 37:3, & & \[
51: 5,52: 21,52: 23
\] & \\
\hline \$90,000 [1] - 39:10
\(\$ 934[3]-41: 5,42: 21\), & 39:6, 127:14, 145:13 & & \begin{tabular}{l}
26[3]-52:24, 53:7 \\
27 [6]-53:6, 53:10
\end{tabular} & \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \$ 934 \text { [3] - 41:5, 42:21, } \\
& 42: 23
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 11,500{ }_{[1]}-123: 12 \\
& 110[1]-121: 3
\end{aligned}
\] & 108:12, 111:15, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 27[6]-53: 6,53: 10, \\
& 53: 11,53: 12,100: 15
\end{aligned}
\] & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 4185 [1] - 1:1 & 7 & \[
52: 12,52: 14,89: 10
\] & age [1] - 134:2 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 57:11, 58:6, 59:20, } \\
& 60: 9,63: 4,82: 2,
\end{aligned}
\]
109:4, 130:21} \\
\hline 42[2]-41.15, 41 & & & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 440 \\
& 110: 18], 110: 15, \\
& 111: 5
\end{aligned}
\]} & \[
7 \text { [4]-29:13, 29:17, }
\] & 55:2 & agenda [2] - 54:16 & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { amounts [5] - } 8: 23, \\
9: 3,45: 5,45: 7,
\end{gathered}
\]} \\
\hline & & according \([1]-8: 22\) & 55.5 & \\
\hline & & ac & a & \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
45[4]-62: 5,62: 8 \\
112: 22,112: 24
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
132: 6,132: 15
\] & 129:4, 131:15, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 31: 18,82: 12,82: 18 \\
& 84: 1,88: 1,92: 13
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 46: 21 \\
& \text { analysis [2] - 125:23, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 46 [3] - 62:18, 62:19, & 71 [1] - 122:7 & 132:2, 132: & 104 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{145:16} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
48[4]-64: 11,64: 12
\]} & 72 [2]-86:15, 86:2 & accuracy [3] - 134:22, & 27:10, 127:12 & \\
\hline & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
77[4]-151: 1,151: 2, \\
151: 3,151: 10
\end{gathered}
\]} & 135:18, 143:12 & 8:3, 128:6 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
angry [1] - 43:24 \\
annexed [1] - 63:15
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
48[4]-64: 11,64: 12, \\
78: 18,116: 10
\end{gathered}
\] & & accurate [6]-76:4 & :19, 136:11 & \\
\hline 4th [6]-28:4, 116:19, & 79 [1]-3:5 & 76:7, 126:13, 135:1, & 138:2, 138:3, 144:1 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { answer [10]-14:15, } \\
\text { 105:4, 117:21, }
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 116:22, 119:2, } \\
& 119: 6,119: 11
\end{aligned}
\] & 8 & acknowledge [1] - 5:2 & 48:21, 149:3 & 118:7, 137:2, 137:8, \\
\hline & \(8[4]-29: 12,29: 13\),
29:17, 29.18 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { acquaintance }[1] \text { - } \\
& 17: 12
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { agents [5] - 4:21, } \\
114: 1,125: 24,
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 140:21, 147:14, } \\
\text { 147:17, 148:10 } \\
\text { answered [2]-119:6, }
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline 50 [6]-65:5, 65:6, & 80 [1] - 3:6 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { acreage }[3]-23: 17, \\
91: 7,150: 2
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\text { ago }[4]-4: 14,68: 16,
\] & 119:17 \\
\hline 111:18 & \[
85 \text { [1] - 30:10 }
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { acres }[3]-23: 17 \\
88: 18,91: 7
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
121: 14,137: 12 \\
\text { agree }[4]-44: 3,
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { answers [2]-102:23, } \\
& \text { 119:16 }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 52 [1]-116:10 & \[
86[1]-110: 6
\] & \[
\text { act }[3]-5: 4,5: 5,5: 7
\] & 105:15, 125:3 & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { anticipated }[1] \text { - } \\
& 151: 15
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{r}
54[5]-89: 13,89: 16 \\
89: 21,90: 9,98: 18
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
89[4]-106: 7,106: 8, \\
106: 9,106: 16
\end{gathered}
\] & acted [1] - 82:16 & 140:16 & \\
\hline \[
55[4]-131: 5,131: 6,
\] & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{8th [1] - 153:15} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { acting }[3]-97: 9, \\
& 132: 22,132: 23 \\
& \text { action }[1]-79: 2 \\
& \text { actual }[5]-7: 17,88: 9, \\
& 91: 9,105: 6,118: 18
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { agreement }[5]-104: 4, \\
& 129: 18,129: 23,
\end{aligned}
\]} & \\
\hline 131:7, 132:6 & & & & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { apologize }[3]-86: 18, \\
110: 15,149: 10
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline 552 [1] - 95:20 & 9 & & ahead [29] - 19: & appear [1] - 112:17 \\
\hline & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 9[4]-29: 13,29: 17, \\
& 29: 18,32: 7
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
91: 9,105: 6,118: 18 \\
\text { adamant }[1]-114: 13
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 22: 7,22: 8,24: 7, \\
& 25: 19,27: 22,33: 3
\end{aligned}
\] & appearances \([1]\) - 4:7 applicable [1]-7:22 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\hline 6[11]-22: 8,22: 10, \\
22: 23,23: 6,23: 8, \\
23: 10,106: 6, \\
149: 11,149: 13, \\
149: 21,149: 23
\end{gathered}
\]} & 90's [2] - 40:13, 45:20 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { add }[4]-44: 2,98: 23 \\
110: 19,111: 6
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
50: 3,61: 6,64: 9
\] & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{application [4] -} \\
\hline & 934 [1] - 49:1 & \begin{tabular}{l}
110:19, 111:6 \\
added [2] -98:15
\end{tabular} & 64:11, 79:10, 87:2, & \\
\hline & 94-175996-3555 [1] & 110:21 & 90:17, 97:1, 101:12, & \[
50: 5
\] \\
\hline & 9750 [1] - 59:22 & \begin{tabular}{l}
additional [6] - 9:1, \\
46.12, \(76.22,76.23\)
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 107:21, 111:8, } \\
& \text { 116:6, 116:21, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { applied }[2]-70: 18, \\
& 70: 19
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
60 \text { [9] - 97:2, 97:4, }
\] & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 46: 12,76: 22,76: 23, \\
& 131: 4,145: 5
\end{aligned}
\]} & 121:3, 127:2, 128:7, & \[
\text { apply [2] - 48:7, } 73: 5
\] \\
\hline 97:13, 100:14, & & & 131:6, 136:23, 142:2 & appointed [2] - 63:14 \\
\hline \[
128: 19,130: 1,130: 2
\] & \[
\text { A.M }{ }_{[1]}-1: 19
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { additions }[1]-12: 9 \\
& \text { address }[1]-132: 20 \\
& \text { addressed }[4]-51: 10 \text {, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\mathbf{A J}_{[7]}-117: 6,128: 20,
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
appointed [2]-63:14 \\
appraisal [65] - 6:8,
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \[
600 \text { [11] - 98:12, 98:13, }
\] & \[
45: 20,76: 16
\] & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 129:6, 129:7, } \\
& \text { 131:17. 132:9 }
\end{aligned}
\] & 6:23, 7:1, 7:3, 26:19,
\[
26: 21,26: 24,27: 7
\] \\
\hline 98:15, 98:24, 99:17, & abatement [2] - 13:24, & adds [2] - 44:2, 93:11 & al [1] - 4: & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
27:9, 73:20, 73:21, \\
74:1, 74:4, 74:8,
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline 104:10, 105:9, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{able [10]-95:} & adjournment [1] - & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{alleged [2] - 14:23} & \\
\hline \[
105: 14
\] & & 152:2 & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 74: 1,74: 4,74: 8 \\
& 74: 14,74: 17,75: 4
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{600-square-foot [1] -} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 95: 23,96: 13, \\
& 105: 12,125: 13
\end{aligned}
\]} &  & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { allow [5] - 8:15, 9:8, } \\
& 52: 7,137: 17,146: 2
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{96:20, 96:23, 99:21,} \\
\hline & & admitted [3]-21:7, & & \\
\hline 6200 [1] - 55:1 & 137:8, 137:9, & 29:12, 29:23 & allowed [2] - 145:12, & 102:6, 105:1,
\[
106 \cdot 15 \quad 107 \cdot 7
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 63 \text { [3] - 105:21, } \\
& 106: 19 \quad 112: 1
\end{aligned}
\] & 146:20 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { advertisement [1] } \\
& \text { 135:14 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{145:13} & 107:10, 108:9, \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 106:19, 112:1 } \\
64 \text { 21-113•1 113•20 }
\end{gathered}
\] & above-entitled [1] - & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{advice [1] - 144:2} & & 108:18, 108:20, \\
\hline \[
64[2]-113: 1,113: 20
\]
\[
645[1]-11: 10
\] & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
153:9 \\
absolutely [5] - 36:23,
\end{tabular}} & & \[
52: 1
\] & 109:1, 109:3, \\
\hline \[
65[1]-112: 9
\] & & 9:21, 140:12 & almost [1] - 92:7 & 109:17, 112:5, \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
66 \text { [5] - 123:22, 127:2, } \\
\text { 129:20, 130:13, }
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 86:12, 133:8, } \\
& 136: 21,141: 23
\end{aligned}
\]} & 144:1, 148:6 & alternatives [1] - & 112:7, 112:8, \\
\hline & & advised [1] - 148: & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
\[
14: 21
\] \\
ambiguous [1]-14:19
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 112:12, 113:19, } \\
& \text { 113:22, 113:24 }
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline & accept [1] - 74:13 & affect [2] - 71:23, & & \\
\hline 67 [1] - 106:16 & acceptance [6] - & 72:23 & \begin{tabular}{l}
ambiguous [1] - 14:19 \\
amenities [1] - 102:24
\end{tabular} & 114:2, 114:5, 114:8, \\
\hline \multirow[t]{7}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 68[3]-3: 5,103: 9, \\
& 103: 11 \\
& 69[3]-116: 6,116: 7, \\
& 118: 24
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{7}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 124:1, 125:9, 133:9, } \\
& \text { 134:1, 135:21, } \\
& \text { 139:15 } \\
& \text { accepted }[1]-146: 15 \\
& \text { accepting }[1]-28: 8 \\
& \text { access }[1]-117: 16 \\
& \text { accessory }[4]-48: 5,
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{7}{*}{```
affected [1] - 30:21
affirmation [1] -
    122:14
affirmative) [1] -
    102:21
afternoon [3] - 81:4,
    81:5, 151:21
```} & \multirow[t]{7}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Amina [1] - 81:12 } \\
& \text { AMINA [3] - 3:6, } \\
& 80: 14,81: 12 \\
& \text { amount }[18]-6: 20, \\
& \text { 10:4, 14:3, 14:7, } \\
& \text { 43:22, 43:23, 44:5, } \\
& \text { 54:13, 54:18, 54:22, }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{7}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 114:11, 114:19, } \\
& \text { 115:1, 115:6, 115:8, } \\
& \text { 115:10, 115:23, } \\
& \text { 116:2, 117:5, } \\
& \text { 117:11, 117:14, } \\
& \text { 117:16, 117:17, } \\
& \text { 117:19, 118:8, }
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline ```
    125:11, 125:14,
    143:12, 151:9,
    151:11
appraisals [4] - 73:11,
    73:17, 108:22, 140:9
appraised [8]-26:8,
    26:10, 26:12, 26:15,
    26:18, 27:5, 114:16,
    145:19
appraiser [10]-76:21,
    94:14, 100:3,
    100:16, 107:19,
    109:7, 109:9,
    109:13, 125:15,
    145:18
appraisers [1] - 148:8
approach [3]-18:21,
    86:18, 124:11
appropriate [10] -
    12:13, 12:17, 32:19,
    32:22, 34:19, 40:4,
    63:15, 139:22,
    148:7, 148:19
approval [5] - 43:21,
    52:9, 57:21, 57:23,
    83:16
approve [1] - 36:21
approved [2]-41:1,
    143:23
approving \({ }_{[1]}-57: 16\)
approximate \({ }_{[1]}\) - 82:2
approximates \([1]\) -
    134:19
April [1] - 153:15
arbitration [2]-63:16,
    63:17
arbitrator [2]-63:14,
    63:15
architect [6] - 40:5,
    44:12, 44:22, 45:2,
    64:16, 133:14
architects [1] - 42:10
architectural [3]-9:6,
    44:11, 78:11
area [28]-17:3, 17:23,
    42:7, 77:6, 89:7,
    89:9, 106:23,
    107:12, 107:14,
    108:12, 108:22,
    110:9, 110:19,
    110:20, 111:3,
    133:10, 133:12,
    133:17, 137:6,
    137:9, 139:23,
    140:8, 140:10,
    141:19, 142:17,
    145:14, 150:1
areas [3] - 75:21,
    112:19, 143:8
argue [2]-5:23, 12:5
argued [1]-10:8
``` & ```
arguing [2] - 5:19,
    63:20
argument [3]-5:21,
    11:19, 11:20
argumentative [1] -
    73:6
arising [3] - 147:7,
    147:19, 148:13
arose [1] - 78:24
Article [1] - 145:13
asserted [2]-25:16,
    25:24
assessor [14]-23:15,
    88:11, 88:16, 91:5,
    91:12, 94:10, 94:12,
    99:23, 100:5,
    100:17, 101:3,
    101:5, 101:10, 107:6
assessor's [2] - 89:8,
    109:24
assessors [1] - 99:14
assistance [2] - 36:2,
    61:14
assistant [2] - 132:19,
    132:23
associated [5] -
    11:12, 13:18, 43:2,
    61:21, 139:20
Associates [8] -
    80:21, 122:3, 123:4,
    123:18, 126:13,
    126:23, 129:13,
    138:17
assume [13]-84:13,
    84:24, 87:15,
    106:17, 108:7,
    109:7, 109:9,
    109:11, 110:7,
    110:13, 112:4,
    117:15, 130:22
assumed [1] - 51:3
assuming [3]-72:24,
    99:18, 118:8
attached [11] - 99:5,
    99:7, 117:6, 117:11,
    117:18, 117:19,
    118:9, 119:1, 119:6,
    142:14, 151:10
attachment [4] -
    117:20, 118:7,
    119:14, 121:20
attachments [1] -
    135:13
attempt [1] - 47:4
attempting [1] - 50:13
attend [3] - 40:19,
    55:19, 136:12
attended \({ }_{[1]}\) - 62:3
attention [1] - 83:12
Attorney [2]-2:5,
    2:10
``` & \begin{tabular}{l}
```

attorney [18]-5:11,
5:12, 66:3, 85:20,
86:14, 87:22, 93:19,
94:20, 95:24, 96:14,
103:20, 104:1,
104:15, 104:19,
105:18, 108:9,
113:3, 113:5
attorney's [3] - 63:20,
66:24, 84:7
attorney-client [1] -
66:3
attorney/client [3] -
5:11, 5:17, 65:15
attorneys [1] - 5:13
attract ${ }_{[1]}$ - 95:14
attracted ${ }_{[1]}$ - 17:21
audience [1] - 15:10
August [1] - 51:6
AUGUST [2]-1:19,
4:1
available [3]-32:16,
84:9, 115:11
aware [15] - 6:6, 7:20,
8:3, 17:5, 21:12,
25:11, 25:22, 26:2,
27:4, 32:12, 73:23,
74:17, 75:23, 76:21,
149:3

``` \\
back-up [1] - 64:20 \\
bad [1] - 64:7 \\
Bailey [1]-114:9 \\
balance [5] - 48:16, 48:18, 49:5, 57:9, \\
146:11 \\
Bar [1] - 64:5 \\
barn [11]-8:6, 8:9, \\
35:8, 37:21, 44:13, \\
69:6, 75:20, 77:9, \\
98:13, 99:17, 99:19 \\
barn/shed [1] - 79:21 \\
barns [1] - 107:13 \\
barriers [1] - 135:3 \\
based [2] - 73:20, \\
74:18 \\
bases [1] - 72:5 \\
basics [1] - 18:17 \\
Bates [3] - 90:14, \\
90:15, 106:3 \\
became [4]-7:20,
\[
25: 22,27: 4,53: 17
\] \\
become [2] - 17:5,
25:11 \\
bed [1] - 142:23 \\
bedridden [1] - 132:10 \\
bedroom [2]-90:12,
140:4 \\
bedrooms [5]-16:21,
\end{tabular} & ```
    16:22, 72:14, 72:15,
    90:12
begin [3]-4:17, 36:5,
    36:13
beginning [2] - 13:13,
    33:8
behalf \([7]-4: 8,4: 10\),
    15:20, 80:15, 82:19,
    84:11, 118:1
belief [2]-82:7,
    118:24
below [1] - 102:15
better [2]-60:18,
    145:20
between [6] - 7:4,
    22:24, 34:8, 65:15,
    71:15, 72:17
beyond [2]-109:21,
    144:3
big [10]-12:22, 12:23,
    13:24, 16:17, 30:6,
    34:4, 77:19, 78:6,
    143:22
bigger [2]-16:13,
    77:15
biggest \({ }_{[1]}\) - 104:5
bill \({ }_{[1]}\) - 66:2
bill-to [1] - 66:2
billings [5] - 66:18,
    66:19, 68:12, 68:13,
    68:15
binder [4]-89:14,
    97:1, 131:5, 132:1
bit \([1]-59: 5\)
black [2]-104:13,
    104:15
blacked [2]-104:11,
    112:20
Board [5] - 52:6,
    93:19, 94:21, 95:24,
    96:14
board [4] - 40:23,
    93:19, 94:22, 95:24
bonus [1] - 75:20
book [3]-86:16,
    86:17, 86:19
bottom [20]-24:17,
    46:10, 48:6, 50:10,
    51:24, 58:15, 76:15,
    90:23, 91:20, 93:23,
    97:21, 100:15,
    103:14, 106:4,
    106:19, 107:2,
    110:9, 112:21,
    116:7, 119:11
bought [2] - 54:8, 79:4
boundaries [2]-40:7,
    43:11
boundary [4]-9:6,
    40:8, 135:2, 135:3
box [3] - 17:20, 69:3,
``` & ```
    100:12
boxes [1] - 103:1
breach [2]-72:24,
    73:2
break [4]-60:24,
    67:6, 118:17, 118:19
breaks [1]-111:2
Brian [10] - 17:12,
    67:24, 73:19, 74:2,
    115:7, 116:17,
    116:22, 132:2,
    132:7, 138:7
bring [9] - 13:14,
    16:17, 16:24, 42:5,
    44:22, 56:9, 71:24,
    124:22, 146:19
brochure [1] - 115:15
Brohan [1]-63:5
Brohan's [1]-62:22
broker [18] - 73:21,
    79:2, 83:23, 83:24,
    85:1, 88:4, 123:17,
    126:15, 126:16,
    126:17, 126:18,
    127:10, 128:17,
    131:1, 131:3,
    132:23, 135:10,
    148:5
brokerage \({ }_{[1]}\) - 127:12
brokers [7] - 134:20,
    134:21, 134:23,
    135:4, 135:16,
    145:9, 145:24
brought [7]-13:1,
    13:4, 44:12, 47:3,
    51:2, 64:5, 124:17
bug [1] - 29:2
building [14] - 36:1,
    36:19, 37:14, 47:1,
    48:23, 51:9, 51:13,
    52:12, 64:23, 70:24,
    71:2, 89:10, 89:11,
    110:16
Building [2] - 37:6,
    37:16
buildings [17]-12:8,
    31:24, 36:15, 52:14,
    64:16, 69:21, 78:7,
    78:9, 78:11, 78:16,
    81:23, 82:5, 82:7,
    89:5, 117:3, 135:1
built [4] - 38:10, 52:5,
    71:6, 113:11
bunch [2] - 107:3,
    147:3
business [1] - 17:12
busy [1] - 118:2
butchered [1]-111:7
buy [5] - 13:24, 17:2,
    24:19, 30:24, 54:3
buyer [19]-14:22,
``` \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{c} 
114:20, 115:16, \\
133:10, 133:13, \\
134:12, 135:8, \\
135:11, 135:17, \\
135:21, 136:10, \\
140:2, 140:4, 140:9, \\
142:19, 143:5, \\
143:24, 145:19 \\
buyer's \([11]-108: 18\), \\
124:7, 125:14, \\
134:10, 137:18, \\
138:2, 139:1, \\
139:15, 139:19, \\
139:21, 142:14 \\
buyers [7]- 86:3, \\
87:6, 95:15, 117:6, \\
134:1, 135:5, 146:14 \\
buying [6] - 16:9, \\
18:11, 19:12, 20:10, \\
28:11, 139:18 \\
BY [49]-16:2, 21:8, \\
21:21, 25:18, 26:4, \\
26:23, 29:20, 30:1, \\
33:22, 34:23, 39:20, \\
49:16, 55:3, 58:19, \\
\(60: 20,64: 10,66: 6\), \\
\(67: 9,68: 5,68: 11\), \\
\(69: 23,70: 4,71: 12\), \\
\(73: 9,74: 12,75: 2\), \\
\(76: 2,78: 19,79: 11\), \\
\(81: 3,81: 14,84: 2\), \\
\(86: 10,90: 18,92: 6\), \\
\(101: 19,102: 14\), \\
\(111: 13,120: 6\), \\
\(126: 11,129: 19\), \\
130:9, 130:14, \\
131:12, 137:1, \\
\(142: 9,147: 1\), \\
149:22, 151:5 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
 &  & ```
    32:14, 32:15
claims [8] - 10:9,
    10:20, 10:21, 11:2,
    11:5, 11:7, 11:8,
    13:1
clarify \({ }_{[2]}\) - 69:24, 75:3
clarifying [1]-99:10
classes [4] - 133:3,
    133:6, 136:20, 137:4
clean [1] - 34:18
cleaned [2]-30:17,
    121:13
clear [2] - 39:18, 74:24
clearly [1] - 108:11
CLERK [5] - 18:20,
    81:9, 151:2, 152:5,
    152:10
client [18]-5:14, 7:10,
    11:24, 32:10, 60:18,
    66:3, 67:17, 79:1,
    100:1, 137:13,
    137:19, 138:13,
    139:2, 144:2,
    148:19, 149:7,
    150:18, 151:7
client's [3]-13:1,
    39:14, 65:16
clients [12] - 7:19,
    7:24, 8:18, 10:4,
    12:18, 83:13,
    114:21, 121:6,
    140:13, 140:15,
    150:3, 150:5
close [13] - 14:18,
    15:4, 26:7, 32:12,
    34:15, 74:1, 86:5,
    87:8, 92:23, 97:6,
    117:4, 146:19,
    151:23
closed [11] - 40:9,
    47:8, 51:19, 68:17,
    68:21, 72:11, 74:7,
    76:4, 76:12, 142:24
closer [2] - 11:4,
    59:24
closes [1] - 146:12
closing [8] - 15:3,
    22:4, 24:2, 28:13,
    28:18, 28:20, 40:16,
    124:8
Code [1] - 1:1
code [8]-9:2, 42:2,
    42:6, 56:9, 72:1,
    135:5
codes [1] - 7:23
Cohen [2]-35:21,
    61:14
combination [1] -
    69:22
coming [4]-9:13,
    28:10, 133:21,
``` & \begin{tabular}{l}
134:12 \\
comments [1]-88:22 \\
commission [23] -
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 67:11, 67:14, } \\
& \text { 121:24, 122:1, } \\
& \text { 122:2, 122:24, } \\
& \text { 123:4, 123:5, 123:9, } \\
& \text { 123:14, 123:19, } \\
& \text { 124:5, 126:12, } \\
& \text { 126:14, 126:16, } \\
& 126: 24,127: 8, \\
& 127: 11,129: 14, \\
& 129: 15,130: 6, \\
& 130: 16
\end{aligned}
\] \\
Commissioners [1] 52:6 \\
commissions [2] -
126:18, 126:19 \\
communicate [1] 137:9 \\
communicated [3] 82:19, 84:24, 115:7 \\
communicating [1] 129:1 \\
communication [1] 85:23 \\
communications [2] 65:15, 66:3 \\
commuter [1] - 100:18 \\
companies [1] - 127:5 \\
company [5] - 40:6, \\
58:24, 123:12, \\
124:6, 125:16 \\
comparables [1] -
109:18 \\
compare [1] - 75:22 \\
compensate [1] -
39:16 \\
complained [1] -
\[
51: 15
\] \\
complaining [1] 56:18 \\
Complaint [1] - 72:4 \\
complaint [3]-51:7, \\
51:9, 70:24 \\
complete [3]-57:24, 76:18, 81:11 \\
completed [3]-67:19, 73:22, 93:17 \\
compliances [1] 135:5 \\
comply [3] - 7:22, 133:16, 134:3 \\
component [1]-68:24 \\
computer [3] - 94:9, \\
100:7, 135:14 \\
concern [8] - 19:20, \\
31:20, 36:20, 43:15, \\
93:18, 95:20, 95:23, \\
150:17 \\
concerned [6] - 30:18,
\end{tabular} & ```
    33:18, 34:7, 34:18,
    72:9, 72:22
concerning [1] - 36:10
concerns [4] - 30:8,
    31:8, 35:1, 135:6
concluded [1] -
    152:13
conclusion [2]-11:3,
    73:8
condition [5] - 84:23,
    113:11, 117:4,
    135:10, 145:10
conditions [6] - 57:17,
    57:19, 58:1, 58:13,
    135:6, 135:7
conduct [1] - 145:9
conduit [1]-69:2
conforming [1] -
    107:14
confused [2]-110:23,
    119:19
confusing \({ }_{[1]}-118: 16\)
Conger [1] - 94:21
connection [1]-72:17
consent [1] - 129:9
construction [6] -
    36:22, 37:18, 38:17,
    51:4, 51:16, 61:22
consult [1]-148:7
consumers [1] - 4:19
contact [2]-116:23,
    146:5
contacted [2] - 17:14,
    118:2
contacts [1] - 62:1
contained [2] -
    135:12, 135:13
contaminated [1] -
    42:9
contingency [2] -
    62:17, 67:2
continue [3]-61:3,
    118:21, 147:17
contract [2]-133:23,
    134:16
contractor [3] - 35:19,
    35:24, 50:21
contracts [1] - 133:16
contribute [1] -
    107:14
conversations [1] -
    83:8
conversion [2]-48:7,
    53:8
convert [1] - 48:22
converted [1] - 98:24
conveyed [1] - 109:2
cooling [1] - 136:5
copies [2]-124:14,
    124:22
copy [15] - 60:2,
``` \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline ```
    73:21, 103:3, 103:7,
    114:19, 115:14,
    124:20, 134:8,
    137:23, 138:3,
    138:10, 138:18,
    144:5, 144:17, 146:8
correct [130] - 10:5,
    12:20, 22:21, 23:18,
    28:7, 32:9, 37:10,
    37:12, 47:12, 47:20,
    55:2, 57:19, 57:20,
    65:4, 65:22, 69:11,
    69:14, 69:16, 71:2,
    71:20, 72:9, 72:12,
    73:11, 73:18, 76:4,
    79:16, 79:24, 81:24,
    82:3, 82:8, 83:14,
    85:7, 88:2, 88:9,
    88:10, 88:12, 88:19,
    89:3, 89:18, 89:19,
    90:3, 90:5, 90:7,
    90:8, 91:8, 91:14,
    91:15, 91:17, 92:2,
    92:4, 92:24, 93:2,
    93:4, 93:5, 93:6,
    93:9, 93:12, 95:1,
    95:6, 95:9, 95:11,
    95:12, 96:21, 97:15,
    97:17, 97:18, 97:19,
    97:22, 97:24, 98:1,
    98:3, 98:6, 98:8,
    98:9, 98:11, 98:20,
    99:9, 99:16, 100:4,
    101:20, 101:23,
    102:13, 107:16,
    107:17, 108:6,
    108:11, 109:5,
    109:8, 109:12,
    110:10, 112:6,
    116:3, 116:10,
    116:11, 116:17,
    119:3, 119:8,
    120:11, 120:12,
    120:14, 121:2,
    121:9, 121:16,
    121:19, 122:17,
    122:18, 122:21,
    123:2, 123:11,
    123:20, 123:21,
    127:1, 127:19,
    128:15, 128:23,
    129:14, 131:15,
    131:16, 131:18,
    132:14, 132:17,
    133:21, 137:24,
    139:4, 139:13,
    139:24, 141:23,
    148:24, 151:2,
    153:13
corrections [3] - 48:1,
    48:2, 51:2
correctly [6] - 24:5,
``` &  & \begin{tabular}{l}
10:18, 10:22, 11:14, \\
12:2, 12:18, 12:21, \\
13:7, 13:9, 14:7, \\
14:10, 14:13, 15:3, \\
15:6, 15:12, 18:23, \\
21:4, 21:7, 21:15, \\
21:18, 21:20, 25:17, \\
25:20, 26:1, 26:17, \\
26:22, 29:18, 29:23, \\
32:2, 32:7, 32:10, \\
32:12, 32:23, 33:3, \\
33:13, 33:16, 34:12, \\
34:15, 39:6, 39:9, \\
39:12, 39:16, 39:19, \\
49:5, 49:7, 54:17, \\
54:20, 54:24, 58:12, \\
60:15, 60:19, 60:22, \\
61:3, 63:8, 63:10, \\
63:18, 63:23, 64:2, \\
64:6, 64:9, 65:12, \\
65:16, 65:20, 65:23, 66:5, 66:14, 66:17, 66:20, 66:23, 67:3, 67:18, 67:22, 68:1, 68:4, 68:9, 69:19, 70:2, 70:11, 70:14, 70:17, 70:19, 71:8, 73:7, 73:24, 74:6, 74:10, 74:22, 75:1, 75:16, 77:1, 77:10, 77:14, 77:19, 77:24, 78:5, 78:12, 78:15, 78:18, 79:7, 79:10, 80:4, 80:8, 81:2, 83:20, 83:23, 86:16, 90:14, 90:17, 91:19, 91:24, 92:3, 92:5, 97:6, 97:9, 100:13, 100:20, 100:24, 101:4, 101:18, 102:9, 105:8, 105:14, 106:7, 110:2, 111:12, 118:17, 118:19, 118:21, 120:3, 124:12, 125:4, 126:6, 126:8, 127:3, 127:13, 129:17, 129:21, 129:24, 130:2, 130:6, 130:8, 130:13, 131:10, \\
134:7, 136:19, \\
142:2, 142:4, 142:7, \\
144:4, 144:7, 144:9, \\
144:11, 144:13, \\
144:19, 144:21, \\
145:3, 149:9, \\
149:12, 149:15, \\
149:17, 149:19, \\
150:4, 150:14, \\
150:21, 150:23, \\
151:3, 151:13,
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
```

    151:19, 151:22,
    152:2, 152:7, 152:9
    court [5] - 10:8, 63:13,
63:14, 125:12
cover [1] - 93:23
covered [1]-51:21
cow [1] - 34:4
CPA's [1] - 148:8
create [1] - 5:4
credit [1]-41:12
credits [4] - 54:3,
54:8, 57:5, 57:9
criminal [1] - 152:3
critical ${ }_{[1]}$ - 135:7
cross [1] - 68:9
CROSS [3] - 3:3,
68:10, 142:8
CSR [2] - 1:22, 153:19
curious [2]-83:11
customary [1] - 127:3
cut [2]-111:10,
111:12 <br>
CV15-00281 [2]-1:12, 4:4

```
\begin{tabular}{c} 
D \\
\hline damage \([1]-16: 8\) \\
damaged \([1]-10: 24\), \\
damages \([10]-10: 4\), \\
10:17, 13:18, 13:20, \\
\(72: 5,73: 4,147: 7\), \\
147:19, 148:12, \\
148:13 \\
darkened \([2]-112: 18\), \\
113:16 \\
date \([9]-19: 17,28: 6\), \\
\(57: 21,66: 7,68: 14\), \\
\(91: 19,91: 21,91: 22\), \\
\(98: 2\) \\
dated \([7]-62: 10\), \\
\(62: 23,90: 6,91: 14\), \\
\(97: 23,116: 19,120: 1\) \\
DATED \([1]-153: 15\) \\
days \([2]-98: 3,145: 24\) \\
deal \([5]-35: 24,60: 18\), \\
\(74: 14,85: 3,148: 9\) \\
dealing \([3]-61: 15\), \\
\(85: 9,85: 13\) \\
deals 81\(]-131: 2\) \\
dealt \([1]-14: 18\) \\
Deann \([4]-45: 15\), \\
\(86: 3,87: 6,120: 7\) \\
deceased \([2]-80: 24\), \\
\(84: 17\) \\
December \([8]-6: 21\), \\
\(66: 9,66: 12,95: 11\), \\
\(95: 13,96: 8,96: 10\), \\
\(97: 10\) \\
decide \([2]-126: 19\), \\
\(127: 11\)
\end{tabular}
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { decided }[5]-17: 11, \\
& \text { 18:7, 18:9, 27:22, } \\
& \text { 28:11 } \\
& \text { decisions }[1]-135: 8 \\
& \text { deemed }[1]-135: 21 \\
& \text { default }[2]-80: 22, \\
& 81: 2 \\
& \text { defect }[1]-69: 18 \\
& \text { defects }[2]-69: 15, \\
& 72: 19 \\
& \text { Defendant }[2]-1: 14, \\
& 3: 9 \\
& \text { defendant }[4]-63: 18, \\
& 80: 23,86: 2,87: 22 \\
& \text { Defendants }[1]-2: 9 \\
& \text { defendants }[8]-4: 11, \\
& 6: 3,6: 6,6: 24,7: 2, \\
& 7: 7,80: 11,87: 5 \\
& \text { delineated }[1]-111: 9 \\
& \text { demand }[1]-14: 20 \\
& \text { demo }[1]-38: 16 \\
& \text { demonstrate }[2]- \\
& 6: 12,9: 13 \\
& \text { Department }[2]-55: 6, \\
& 153: 8 \\
& \text { deposits }[1]-135: 20 \\
& \text { Dept }[1]-1: 13 \\
& \text { describing }[3]-68: 20, \\
& 70: 6,71: 23 \\
& \text { description }[3]-47: 3, \\
& 48: 20,49: 23 \\
& \text { detached }[1]-48: 5 \\
& \text { determine }[4]-27: 10, \\
& 27: 12,33: 23,114: 5 \\
& \text { determining }[1]- \\
& 72: 17 \\
& \text { developers }[2]-54: 3, \\
& 54: 9 \\
& \text { died }[5]-84: 20,85: 3, \\
& 85: 6,85: 8,92: 3 \\
& \text { difference }[3]-34: 8, \\
& 92: 12,149: 4 \\
& \text { differences }[1]-92: 16 \\
& \text { different }[12]-5: 10, \\
& 10: 9,11: 10,13: 3, \\
& 17: 10,22: 16,23: 3, \\
& 23: 5,92: 19,103: 14, \\
& 140: 21 \\
& \text { difficult }[1]-104: 9 \\
& \text { dig }[2]-12: 3,12: 14 \\
& \text { digest }[1]-78: 15 \\
& \text { diligence }[1]-150: 8 \\
& \text { DIRECT }[3]-3: 3, \\
& 15: 24,80: 19 \\
& \text { direct }[1]-99: 11 \\
& \text { directed }[1]-120: 7 \\
& \text { directly }[1]-85: 4 \\
& \text { dirt }[3]-59: 3,59: 19, \\
& 59: 21 \\
& \text { disagree }[1]-123: 16 \\
& \text { disbarment }[1]-64: 4
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline  & ```
    102:17, 103:2,
    103:3, 103:6,
    103:12, 105:23,
    106:10, 106:11,
    107:22, 109:21,
    111:23, 113:3,
    116:12, 118:9,
    118:10, 119:13,
    122:8, 122:19,
    122:22, 126:21,
    144:5, 144:14,
    146:8, 148:24,
    149:2, 149:9,
    149:24, 150:6,
    150:17, 150:20,
    150:21, 151:9
documents [27] -
    6:12, 6:24, 7:12,
    13:2, 13:12, 20:13,
    20:17, 20:23, 29:3,
    29:8, 55:14, 62:6,
    84:9, 97:11, 103:20,
    104:6, 124:17,
    124:22, 125:5,
    125:7, 125:18,
    131:13, 146:14,
    149:13, 149:20,
    150:11
dollars [1] - 10:4
done [34]-7:15,
    28:21, 35:7, 48:21,
    55:23, 59:8, 69:2,
    69:18, 73:11, 76:6,
    90:4, 102:6, 109:3,
    113:19, 113:22,
    113:23, 113:24,
    114:8, 114:11,
    124:8, 124:24,
    129:8, 134:12,
    134:14, 135:22,
    135:23, 136:1,
    136:9, 142:1,
    142:21, 142:22,
    143:14, 151:20,
    152:1
door [1] - 18:6
doors [1]-51:14
dot \({ }_{[1]}\) - 107:23
Dotson [4]-1:22,
    153:4, 153:18,
    153:19
doubt \({ }_{[1]}-123: 11\)
down [12]-8:15,
    28:11, 30:22, 36:18,
    37:15, 37:21, 51:15,
    51:23, 80:5, 102:21,
    121:1, 151:13
downstairs [2]-42:7,
    77:18
dozens [1] - 132:15
drapes [1] - 102:24
drawing [1] - 64:15
``` & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { drawings [5] - 40:5, } \\
& \text { 40:24, 44:13, 45:1, } \\
& \text { 45:3 } \\
& \text { drop }[1]-40: 13 \\
& \text { drove }[2]-17: 11, \\
& \text { 17:19 } \\
& \text { due }[2]-48: 16,150: 8 \\
& \text { duly }[2]-15: 21,80: 16 \\
& \text { during }[31]-7: 3,7: 9, \\
& 14: 16,20: 12,20: 16, \\
& 22: 18,24: 1,25: 11, \\
& 25: 22,26: 9,27: 7, \\
& 28: 17,28: 19,29: 4, \\
& 29: 21,30: 24,31: 14, \\
& 32: 18,34: 24,67: 10, \\
& 71: 14,73: 1,73: 10, \\
& 77: 23,79: 1,79: 5, \\
& 79: 13,79: 18,84: 22, \\
& 86: 1,125: 12 \\
& \text { duties }[5]-5: 12,5: 13, \\
& 5: 14,5: 15,143: 24 \\
& \text { duty }[3]-72: 22,73: 1, \\
& 73: 2 \\
& \text { dwelling }[2]-48: 5, \\
& 52: 19 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & ```
electrical \({ }_{[16]}-8: 6\),
    8:10, 9:2, 35:9,
    38:23, 38:24, 42:6,
    50:14, 50:17, 51:12,
    68:22, 68:23, 69:3,
    71:5, 79:20, 136:2
electricity [3] - 35:7,
    35:10, 99:1
element [1] - 135:8
elements [1] - 13:20
empty [1] - 34:10
enacted [1] - 4:23
end [11] - 5:23, 16:22,
    39:11, 58:24, 59:4,
    61:19, 66:21, 84:18,
    101:13, 109:20,
    146:12
ended [1] - \(38: 22\)
engineers [1] - 148:8
enlarge \([4]-7: 21\),
    8:24, 9:8, 42:4
enlarged [2]-43:16,
    60:10
entered [1] - 80:22
entire [1] - 76:20
entitle [1] - 73:4
entitled [5] - 4:4,
    13:23, 64:5, 153:9,
    153:10
entity \([3]-80: 9,80: 22\),
    80:23
environmental [1] -
    146:5
equal [1] - 108:3
equals [1] - 109:4
error [2]-7:16, 118:6
errors [1] - 135:16
escrow [14]-14:16,
    14:18, 15:4, 32:13,
    34:15, 68:17, 72:11,
    74:1, 74:7, 86:6,
    87:8, 97:6, 124:9,
    146:13
essentially [3] - 63:24,
    64:4, 89:17
establish [1]-6:2
established [1]-5:3
estate [16] - 6:17,
    68:16, 70:5, 70:7,
    71:15, 73:1, 73:5,
    73:10, 79:1, 84:1,
    132:24, 142:11,
    142:15, 145:8,
    148:5, 148:6
estimate [4]-39:8,
    39:9, 58:23, 61:18
estimates [1] - 134:19
et [1] - 4:5
ethical [1] - 145:12
eventually [4]-44:14,
53:17, 60:3, 138:2
``` & ```
evidence \({ }_{[7]}-6: 2,6: 5\),
    7:10, 9:12, 11:21,
    12:15, 49:8
exact \({ }_{[1]}\) - 6:4
exactly [4]-10:19,
    38:16, 47:10, 61:24
EXAMINATION \([6]\) -
    15:24, 68:10, 79:8,
    80:19, 142:8, 146:23
examine \({ }_{[1]}\) - 68:9
examined [2]-15:22,
    80:17
example [3] - 4:19,
    4:22, 143:5
Excavating [2] - 60:5,
    60:10
excess [1] - 109:4
excludes [1] - 112:13
exclusionary [1] -
    15:9
excuse [6]-26:17,
    32:2, 33:13, 54:17,
    60:22, 147:4
exercise [2]-15:9,
    108:8
Exhibit [156] - 19:1,
    19:2, 19:6, 21:3,
    21:22, 22:8, 22:10,
    22:15, 22:23, 23:6,
    23:8, 23:10, 24:7,
    24:8, 24:9, 25:4,
    27:23, 28:2, 28:3,
    36:24, 37:2, 37:3,
    38:7, 38:15, 39:3,
    39:10, 41:2, 41:3,
    41:8, 41:11, 41:15,
    41:16, 42:12, 42:13,
    42:20, 42:24, 43:4,
    43:5, 44:7, 44:8,
    45:7, 45:10, 45:21,
    45:24, 46:9, 46:23,
    46:24, 47:14, 47:15,
    47:21, 48:10, 49:3,
    49:17, 49:24, 50:3,
    50:7, 52:21, 52:23,
    52:24, 53:6, 53:7,
    53:11, 53:21, 54:15,
    55:4, 56:10, 56:12,
    57:4, 57:8, 57:13,
    58:4, 58:11, 58:20,
    58:22, 59:7, 59:15,
    59:17, 60:4, 60:21,
    61:6, 61:9, 62:5,
    62:8, 62:18, 62:19,
    62:21, 64:11, 64:12,
    65:5, 65:6, 65:8,
    81:6, 81:18, 81:20,
    86:15, 86:22, 87:24,
    89:13, 89:17, 89:20,
    89:21, 90:9, 92:8,
    97:2, 97:4, 97:13,
98:18, 100:14,
``` \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline ```
    14:15, 15:4, 15:14,
    21:12, 25:14, 29:16,
    29:19, 67:12, 68:11,
    69:23, 70:4, 71:12,
    73:9, 74:12, 75:2,
    76:2, 78:19, 80:2,
    124:19, 125:1,
    136:17, 142:5,
    142:9, 145:1, 145:5,
    146:21, 150:12,
    150:22, 151:12,
    151:23
hall \({ }_{[1]}-151: 22\)
Hall [3]-4:10, 14:14,
    15:13
hand [2]-59:11,
    100:19
handling [1] - 139:8
handwriting [9] -
    97:16, 101:17,
    102:3, 104:3,
    114:23, 118:3,
    120:17, 120:18
happy \([1]-115: 12\)
HARRY \({ }_{[1]}-1: 13\)
Harry [4]-4:4, 45:14,
    86:2, 87:5
head [1] - 30:14
health [1]-43:15
Health [3]-41:1,
    43:20, 55:6
hear [1] - 115:18
heard \(\left.{ }^{2}\right]\) - \(36: 14,39: 7\)
hearing [1] - 145:1
hearings [2] - 40:19,
    152:6
hearsay [1]-25:14
heating [1] - 136:4
hedges [1] - 135:2
held \([4]-55: 8,55: 10\),
    98:3, 147:12
help \([8]-8: 19,8: 20\),
    13:15, 16:24, 17:13,
    35:19, 61:23, 61:24
helped [1] - 62:2
hereby \({ }_{[1]}\) - 153:7
herein [2]-153:10,
    153:11
higher [3] - 26:13,
    95:14, 108:21
highlighted [2] -
    104:17, 112:17
hills [1] - 44:17
hire [6] - 4:21, 9:13,
    13:14, 13:15, 40:5,
    40:6
hired [1] - 36:3
hires [1] - 140:9
hiring \([1]\) - 17:17
hold [4]-17:12,
    18:12, 40:1, 88:3
``` & \begin{tabular}{l}
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { holding }[1]-114: 15 \\
& \text { holds }[1]-147: 11 \\
& \text { holy }[1]-34: 3 \\
& \text { home }[9]-29: 2,31: 1, \\
& 53: 17,74: 19,76: 20, \\
& \text { 127:9, 135:24, } \\
& \text { 139:18, 140:11 } \\
& \text { homes }[2]-73: 4,93: 2 \\
& \text { honest }[1]-49: 10 \\
& \text { honestly }[2]-84: 22, \\
& \text { 104:4 } \\
& \text { Honor }[61]-4: 11, \\
& \text { 4:16, 4:18, 5:22, } \\
& 9: 12,9: 18,11: 7, \\
& \text { 12:23, 13:21, 14:3, } \\
& \text { 14:15, 15:5, 15:8, } \\
& \text { 15:16, 18:22, 21:14, } \\
& 21: 19,25: 14,32: 15, \\
& 39: 17,54: 23,58: 15, \\
& 61: 4,63: 12,65: 19, \\
& 66: 2,66: 15,66: 22, \\
& 67: 7,67: 13,68: 7, \\
& 74: 24,75: 15,77: 21, \\
& 78: 10,78: 14,79: 9, \\
& 80: 3,80: 6,80: 10, \\
& 90: 16,91: 20, \\
& 101: 15,105: 11, \\
& 106: 8,110: 15, \\
& 118: 22,124: 11, \\
& 124: 13,126: 4, \\
& 134: 5,136: 15, \\
& 136: 18,141: 24, \\
& 142: 3,142: 6, \\
& 146: 22,149: 10, \\
& 150: 12,151: 15, \\
& 152: 5
\end{aligned}
\] \\
HONORABLE \({ }_{[1]}-1: 8\) \\
hope [1] - 151:20 \\
horses [2]-16:18, 17:23 \\
hours [4]-94:17, 94:18, 95:7, 96:11 house [54]-11:15, 13:22, 13:24, 18:4, 20:10, 20:14, 24:19, 35:1, 36:18, 37:21, 40:10, 53:16, 64:22, 69:4, 69:5, 69:6, 75:20, 76:18, 77:9, 77:19, 78:3, 88:24, 93:7, 98:19, 99:6, 99:8, 99:13, 99:15, 101:14, 101:22, 102:11, 104:22, 104:23, 107:5, 107:6, 107:7, 108:10, 108:13, 108:16, 109:10, 110:20, 110:21, 110:24, 111:1, 111:3, 111:8, 111:15, 111:19,
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 115:19, 121:14, } \\
\text { 140:4, 149:3 } \\
\text { houses }[5]-77: 21, \\
77: 24,107: 13, \\
\text { 121:12, 142:23 } \\
\text { huge }[1]-92: 18 \\
\text { hundred }[1]-76: 17 \\
\text { husband }[12]-80: 24, \\
83: 22,83: 23,84: 17, \\
84: 20,84: 22,85: 1, \\
85: 3,85: 6,92: 3 \\
\text { 127:20, 129:10, } \\
\text { husband's }[1]-132: 7
\end{gathered}
\]
\begin{tabular}{l} 
| \\
\hline idea \([5]-34: 19,51: 1\), \\
\(72: 13,87: 15,105: 3\) \\
identical \([1]-92: 8\) \\
identification \([1]-\) \\
97:14 \\
identified \([4]-20: 5\), \\
\(89: 23,96: 3,104: 8\) \\
identify \([1]-122: 23\) \\
illegal \([2]-51: 15\), \\
\(51: 22\) \\
illegally \([2]-38: 10\), \\
\(71: 6\) \\
impact \([2]-53: 24\), \\
\(54: 2\) \\
imperative \([1]-143: 7\) \\
important \([3]-16: 19\), \\
118:11, \(135: 7\) \\
impression \([1]-74: 16\) \\
improper \([2]-7: 13\), \\
\(76: 23\) \\
improperly \([1]-8: 4\) \\
improved \([2]-107: 8\), \\
107:12 \\
improvement \([1]-\) \\
\(107: 13\) \\
improvements \([6]-\) \\
\(64: 21,69: 20,79: 3\), \\
\(107: 9,134: 18\), \\
\(134: 24\) \\
IN \([2]-1: 6,1: 7\) \\
in-law \([4]-88: 24\), \\
\(93: 10,93: 16,98: 16\) \\
inappropriate \([3]-1\) \\
\(32: 4,35: 5,67: 15\) \\
inappropriately \([1]-\) \\
\(31: 23\) \\
incapacitated \([1]-\) \\
\(85: 12\) \\
include \([2]-144: 14\), \\
147:24 \\
included \([1]-77: 5\) \\
including \([7]-6: 9\), \\
\(6: 24,7: 1,82: 4\), \\
\(112: 13,132: 17\), \\
148:8 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & ```
incorrect [6] - 6:22,
    34:6, 92:15, 95:16,
    98:21, 101:11
incorrectly [2] - 20:5,
    148:23
increasing \({ }_{[1]}\) - 42:17
incur [2]-37:12,
    79:15
incurred [2] - 16:8,
    37:23
incurring [2] - 37:10,
    79:3
indicate [12]-29:8,
    44:19, 48:15, 48:24,
    52:11, 57:8, 88:15,
    114:23, 133:6,
    135:2, 136:20, 137:4
indicated [6] - 48:21,
    56:2, 87:21, 119:1,
    121:17, 138:12
indicates [6] - 53:7,
    53:14, 81:21, 88:1,
    93:7, 104:22
indicating [1] - 53:18
industry [1] - 146:3
ine [1] - 31:6
info [2] - 97:14, 102:6
inform [3] - 31:22,
    50:20, 51:11
information [45] - 5:6,
    21:1, 30:23, 32:15,
    34:14, 65:19, 84:16,
    93:13, 93:15, 94:11,
    94:13, 96:18, 104:3,
    107:3, 113:18,
    114:24, 115:15,
    116:2, 119:1, 119:3,
    119:10, 123:24,
    133:7, 133:12,
    133:19, 134:15,
    134:16, 134:17,
    135:13, 135:17,
    135:19, 136:21,
    137:6, 137:10,
    139:16, 141:4,
    141:8, 141:13,
    141:22, 143:4,
    143:9, 145:17,
    147:7, 147:20,
    148:14
informed [5] - 35:11,
    51:24, 85:24, 115:8,
    120:20
initial [4]-24:23, 25:1,
    71:21, 98:2
initialled [2]-22:21,
    146:16
initials [1] - 22:13
input [5]-7:1, 94:7,
    100:6, 128:1, 129:23
inputting [1] - 135:17
``` & ```
inside [2] - 133:24,
    139:15
inspection[10] - 29:2,
    34:1, 124:7, 124:8,
    136:1, 137:13,
    137:15, 137:18,
    138:1, 141:10
inspections [13] -
    28:21, 28:24, 29:11,
    58:3, 134:4, 134:11,
    134:14, 135:22,
    136:10, 136:12,
    145:9, 145:19,
    148:19
inspector [4] - 29:2,
    51:7, 140:11, 140:12
install [2] - 59:19,
    60:10
installation[1] - 59:18
instance [2]-102:24,
    113:23
instances [1] - 6:14
instead [2] - 72:2,
    120:3
instructions [3] -
    40:21, 55:22, 124:5
insufficient [1] - 32:4
interested [1]-131:10
interrogatories [2] -
    122:10, 122:12
interrogatory [1] -
    122:23
investigate [1] - 135:4
investigated [1] - 51:8
invoice [9] - 32:7,
    37:6, 37:8, 37:16,
    39:6, 39:7, 59:20,
    61:12, 61:13
invoices [9]-44:11,
    62:9, 62:13, 62:22,
    63:2, 65:9, 65:10,
    66:7, 66:11
involved [1] - 134:21
involvement [1] -
    97:12
involves [1] - 4:6
involving [1] - 134:20
irregular [1] - 27:13
issue [8]-7:8, 7:20,
    29:9, 51:9, 51:21,
    71:13, 78:24, 136:2
issued [2] - 38:23,
    51:17
issues [23] - 13:2,
    14:17, 28:17, 28:19,
    33:10, 37:12, 52:1,
    63:21, 71:2, 71:23,
    72:8, 72:18, 115:11,
    119:17, 120:17,
    120:21, 135:24,
    136:6, 136:7, 138:3,
``` \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 138:5, 139:13, & JOHNSON [2] - 3:6, & 125:11 & [1] - 111:15 & 98:1 \\
\hline 143:14 & 0:1 & land [3]-69:20, & liability \({ }_{[1]}-10: 10\) & lists [9]-90:12, 92:12, \\
\hline item [1] - 50:4 & Johnson [16] - 4:6, & 134:18 & license [1]-132:24 & 98:10, 106:22, \\
\hline items [14]-7:12, 9:7, & 77:23, 80:7, 80:23, & landscaping \({ }_{[1]}\) & licensed [3]-84:1, & 107:18, 110:8, \\
\hline 24:4, 58:8, 66:2, & 1:4, 81:12, 81:15, & 17:22 & 133:1, 139:20 & 28:22, 138:16, \\
\hline 109:18, 109:19, & 1:17, 84:3, 94:16, & language [2] - 142:12, & licensee [1] - 144:3 & 146:5 \\
\hline 112:14, 112:17, & 13, 114:23, & 147:24 & limit \({ }_{[1]}-5: 21\) & lived [3] - 16:20, \\
\hline 121:7, 121:17, & 8:23, 121:23 & laptop [1] & LIN & 16:21, 16:22 \\
\hline 121:18, 124:13, & 7:17, 128:20 & large [2]-31:9, 31:14 & 6:10, 46:19 & living [25] - 6:11, 6:16, \\
\hline 147:3 & Johnson's [1] - 97:12 & larger [3] - 6:20, 9:10, & Linda [1] - 94:2 & 8:11, 23:11, 30:9 \\
\hline itself \([5]-7: 1,69: 15\), & joint [1] - 10:10 & 111:19 & LINDBERG \({ }_{[3]}\) - 1:10 & 31:23, 31:24, 42:7, \\
\hline 72:20, 79:19, 94:8 & jointly [1] - 10:7 & Iast [13] - 16:4, 16:5, & 3:5, 15:1 & 81:21, 90:20, 95:5, \\
\hline & JUDGE [1] - 1:8 & 19:6, 24:16, 32:21, & Lindberg [15]-4:4, & 98:10, 98:19, 99:5, \\
\hline & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
JUDICIAL [1] - 1:6 \\
June [1] - 57:22
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 87:13, 101:16, } \\
& \text { 116:12, 121:13, } \\
& \text { 122:13 }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 16: 7,18: 24,19: 1, \\
& \text { 19:9, 29:22, 51:23, } \\
& 65: 21,115: 18,
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 105:6, 106:23, } \\
& \text { 107:10, 108:12, } \\
& \text { 108:14, 110:8, } \\
& \text { 110:20, 111:3, 150:1 }
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { James }[3]-80: 24, \\
& 82: 10,88: 1
\end{aligned}
\] & & & & \\
\hline January [11] - 19:11, & K & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
late [2] - 16:11, 40:15 \\
Law [2]-2:5, 2:10 \\
law [36]-8:10, 11:17,
\end{tabular}} & & \\
\hline 116:22, 118:1, & keep [4] - 17:23 & & Lindbergs [3] - 71:15, 113:24, 146:7 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ioan }[2]-28: 10, \\
& 143: 12
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 119:2, 119:11, } \\
& \text { 120:1, 121:8, } 122: 13
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& : 22,124: 22 \\
& 0: 21
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { law }[36]-8: 10,11: 17, \\
13: 23,16: 16,17: 22,
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { line }[8]-9: 6,30: 7, \\
& 30: 11,30: 16,30: 19,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { located }[3]-86: 4, \\
87: 7,121: 14
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline JE [7] - 122:2, 123:18, & key \({ }_{[1]}\) - 18:6 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 34: 21,35: 12,37: 3, \\
& 40: 10,40: 14,42: 1,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
33: 19,107: 8,121: 13
\] & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { location }[4]-43: 10, \\
& 44: 19,89: 11,135: 1
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline 126:13, 126:22, & Kincannon [30] - & \[
42: 16,43: 9,44: 14,
\] & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { lines }[5]-40: 8,43: 11 \\
43: 12,135: 2,135: 4
\end{array}
\]} & \\
\hline 129:13, 130:21, & 17:13, 17:14, 17:18, & 45:17, 48:23, 52:8, & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
lockbox [1] - 18:6 \\
loft [1] - 107:7
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline 138:16 & 18:2, 18:12, 67:24, & 53:12, 54:5, 62:9, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { list }[4]-54: 8,95: 13, \\
& 98: 8,114: 7
\end{aligned}
\]} & \\
\hline JEROME [1] - 1:8 & 74:2, 82:21, 82:22, & 65:3, 70:15, 71:3, & & \begin{tabular}{l}
loft [1] - 107:7 \\
logical [1] - 72:17
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Jim [5] - 23:22, 84 & 24, 83:8, 114:4 & 71:6, 75:19, 76:16, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { listed [27] - 8:5, 20:13, } \\
& \text { 23:10. 23:19, 23:22. }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
logistical [1] - 36:4 \\
look [46] - 17:9, 18:4,
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline 114:9, 116:23 & 石8, 116:17, & 77:6, 77:8, 77:15, & & \\
\hline JJ [1] - 132:9
JJVL [11] - 103:15, & 117:13, 117:23, & 7:16, 78:3, 88:24, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 23: 10,23: 19,23: 22, \\
& 24: 4,24: 5,29: 9,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { look }[46]-17: 9,18: 4, \\
\text { 19:15, 20:21, } 21: 3,
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline JJVL [11] - 103:15, & 117:24, 128:10, & 93:10, 93:16, 98:16, & 32:23, 45:15, 52:17, & 23:3, 27:9, 27:12, \\
\hline 116:7, 116:12, & \[
9: 1,132: 3,1
\]
\[
3: 13,138: 8,
\] & 141:21 & 52:18, 75:20, 75:22, & 41:2, 42:12, 46:9, \\
\hline 118:11, 119:4, & \[
138: 18,138: 24
\] & law's [2]-33:11,
\(64: 22\) & 82:18, 91:18, 95:5, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 48: 10,50: 3,52: 22, \\
& 53: 10,56: 10,59: 15,
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 119:7, 119:12, 121:3 & 139:6, 140:14, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{lawsuit [5] - 106:12,} & 96:5, 96:19, 99:12, & \[
64: 11,65: 5,74: 3
\] \\
\hline Joan [4]-1:22, 153:4, & 140:20 & & 119:11, 121:7, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 75: 23,78: 13,87: 24, \\
& 88: 20,90: 9,98: 22,
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline 153:18, 153:19 & Kincannon's [4] & 177:15 & \[
26: 19,148: 2
\] & \\
\hline job [2]-110:7, 145:15 & 73:19, 132:13, & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { lawyer [2] - 64:7, } \\
& 147: 16
\end{aligned}
\] \\
lawyers [1] - 148:8
\end{tabular}} & listing [66] - 6:7, 6:13, & 101:12, 111:6, \\
\hline John [14]-4:4, 4:8, & 132:18, 132:19 & & \[
6: 15,6: 21,7: 1,20: 5 \text {, }
\] & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{116:6, 116:12,
119:20, 121:3,} \\
\hline 7:24, 15:17, 16:3, & kind [5] - 18:7, 30:19, & & 22:3, 22:15, 31:18, & \\
\hline 16:5, 21:22, 21:24, & 36:2, 56:18, 131:2 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { lawyers }[1]-148: 8 \\
& \text { leach }[8]-30: 7,30: 10,
\end{aligned}
\] & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 75: 18,76: 14,77: 13, \\
& \text { 82:9, 82:10, 82:12, }
\end{aligned}
\]} & 12:11, \\
\hline 22:10, 42:13, 61:5, & knowing [1] - 26:15 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Ieach }[8]-30: 7,30: 10, \\
30: 16,30: 19,31: 6,
\end{gathered}
\] & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{127:13, 127:1} \\
\hline 65:20, 67:10, 114:9 & knowledge [1] - 129:9 & \[
33: 19,43: 12,121: 13
\] & 82:18, 82:19, 83:9, & \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { JOHN }_{[4]}-1: 10,2: 4, \\
& 3: 5,15: 19
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { known }[23]-5: 6,5: 7 \text {, } \\
& 6: 4,7: 6,12: 15,15: 1 \text {, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Iearn }[5]-31: 13, \\
& 31: 16,35: 4,79: 13
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 88: 1,88: 6,88: 15, \\
& 89: 24,90: 1,90: 10,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 130:3, 130:15, } \\
& \text { 131:4, 131:5, 131:6, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline John's [2] - 83:9, & 6.4,
15:2, 32:18, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { learned }[3]-35: 16, \\
72: 12,79: 18
\end{gathered}
\]} & \[
91: 9,91: 21,91: 22,
\] & 131:24, 139:7, 148:3 \\
\hline 128:11 & 35:23, 69:13, 141:9, & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
92:1, 92:7, 93:1, \\
93:14, 93:24, 94:3,
\end{tabular}} & looked [15] - 17:10, \\
\hline JOHNS [2] - 3:6, 80:14 & 141:11, 141:13, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\text { least }[2]-76: 22,116: 2
\]
\[
\text { leave }[1] \text { - 114:18 }
\]} & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 17:12, 18:5, 18:6, } \\
& \text { 27:11, 58:9, 61:17, }
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline Johns [30] - 4:6, & 141:14, 141:16, & & \begin{tabular}{l}
93:14, 93:24, 94:3, \\
94:7, 94:8, 94:12,
\end{tabular} & \\
\hline 23:22, 80:21, 80:24, & 1:17, 141:18, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{led [3] - 12:11, 12:16,} & 94:14, 94:16, 95:10, & 67:6, 75:8, 89:17, \\
\hline 81:12, 82:10, 82:12, & 141:22, 147:8, & & 96:22, 97:9, 97:10, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 114:22, 115:16, } \\
& \text { 128:1, 132:6. 147:5 }
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline 82:20, 83:21, 88:2, & 7:9, 147:20 & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { left }[3]-106: 23, \\
& \text { 115:19, 118:23 } \\
& \text { legal }[6]-8: 22,65: 3,
\end{aligned}
\]} & 97:14, 98:2, 98:5, & \\
\hline 92:9, 96:1, 116:23, & 148:15 & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{98:17, 100:21,} & looking [59] - 9:3, \\
\hline 122:2, 123:4, & knows [3]-11:20, & & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 9: 16,16: 11,16: 14, \\
& \text { 17:2, 18:18, 22:23, }
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline 123:18, 126:13, & 11:23, 35:24 & 73:7, 81:11, 107:10, & 104:4, 114:15, & \\
\hline 126:16, 126:23,
127:6, 127:19, & KW [1] - 24:17 &  & 22, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 17:2, 18:18, 22:23, } \\
& \text { 24:1, 25:4, 27:23, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 128:6, 128:16, & L & legislature [1] - 4:23 & 128:11, 129:18, & \[
36: 2,37: 16,38: 7,
\] \\
\hline 129:2, 129:3, & & less [1] - 75:24 & 129:23, 130:3, & 41:8, 43:4, 45:10, 46:13, 46:18, 47:21, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 129:13, 130:21, } \\
& \text { 138:1, 138:17, 139:7 }
\end{aligned}
\] & L-i-n-d-b-e-r-g [1] -
16:6 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { letter }[1]-83: 16 \\
& \text { letting }[1]-38: 22
\end{aligned}
\]} & 149:5, 149:7 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 49: 3,49: 17,51: 23, \\
& 52: 21,53: 6,53: 14,
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline Johns's [1] - 149:5 & Lace [2]-114:9, & & listings [2]-96:16, & 55:13, 57:4, 58:4, \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 73:9, 74:12, 74:21, } \\
& \text { 74:23, 75:2, 75:14, } \\
& \text { 76:2, 76:24, 77:21, } \\
& \text { 78:2, 78:10, 78:14, } \\
& \text { 78:19, 79:9, 79:11, } \\
& \text { 80:1, 80:2, 80:6, } \\
& \text { 80:10, 80:21, 81:3, } \\
& \text { 81:14, 84:2, 86:17, } \\
& \text { 86:20, 90:15, 90:18, } \\
& \text { 91:20, 92:6, 97:8, } \\
& \text { 97:10, 100:14, } \\
& \text { 100:22, 101:1, } \\
& \text { 101:19, 102:11, } \\
& \text { 102:14, 105:10, } \\
& \text { 105:15, 106:8, } \\
& \text { 110:3, 111:13, } \\
& \text { 118:18, 118:22, } \\
& \text { 120:6, 124:11, } \\
& \text { 124:13, 124:19, } \\
& \text { 124:21, 125:1, } \\
& \text { 125:3, 125:20, } \\
& \text { 126:3, 126:7, } \\
& \text { 126:11, 127:16, } \\
& \text { 129:19, 130:1, } \\
& \text { 130:9, 130:14, } \\
& \text { 131:12, 136:17, } \\
& \text { 137:1, 142:3, 142:5, } \\
& \text { 142:9, 144:6, 144:8, } \\
& \text { 144:12, 145:1, } \\
& \text { 145:5, 146:21, } \\
& \text { 147:1, 149:10, } \\
& \text { 149:14, 149:18, } \\
& \text { 149:22, 150:5, } \\
& \text { 150:12, 150:20, } \\
& \text { 150:22, 151:1, } \\
& \text { 151:5, 151:12, } \\
& \text { 151:15, 151:20, } \\
& \text { 151:23, 152:4, 152:8 } \\
& \text { multi [1]-52:18 } \\
& \text { multiple [4]- 33:1, } \\
& 63: 16, ~ 131: 22, ~ \\
& \text { 135:13 } \\
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The listed pleadings were requested to be added to the Joint Appendix when the parties conferred on the contents of the Joint Appendix and were not included in the final Joint Appendix. The listed transcripts were to be included in the Joint Appendix but were not added to the final Joint Appendix.
    ${ }^{2}$ The Opposition to Motion to Amend or Alter Judgment Pursuant to NRCP 59(e) was included in the Joint Appendix as requested, however, the exhibits to the Opposition were not included in the Joint Appendix.

