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TUESDAY, AUGUST 21ST, 2018; RENO, NEVADA - OOO-

THE COURT: Counsel, you may call your next witness.

MR. MOORE: Your Honor, before we do, I would also like to invoke the rule of exclusion, if there are any witnesses in the courtroom.

THE COURT: That's been invoked. I take it there are no witnesses here.

MR. MOORE: Your Honor, we would call Sherrie Cartinella.

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { SHERRIE CARTINELLA } \\
\text { produced as a witness on behalf of } \\
\text { the Plaintiff, being first duly sworn, } \\
\text { was examined and testified as follows: }
\end{gathered}
$$

## DIRECT EXAMINATION:

BY MR. MOORE:

Q Good afternoon, Miss Cartinella. How are you?

A Fine, thanks.

Q Could you please state your full name and spell it for the record?

A Yes. Sherrie,S-H-E-R-R-I-E, Cartinella, C-A-R-T-I-N-E-L-L-A.

Q And, Miss Cartinella, why are you here today?
A I was retained as an expert witness.
Q Before we get into your thoughts as an expert witness in this case $I$ would like to go through some of your background, if that's okay. How long have you been in the real estate industry?

A Since 1995.

Q And when you entered into the real estate industry what position did you hold?

A I was an owner of a Century 21 real estate office. And later became a broker.

Q When did you become a broker?
A 2001.
Q And have you been a broker ever since?
A Yes.
Q What kind of real estate transactions are you involved in as a broker or as a realtor?

A I typically do residential sales. I have done some commercial sales. But more than anything I do residential.

Q Could you give me some kind of an estimate of how many realty transactions you have been involved in
per year over the last say ten years?
A I would say probably 20 a year, 20 to 30, depending on the year.

Q Could you give an estimate of how many are residential compared to commercial?

A Actually, I would say 97 percent are residential.

Q Walk me through, since 1995, what you have done as a real estate professional.

A I have been involved in sales. I volunteered for different various positions with the board office with the Reno/Sparks Association of Realtors.

I recently was appointed by Governor Sandoval for a Real Estate Commissioner and served three terms as Real Estate Commissioner.

Q And when was that?
A That was it would be -- I was appointed for three years and gave it up two years ago, so going back -- it would be from '13 to '15.

Q As a Real Estate Commissioner what kinds of things were you involved in?

A We basically did the educational requirements for the State of Nevada. We did hearings, disciplinary hearings, for the real estate agents for the State of

Nevada.

Q And as a commissioner how many let's say disciplinary hearings were you involved in over the three years that you were commissioner?

A $\quad 12$ to 15.

Q Have you held any positions with the National Board of Realtors?

A I have served on committees with the national association.

Q What committees?

A Risk reduction primarily.
Q What about the Nevada Association of

Realtors?

A I served on various committees through the years. My most current was the president of the association in 2011.

Q What about the Northern Nevada regional MLS, multi-listing service?

A I actually have served as trustee on the Multiple Listing Service probably for the last 15 years on and off. We serve a term and then you are excused - you have to be excused for a year and then you can go back on.

Q What are your obligations in that regard?

A As a trustee, again, we determine programs that will benefit the real estate agents. We do the disciplinary fines as realtors for them to stay in compliance and things like that.

Q What about with the Reno/Sparks Association of Realtors, have you held any positions with them?

A Just the president and I served on the Board of Directors off and on again for about the last 15 years. I'm currently not a Board of Director.

Q And what about with the National Women's Counsel of Realtors have you held positions with them?

A I have. Served as governor, state president, and on the steering committee for national.

Q Currently what licenses do you hold as a realtor?

A Broker's license.
Q I don't know if you will understand this question, but where is your license, your broker's license, currently parked?

A I'm under Ferrari Lund Real Estate. And that's on Lakeside Drive. We have three locations, but I'm at the Lakeside Drive.

Q How long have you been with Ferrari Lund?
A Five years.

Q Have you received any awards in your career as a realtor?

A I have. Various recognitions. Realtor of the year. Distinguished realtor for state. Things like that.

Q Miss Cartinella, in your experience as a realtor and as a broker and in other positions in the realty industry are you familiar with the statutory duties of realtors?

A I am.
Q What duties do realtors owe to parties to a transaction to disclose known information?

A To treat all parties fairly and to disclose anything that they know or should have known about a transaction.

Q Your Honor, I would submit Miss Cartinella as an expert in realty transactions and realtor duties?

THE COURT: All right.
MR. HALL: I haven't heard a lot of educational experience, but I'll just submit the matter, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Ask your next question.

BY MR. MOORE:
Q Miss Cartinella, why were you retained in this case?

A I was retained to review documents and to see if there was anything that $I$ could see or that in my opinion would be a violation in the Lindberg case.

Q What did you do to fill this assignment to look at the -- at these documents and form opinions?

A I reviewed the documents that were given to me. I believe it was the Complaint and the packet that we are required to obtain for the state records.

Contains everything that we would have in our records for real estate transactions.

Q What are some of those documents that would be included?

A The offer and acceptance. The various disclosures, things like that for the State of Nevada. And then $I$ also did do some research with the county as far as regulations and things like that.

Q What did you look at from the county's perspective?

A I looked at just to verify the in regard to the size of septics for the different bedrooms within a property.

MR. HALL: Your Honor, could I ask Mr. Moore to move so that I can see the witness?

THE COURT: You are blocking his view.
MR. MOORE: This way?
MR. HALL: Either way.
THE COURT: Either way.
MR. MOORE: I apologize.
THE COURT: That's okay.
MR. MOORE: I don't mean to block your view.
THE COURT: And then if you could speak up a little louder?

THE WITNESS: Okay.
BY MR. MOORE:
Q Did you look at some zoning requirements with the County as well?

A I did look at the zoning requirements and realized it was zoned for low density suburban.

Q And why did you look at all of these documents that you mentioned?

A Just doing research with the Complaint, some different things came up and $I$ just felt that it was pertinent to look at different items. When the listing said that it was -- had the unit and then additional units, $I$ questioned as far as looking at the low density
suburban situation whether it should have been in a multi-family category. So that's why I looked at that to make sure.

Q Reviewing all these documents, looking at the things that you reviewed, the Complaint, the packet that is kept for real estate transactions, zoning and health regulations, what did you learn that the realtors for the seller in this case -- either AJ Johnson or James E Johns -- knew about the property in this transaction?

A I'm not sure $I$ understand what you are asking.

Q Let's go ahead and we'll look at some documents that you mentioned that you reviewed. And I'll see if you reviewed these. May I approach the witness, your Honor?

THE COURT: Go ahead.
BY MR. MOORE:
Q And, Miss Cartinella, could you turn to
Exhibit 2 in the binder that's in front of you?
A Yes, this is the listing that is put in the multiple listing service.

Q And did you review this document in preparation for offering your opinions here today?

A Yes, I did.

Q And from this document what did you learn that the sellers' realtors knew about this transaction from looking at this listing?

A Well, in the listing the main thing that $I$ paid attention to was actually in the comments. And in the comments it states that there are three separate units on the property: In-law quarters, guest house, office or studio.

Q And why was that a concern for you?
A Primarily because of the acre parcels being allowed one septic and the county goes by bedrooms. And the listing says it is a three bedroom. And with the other additional units being potential bedrooms that's what made me have concerns.

Q Did you learn that there were actually more than three bedrooms at this property?

A On the listing when it says that there are three separate units $I$ would assume that those -- it says that it can be used for guest quarters. So I'm assuming that would be a bedroom.

Q In your review you concluded that there were likely more than three bedrooms?

A Yes.
Q What else did you review in here? Did you
determine the acreage that was found?
A That's what -- caught my eye to begin with was the acreage is 1.12. And, again, in Washoe County we are allowed one septic tank per acre. And then the size of the septic is regulated by the number of bedrooms. So I did notice that it was one acre and then when $I$ saw all the other buildings it made me take note.

Q And you took note -- did you learn later on the actual size of this one septic tank that was found at this facility, at this property?

A I did. Because one of the documents -- I'm not certain where it is here -- but on one of the documents was the actual septic inspection from Waters I believe. And it clearly states that it is a thousand gallons.

Q Could you turn to Exhibit 9?
A Yes.
Q And what is Exhibit 9?
A It is the actual septic inspection that was done by Waters Vacuum Truck Service.

Q What in this document alerted you to the size of the septic tank?

A It states clearly that it is 1,000 gallons.
Q So after you reviewed all of these documents
did you come to a conclusion that the realtors in this case knew that there were three separate units on the facility and it was listed as single family residential on 1.12 acres of land and there was one septic tank and one -- and it was 1,000 gallons?

A Yes.

Q Is that information that you believe these realtors knew?

A I believe they did, yes.
Q And if they didn't know this information do you believe that they should have known?

A I do.

Q With this information that was known or that should have been known, did you form an opinion about what Miss Johnson and Mr. Johns, the sellers' realtors in this case, should have known related to the septic system?

A I did. I felt that the NRS statute had been violated.

Q Which statute?

A I believe it is 645. MR. HALL: That's a conclusion of law, not an opinion.

THE COURT: Well, it is her opinion that it
was. But it is the -- go ahead.
BY MR. MOORE:
Q What else should Miss Johnson and/or
Mr. Johns have known about this septic system as to its size?

A As far as the size is concerned, it would have to do with the bedrooms and the -- on the property. And a three bedroom would be adequate for the thousand gallons. But after that it is -- I believe and I would have to check for certainly, but $I$ believe it goes up now into 4 to 5. It is 1500 gallons and then after that it goes up by 250 gallons per bedroom.

Q And how did you know that for four bedrooms or more it should have been 1500 gallons?

A Well, I actually checked the documents at the county to make certain. But the basic thing that made me question was the septic itself. There is only one septic per acre and that's what made me question.

Q And do you believe that Miss Johnson and/or Mr. Johns should have disclosed that the septic system was not satisfactory?

MR. HALL: Leading.
THE COURT: Yes. You are -- you tend to lead, so I'll sustain that.

BY MR. MOORE:
Q What do you believe Miss Johnson and Mr. Johns should have disclosed regarding the septic tank knowing the information that was known to them at the time of this transaction?

A I don't know that it's a matter of disclosure because the disclosures typically comes from the seller. But in my opinion the agents should have seen a red flag come up when that many units were on the property and that's what $I$ would think.

Q And what, if anything, should have been done by these agents with these red flags?

A I would think that the agents would have checked with the seller and then again for any buyer to -- at that point have the seller disclose or make certain that the seller understands and discloses the fact that there -- that it was not adequate for the property.

Q And do you have an opinion regarding whether AJ Johnson and James E Johns violated their statutory duties under NRS 645.252 by failing to disclose info that they knew or that they should have known when they did not ensure that issues related to the septic size were disclosed?

THE COURT: To whom?

MR. HALL: Again, your Honor, my objection is
that she is testifying to a matter of law.
THE COURT: Again, she is giving her opinion. But the question you asked wasn't the answer she gave. Disclosed to whom?

MR. MOORE: I want to know if she has an opinion and I'll ask her what her opinion is.

THE COURT: She says you have to talk to the seller.

MR. MOORE: And ensure that there is a disclosure.

THE COURT: By the seller?
MR. MOORE: Uh-huh (affirmative).

THE COURT: Right?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

BY MR. MOORE:

Q And in this case was there ever a disclosure made by the seller related to the adequacy of the septic system?

A I did not see anything in the property disclosure. Again, it has more to do with purporting to the public what a property is capable of doing. And that is where in my opinion an agent is responsible for making
certain that we purport to the public what can transpire on the property, what the different aspects are to it.

Q Do you have an opinion as to whether AJ Johnson or JE Johns violated their statutory duties to ensure that information that was known or should have been known was disclosed?

A I believe that it is my opinion that as a real estate agent we would know certain things about a transaction. And $I$ feel that it is volatile on the
'knew' or 'should have known.' But it is very clear with the county, with many other transactions and $I$ do feel that they should have known that that was a problem.

Q Do you have an opinion that that problem that you believe should have been known should have also been disclosed?

A Yes.
MR. MOORE: I have no further questions. CROSS EXAMINATION

MR. HALL: May I sit here, your Honor? THE COURT: Sure.

BY MR. HALL:
Q If this is something that a realtor should have known apparently off the top of their head, why did you have to go to the county to research?

A
I didn't research the fact that it was a one acre parcel. I researched to find out the bedroom -- to see if that had changed. Just to clarify. But the thing that $I$ inherent -- that to me, a real estate agent, just knows is that you cannot have more than one septic per acre lot. It has to do with the sanitation, sterilization, where the well is, that sort of thing. And typically if you do any rural transactions at all, then you are aware of that.

Q Okay. When you say that the realtor should have seen a red flag or that should have been a red flag to them, what do they then do about that?

A I would think that you would again check with the seller and determine whether or not you should advertise in a multiple listing situation that goes out to thousands and thousands of people that you could have a certain unit on a property that is not going to come to fruition.

Q So the problem you are trying to prevent is the public coming to the conclusion that they can build more on the zone -- or on the lot than the zoning allows?

A Correct.
Q When you make an application for a building permit, isn't the zoning checked before that permit is
issued to see if the permit complies?
A I am not certain on a building permit how that -- I honestly don't know how they do that.

Q I believe you stated in your written opinion that you reviewed the Waters report?

A Yes, sir.
Q What file did you find the Waters report in?
A I was given the documents from the files that we keep for the State of Nevada which would include any reports, any inspections, that sort of thing.

Q Were you aware that the buyer also had that report well before close of escrow?

A I see on the -- and I believe this was the same one that $I$ have. There is a signature. So I'm assuming that it was read and approved, yes.

Q And in fact on the final walk-through form, is it also not disclosed that that condition had been remedied? In other words, that the correct size of the tank had been disclosed -- arrived at, I guess would be a better word.

A I'm not certain -- I remember seeing that on the seller's real property disclosure.

Q Did you search for that in any other places?
A I did not.

Q Are you not aware that the buyer in this transaction actually signed off and approved and went forward with the purchase after having that information?

A I do see that the buyer signed off on the well. I don't have -- may $I$ ask for a seller's property disclosure?

THE COURT: That's Exhibit 1, isn't it?
MR. MOORE: I think so. Yes.
THE WITNESS: And I apologize, I don't see where they had signed off on the property, the seller's property disclosure for the -- the extra units. I do see the seller's property disclosure, but it -- the only thing that we do ask is about the -- letter $C$ under one. Any construction modifications, alterations or repairs made without a required state, city or county building permit. That that is -- that doesn't -- that didn't have to do with the septic situation.

BY MR. HALL:
Q Are you in effect testifying that once the information concerning the size of the septic tank had been listed that that red flag would have impelled or -would have meant that the brokers -- strike that. My question is, is it your testimony that because of the problem with the lot size being 1.14 acres and the number
of units on that property being what it was, that the broker in this case should have investigated that further?

A Yes, sir. And it was actually 1.12 acres. And it is my opinion that when an agent is going to list a property and purport again to the public that there are certain things that can be done with that property, I believe it is the agent's responsibility to research and make sure that that's appropriate.

Q What do you mean by research? What kind of research?

A Well, again, it would be very easy and clear that if -- the septic only had a thousand gallon tank that that's only three bedrooms. So there would be no way, in my opinion, that you could advertise that there are three separate units additionally on the property that could be used for in-law quarters, guest quarters or an office or studio. So that's where my concern would have come in.

Q I think my question was directed more to what a broker should do. In other words, the investigation that you are suggesting $I$ guess is to go to the county and research further?

A Yes. I would say the county would certainly
explain the bedroom variation very clearly. Again, it is -- again it goes back to the one acre parcel and one septic. And $I$ believe that that's just -- again, that's been around since the 80's or before. Any time we have additional units, $I$ would think that that needs to be questioned and at least again disclosed that these aren't -- you know, that that really can't be done without some modifications and maybe a bigger septic and that sort of thing.

Q But wouldn't that require an investigation on the part of the agent?

A I don't know about the investigation, how you could go about that. Again, a lot of it has to do with just the practice. When we are in practice we know certain things that come up perhaps through different transactions that would again make us at least have a red flag to come up.

Q Well, you keep talking about the red flag and I'm trying to find out about the investigation that you are suggesting that a broker or the agent should go through. Isn't it true that NRS 645.252 specifically excludes or relieves the agent or broker from having to conduct an investigation?

A And what statute is that?

Q NRS 645.252 section four.
A I believe that that statute is obviously releasing some liability from the agent. I don't know that that's the intent. I don't know that -- again in this particular case, $I$ felt it was very straight forward. It wasn't a -- anything that really had to have much thought given into it.

Q But you had to go to the library to research -- to the county offices to do research to verify things?

A No, sir. I didn't -- I knew without any research from past experience. As an example when a client comes and wants to purchase a property that's on an acre lot because they would like to see their in-laws move in, that's the first thing -- to add a mobile home or another unit -- the first thing that is talked about as an agent is that you can't do that. You can only have one septic per acre per parcel number. And that's just a general knowledge, $I$ believe.

What I had to research was specifically the bedrooms. I knew that three bedrooms or more had to have -- or pardon me. Up to three bedrooms only required 1,000 gallons which this property would comply with.

Had it not been advertised that you could add
three additional units to that property, that's when I - when I said I had to research. I just wanted to make sure that $I$ read the code and to get it -- if there was any changes and that sort of thing. So I had-- that's what $I$ really had to research was the specifics.

And $I$ believe it is after -- it is in my report and $I$ believe it is after the three. From 4 to 6 it is 15.

And then for an additional 250 gallons per bedroom additionally. That's what I had to research. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Ma'am, let me ask you this.
The Exhibit 2 is the initial listing as I
understand it?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: And it has three bedrooms?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

THE COURT: All right.
THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: But $I$ have got an acre and. 12 .

So no red flag?
THE WITNESS: No.

THE COURT: Second page it says three units --
but then it says all kinds of possibilities?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: Now, that's not saying that there are other things there. It says you have the possibilities of changing the garage or the barn or whatever it is to a mother-in-law quarters, right?

THE WITNESS: Well, $I$ just read it as three separate units on the property. And then it says in-law quarters or guest house, office or studio. But --

THE COURT: But the possibilities are endless?
THE WITNESS: Right.
THE COURT: It is not saying that they are
there. It is just the possibility of converting the two other buildings.

Wouldn't that be the other realtor's or the other agent's obligation to say the same thing that you are saying? There is a possibility to have people, if you are going to buy this. But, you may run into trouble with the septic if you have plans that are definite that are going to have living quarters?

THE WITNESS: Well, in the listing, again, I just see that it says three separate units on the property. So that to me would mean they are there already.

> THE COURT: Yeah, but you are tying it into
acres for the number of septics and bedrooms for the capacity of the septics, right?

THE WITNESS: Correct.
THE COURT: So for three bedrooms it is sufficient.

THE WITNESS: The 1,000 , yes. For one.
THE COURT: All right.
And then when did that 15,000 pop up?
MR. HALL: That was when AJ went back to the seller and he gave her that information.

THE COURT: So that was a verbal
communication.
MR. HALL: Okay. It was verbal.
THE COURT: All right. But as of January 2016
it is 1,000 gallons. So -- but they are talking about possibilities, without saying that that's there, ready to go.

THE WITNESS: Well, I guess again it depends on how you read it. When I'm reading it, it says three separate units on the property. There are different things that you could use them for, maybe different things.

THE COURT: Right.
THE WITNESS: But just having the separate
units I think -- if a buyer were looking at a property like this, that would be what would attract someone.

THE COURT: Is that a term of art, 'a unit?' THE WITNESS: A unit.

THE COURT: If $I$ have an independent garage separate from the house, is that considered a unit. So the property, if $I$ have an acre, I have a house and a detached garage, is that two units or one unit, a detached garage?

THE WITNESS: It would typically say it was a garage if it were -- and it would be in the listing on the first page and when it talks about the garages, which this one does say a four-car garage.

THE COURT: That doesn't mention the other two units, does it, on that first page?

THE WITNESS: On the garage. I don't believe so, no.

THE COURT: I mean, for somebody to become interested in purchasing property, usually they drive by and say, "Oh, that looks nice. Let's find out about it." So the buyers saw that there were three buildings on the property. All right. Do they have an obligation to investigate? THE WITNESS: The buyer?

THE COURT: Buyers.
THE WITNESS: I would imagine it would depend on what they planned to do with it. So I'm not sure as far as investigating. Again it depends on what they would be doing with that property. But the base purchase of that property could really make a big difference if you see different outbuildings.

THE COURT: Now, if the buyers told their agent that what they want to do, "We have a mother-in-law here and we want a place for her. And this would be perfect because you have got three buildings. We could put her in one. It is big enough. It would be nice," and that's relayed to the sellers' agent or broker, then $I$ could see where that would kick in.

They would say, "Whoa, wait a minute. Now, it may not be permitted or whatever to be able to accommodate that particular request."

But, short of that, wouldn't the statement, "Hey, you could do anything on the property. The possibilities are unlimited"?

THE WITNESS: And that -- in my opinion, that would have been perhaps the more appropriate thing to say, rather than there were three separate units on the property and, again, that one could be in-law quarters or
a guest house. And there again that's where $I$ feel that the listing agent had some responsibility in advertising that that was actually a possibility or that that's what was on there.

THE COURT: All right. So as a realtor being on the commissions that you are on and in your position with the Nevada Commission, you are saying that the statement in the middle of the page of the second exhibit is misleading?

THE WITNESS: I believe it is misleading.
BY MR. HALL:
Q That information concerning the amount of square footage of the sewer tank you understand that was corrected in the middle of January?

THE COURT: She is not talking about the 15,000 gallons, are you?

THE WITNESS: No. I'm not really -- I wasn't privy to any of that until -- I heard about it later, but I didn't have it in my initial documents.

THE COURT: That's not in the listing.
BY MR. HALL:
Q So in your report you state that the facts concerning the issues that you talked about here, the septic and number of units, should have been known to the
agent -- by the agent and disclosed. But, again, that information was clarified and corrected prior to close of escrow, was it not?

A To my knowledge it was not before close of escrow -- determined about the size of the tank? Is that what --

Q Well, the size of the tank or as $I$ understand it you are discussing the number of units that are on the property. Three units on an acres. Okay. My question is this: The information that's available at close of escrow has been accepted by the buyers. They know the correct information about the septic size, the units, whether they perform or not. How could there be any detriment to the buyer involved in the transaction? MR. MOORE: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion.

THE COURT: Well. Overruled on that. But I'm not sure the statements contained in the question are accurate. Let's find out.

The size of the tank -- or as $I$ understand it you are discussing a number of units that are on the property. Three units on an acre, okay. My question is this: On one acre the information that's available at close of escrow has been accepted by the buyers. They
know the correct information about the septic size, correct. The units, correct. Whether they -- conform or not. I don't know if that's correct. And that's -- the court's objection to that question. Were they aware of whether or not there was conformance with the requirements on the one acre lot.

MR. HALL: They obtained an appraisal report by that time and the appraisal report would have that information.

THE COURT: Who obtained the appraisal?
MR. MOORE: Your Honor, the appraisal in this case was obtained by the seller in September of 2012 .

THE COURT: But it was made available to the buyers. That was the testimony.

MR. MOORE: Our contention is that's the case. There is a dispute on our side.

THE COURT: He admitted that he saw it.
MR. MOORE: Certain portions of it correct.
MR. HALL: I understood there were two
appraisals. Each side got an appraisal.
MR. MOORE: They are talking about an
appraisal that the bank obtained in this case. That was done in February. That was done on February 20 th of 2013, after my client had accepted a counteroffer. It is
not admitted as an exhibit here. We didn't feel it was pertinent because it was after the acceptance of the counteroffer.

THE COURT: But before it closed?

MR. MOORE: Eight days before close, yes.
THE COURT: Is it an exhibit?
MR. MOORE: The first appraisal is -- I
believe Exhibit 63, your Honor.
THE COURT: 63?

MR. MOORE: And then portions of it are 64.
THE COURT: Here on the appraisal -- you don't have that on front of you. Can you hand her the second volume?

MR. MOORE: Yes.
THE COURT: Ma'am, if you would turn to 63?
THE WITNESS: Yes, I have it.
THE COURT: The fourth page in?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: That middle paragraph down at the bottom beginning with the, "Subject also has the utility -- "

Right there. Right there. The one below it. There you go.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: Do you see where he says, "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 are given little value."

THE WITNESS: I don't think I'm on the right page.

THE COURT: Is that 63?
THE WITNESS: I'm on 63. And I'm --
THE COURT: It is the fourth page on mine.
THE WITNESS: Here. I think it is -- it is
the third page here. It is the -- okay. "The subject also has the utility of a guest house." Is that correct?

THE COURT: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Yes, it is on three here. Okay. I see where, "It is given little or no value."

THE COURT: They appraised the property at $\$ 400,000$. Isn't that $a, \quad$ Hey, look at this. Be aware of this type of statement there"?

THE WITNESS: Well, it is certainly the appraiser's opinion on it. I don't know that, as far as when this took place, was this the appraisal --

THE COURT: Before closing.
THE WITNESS: Before closing?

THE COURT: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Was this appraisal done by the bank or the --

THE COURT: This was the seller's appraisal.
THE WITNESS: The seller. Okay. So if the appraisal was done prior to the listing --

THE COURT: Not prior to the listing.
MR. MOORE: It is -- the appraisal date is September 5 th and the listing was September $21 s t$.

THE COURT: So it was, yes. It was before the listing.

THE WITNESS: Okay. So, again, if this
information had been given to the real estate agent and it says that there is no value, then that may have been the more appropriate thing, to put in the components that it was -- the appraisal had been done and these things didn't have value, rather than to purport that there were the three extra units. Again, the public would not be seeing the appraisal.

THE COURT: Right. But the potential buyer would.

THE WITNESS: The potential buyer would not necessarily -- I'm not certain in this case. THE COURT: He did.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE COURT: According to the evidence.
THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm sorry. Because typically the buyers lender is the one that does the appraisal. And that's what the buyer would go by.

THE COURT: So does that put anybody on notice of the situation?

THE WITNESS: Well, if they read -- I guess.
By the time you are into the transaction this far, I would -- again, I don't know the timeframes. I was not really privy to the appraisals, for my report my opinion.

But, again, depending on when it was given, by then you have -- you are already into the transaction. You have already --

THE COURT: Fell in love?
THE WITNESS: Fell in love. You have already probably had inspections done. You have spent money on things like that. And you are dedicated. You are already moving forward. I think, again, a client, a prospective buyer, would go more by what is put out on all those sites and, you know -- 90 percent of our traffic comes from all of that.

And that's out there to literally thousands and thousands of people.

THE COURT: But isn't it a fact that the asking price was close to $\$ 400,000, \$ 385,000$, something like that?

MR. HALL: 395.
THE COURT: 395 . The listing.
That was subject to change obviously.

THE WITNESS: Depending on the market
conditions and things like that it would make a difference.

THE COURT: All right. Counsel, follow up? BY MR. HALL:

Q I'm not sure I have understood the dialog between you and the judge. But let me ask it this way. Are you suggesting that the buyer should not be held to have -- had it disclosed to him, the information set forth in his own appraisal or the bank's appraisal, if that's part of what --

MR. MOORE: Objection. Beyond the scope of this witness's testimony. She is testifying about the septic tank.

THE COURT: That's not in evidence. We don't know what that appraisal was.

MR. HALL: That's all the questions we have, your Honor.

BY MR. MOORE:
Q Just a few follow-up questions.
Miss Cartinella, you have expressed several opinions about things that the seller's agent should have known and should have disclosed in this transaction.

Do your opinions related to what the sellers' agent should have known also apply to what the buyer's -that the buyer's agent should have known?

A They do. I believe.
Q And in this instance, you are not testifying that the failure to disclose was related to the size of the septic but whether it was adequate or not?

A Exactly, yes.
THE COURT: If there were more than three
bedrooms.
MR. MOORE: Right?
THE WITNESS: Correct.
BY MR. MOORE:
Q And if the evidence shows in this case that there are three bedrooms in the main house and one bedroom and a bathroom in the mother-in-law's quarters, your opinions are unchanged; is that right?

A If -- could you repeat that?

Q If the evidence shows that there are three bedrooms in the main house and one bedroom in the mother-in-law quarters and they both are served by one septic, your opinions aren't changed?

A I feel that that should have been known.
Q Okay. Yes.
A Sorry.
Q Looking at Exhibit 2, do you see that?
A Yes.
Q Do you see that there are photos at the bottom of Exhibit 2 depicting the property?

A I don't have them here, but I do remember seeing the photos. I'm sorry, on page one, yes. I'm sorry.

Q Do you recall if those photos depict the mother-in-law quarters?

A I believe the photos did show all of the outbuildings or units or --

Q The bedroom in the mother-in-law quarters?
A Yes.
Q No further questions.
THE COURT: All right. Anything further?
MR. HALL: No.
THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. You may step
down.
MR. MOORE: May she be excused, your Honor? THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MOORE: Your Honor, we call Ron Cohen. - 000 -

RON COHEN
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 Could you please state your full name and spell it for the record?

A Ron Cohen, $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{N}$.
Q And, Ron, why are you involved here today?
A We are a general contractor that utilizes John for some subcontracting work and he had bought this property and asked me to come take a look at it.

Q How long have you been in the contracting business?

A I have had my company for over ten years and I've been contracting in Reno for another company for almost 20 years.

Q And what's the name of your company?
A Building Tectonics.
Q And what type of work do you do typically at building Tectonics?

A We do a mixed bag of 50 percent commercial and 50 percent residential.

Q And why did Mr. Lindberg contact you in this case?

A The original contact was his upper shed building he was wanting to put power to it. And we looked at it trying to get safe power to it because the power that was running to it was running along the fence line.

Q What if anything came of this issue trying to run power up to the building of the upper part?

A During our permit research and APN research on the property, we had discovered that that building up there was too old and probably never permitted, but we also discovered that the lower building, the in-law's quarters, if you will, was not permitted as a residence. It was permitted as a garage.

Q And looking at this property I just have a question about it. Specifically the mother-in-law quarters, how many bedrooms were in there, in that
mother-in-law quarters?
A I believe there is one bedroom upstairs and it was a large like living style room downstairs.

Q And was there a bathroom?
A Yes. Bathroom and kitchen.
Q And what issues were raised because of the upper building not being permitted?

A Well, when we opened that can of worms of the upper building, contacting the power company and the county to pull a permit for a panel upgrade on the upper building --

THE COURT: The upper building is not the mother-in-law quarters?

THE WITNESS: Correct. They also did the same research he did and found that the lower building was not ever signed off for $C$ of $O$ or had any final inspections or completed as an in-law quarters. So they held his upper permit so he could not -- wasn't able to get power in his upper building.

Q What ultimately has become of the upper building?

A The upper building now has safe and final power on it and is permitted with its own separate meter on it.

Q Go ahead -- there are exhibits in front of you. Can you look at Exhibit 10?

A Okay.
Q What's Exhibit 10?
A It looks like a proposal dated December 31, 2015, for some demolition work and reworking of a building.

Q Is this proposal from your company?
A It is.
Q And why did you make this proposal to Mr. Lindberg?

A Could $I$ have a second to read it?
Q You bet.
A Okay. This proposal was created for -- at that point we were looking at options for John, what was more cost effective and feasible with -- to utilize that upper building because the county at one point had indicated that he may have to tear it down because there is no record of it.

We couldn't find any record of it. So I had given him a couple options of tear down and reconstruction of a new building similar in size and shape.

Q Did either of these options come to fruition
in this case?
A No.
Q What -- I think you actually testified about what ultimately happened. It got permitted and got power?

A Correct.
Q Could you turn to the next exhibit, Exhibit 11? And what is Exhibit 11?

A So this is an -- Exhibit 11 is -- it says invoice. But this is for all of the work and proposed cost to get the in-law's quarters back into code compliance and get it approved to be an in-law's quarters.

Q Did this proposal include any construction?
A I would imagine the only construction it would have -- included would be any destructive testing that the county would require for electrical and plumbing.

Q So correct me if $I$ am wrong on this. Was this a proposal from you to John just to see if you could get permits?

A Yes. There was no guarantee that we could even get in-law's quarters on that property.

Q So after this estimate was provided to John
what steps did you take to try to help John get the mother-in-law quarters and the upper building permit?

A The first steps was as-built in the existing building, bringing the county records up-to-date with what plans we could find for the existing building.

Several meetings with Washoe County Building Department and what steps were going to be needed to try to get that property zoned for a secondary dwelling on the property because it is only zoned for single family dwelling.

Q And what kind of -- what kind of applications did you fill out in seeking to do this?

A The first was a Planning Department application that requires Health Department approval and building approval. We also submitted plans as a remodel to an existing structure showing the as-built as it was built already to generate the paperwork for a permit record in the county system.

So it took Planning for review. Planning had several conditions on their review about trying to even allow a secondary dwelling. It ended up working out, if we could get Health Department's blessing. We were going to -- Planning was going to sign off following Health Department and Building. If they were both okay,

Planning was going to work with us.
Q Did you have applications for all of these different entities?

A We did. Building automatically triggers to Health Department. We did end up having to go through a SWSB board for the Health Department to try to get their approval for the secondary dwelling and managing the septic system along with the well.

We were first denied in the first SWSB board meeting. We worked with -- Health Department, department heads, revamped the septic drawing to get it to where they thought it would pass and meet code. So we revamped it, resubmitted it, sat at another SWSB hearing and ultimately we were awarded the variance.

Q And what direction was given by the county when you were ultimately given the variance?

A We had to separate the sewer lines -- the way it was built originally was the existing sewer line from the in-law's quarters ran and tied into the existing house's sewer line and then out to the single septic tank that was only sized for the existing house, not for the secondary dwelling.

We needed to -- there wasn't enough room to add a larger tank with the expanded leach fields, so we
separated the sewer lines from the existing house and the in-law's quarters, two separate sewer lines, and ended up installing another septic tank, leach field and repair field. So now they have separate septics for each dwelling.

Q Was that required by the county?
A That was 100 percent required.
Q What other requirements were made by the county which regard to the mother-in-law quarters?

A He had to put a monitoring device on the well. And he has to report that once a year.

Q What does it monitor?
A It monitors contaminates from the leach field of the septic tank into the actual well head to make sure that he has safe water.

Q What other requirements were made by the county regarding the mother-in-law quarters?

A Reduction in size. The existing -- the mother-in-law quarters or any secondary dwelling cannot exceed one-half the size of the main dwelling. So we had to reduce the size, which was basically the whole ground floor of the mother-in-law quarters. And that's now storage. And the upper floor is the respite.

Q And that 50 percent requirement, that the
accessory building cannot be more than 50 percent the size of the main building, where is that found?

A That's in the planning code, in the Washoe County planning.

Q Could you look at Exhibit 25? In the second page of Exhibit 25 , what is that code requirement that's listed there on that second page? Is that the one we are talking about?

A That is.
Q So how did you go about abandoning certain space within the mother-in-law quarters?

A There was -- there was an access from the ground floor of the in-law's quarters to the second floor and we essentially walled it off. And the stairwell goes down to basically nowhere. So it is separated. There are two separate instances. You had to take the finishes out, which in this case was the flooring.

Q How is that new space treated after that? After it was -- essentially abandoned, how is it treated?

A It is considered storage.
Q After the county gave permission to move forward with steps with -- let's keep looking -- were there -- what other conditions were required by the county?

So we have the separating of the septics. We have to install another septic system. You had to disconnect the septic from the main house and connect it to its own tank.

You had to abandon some space in the living quarters.

You had to install a monitor on the well.
What other requirements were issued by Washoe County so that the variance could be granted?

A It needed -- this was a while ago. It needed -- the smoke detectors to be hard wired. It needed an 0-2 detector. I believe it needed an arc fault breaker -- arc fault breaker in the panel to meet residential code now.

There was something with the kitchen. And $I$ don't remember which scenario it was, whether it was the oven or something.

Q Can you think of any other requirements that were made by the county as you are sitting here?

A Not off the top of my head.
Q I get that. I understand that.
What permits were required to be pulled, if any, in response to what the county had required?

A There was the permit for the septic that was
separate. There was the building permit. And it needed to be carried through all the way to $C$ of $O$.

And then the upper building was a separate electrical permit.

Q Could you turn to Exhibit 14?
THE COURT: What size was the septic tank that you put in?

THE WITNESS: Our company didn't physically put them in. I think it was two 5,000-gallon tanks. I'm not sure.

MR. MOORE: We have those, your Honor. Montner Excavating put in another thousand gallon tank. THE WITNESS: Okay.

BY MR. MOORE:

Q Do you recognize Exhibit 14?
A I do.
Q What is that?
A This is for the -- this is for the Health Department for his septic.

Q Is it a variance?
A It is.
Q Ultimately was this variance granted?
A It was ultimately.
Q Would you turn to Exhibit 42? Do you

```
recognize Exhibit 42?
```

A I do.
Q What is that?
A That's the development application for the in-law's quarters.

Q And why was this required? Why did this need to be filled out?

A Because it is -- it has to go -- this is part of the Planning Department of getting them to -- allow the variance under the current planning code.

Q Was that variance eventually granted?
A It was.
Q Would you turn to Exhibit 43?
A Okay.
Q Do you recognize Exhibit 43?
A I do.
Q And what is that?
A This is the Building Department application.
Q Was this necessary? Was this required by
Washoe County?
A It was.
Q This application was it ultimately granted?
A It was granted and signed off.
Q Why does it say here in the middle of the
permit description, "Conversion of existing storage building on the west side of the property to in-law quarters," and then it mentions a reduction to 934 square feet?

A So in meeting with the county initially of how to approach this problem building on the property, I came up with the idea of approaching them with it as a remodel versus a new building. And the reason for that is, as a new building, it would have been really problematic because the entire building it would have to have come up to I am going to guess 2012 residential code at that point.

When the original -- the second permit that was pulled on that building which was never found was taken through framing. So it was signed off, foundation and framing. We wanted to utilize that as still good and then move forward with a remodel of a storage building, as it was originally permitted, into a residential unit.

And the reduction of square footage goes back to Planning. It can't be more than half of the size of the main dwelling.

Q Did the county let you do that creative step?
A They did. And the only reason they let us do it is we did find a set of drawings that had a Washoe

County stamp on them from the storage building remodel. And they -- we took those to the county. They scanned them in and now they are part of this parcel number record.

Q Your Honor, we reviewed Exhibit 10 and 43 with this witness. And they weren't offered or admitted yesterday. I would offer them today.

MR. HALL: No objection, your Honor.
THE COURT: Admitted.
BY MR. MOORE:
Q Would you turn back to Exhibit 15? Do you recognize Exhibit 15?

A I do. I have seen it.
Q What is it?
A This was taking a survey of the property. And the main part of it was -- is we needed to show a topo for the new septic system because of location for the new septic system and also to verify setbacks of the existing building to the property line.

Q And why was this survey required? Was it required by the county?

A It was required by the county. Mostly the Health Department requires it anymore. They have had so many bootlegged systems of septics put in and they want
an accurate and current record of all property that gets worked on as far as sloping because people do change the grade of existing properties.

Q Can you turn to Exhibit 16? Do you recognize Exhibit 16 ?

A I do.
Q What is Exhibit 16?
A It is a proposal for architectural services to complete the as-built drawings for the storage conversion to secondary dwelling.

Q And why were these architectural plans required?

A We have to prepare drawings of the proposed remodel from storage to residential dwelling in order for the Building Department to complete their plan review.

Q Was that required by the county?
A Yes.
Q Exhibit 18. If you could look at that for me? What is Exhibit 18?

A This looks like the printout for the -- when I submitted the drawings. This is for -- oh, no. I'm sorry. This was -- this was the initial inspection request. So they had done the permit number in order for us to call inspection. This is before we completed
plans. So we called the county out there to do a walk through with us to see what they were going to require from us in order to pull an actual permit to convert the building.

Q Could you turn to Exhibit 20? Do you recognize Exhibit 20?

A I do.
Q What is it?

A This is the trip permit for the inspector to come out -- Bob Florez was the lead inspector for the county at the time. He now works for the City of Reno -to see if we could final out the two previous permits that were pulled on the same building.

The one in '94 was a well previous owner who pulled the storage unit building. The 96355 permit was the owner just before John pulled the remodel permit and extended the storage unit and added the second floor.

Q What is significant about these comments at the bottom of this exhibit, if anything?

A The second one is the one that's significant about it. The 9417 was for a detached garage, not a two-story accessory dwelling. That was the one that put us dead in the water when we tried to final out some of those open permits.

Q Exhibit 22. Would you look at that? Do you recognize Exhibit 22?

A I do.

Q What is it?
A It is the plan status for the actual building permit for the conversion.

Q And what is significant about this document?
A That is the actual permit plan review status for converting the existing storage building into the secondary dwelling.

Q Exhibit 23, can you turn to that? Do you recognize exhibit 23?

A Yes.

Q What is that?
A It is an e-mail from David Kelly, who was the department head for the Health Department who we were working with to try to get this thing to pass.

Q And what were the concerns raised in this e-mail?

A The big one is you can't improve the secondary dwelling due to the limited acreage and no variance from Sewage, Wastewater and the Sanitation Board, which we call SWSB.

Q And what action did you take in response to
this assertion that there was no variance yet from the sanitation board?

A This is when another application with the drawings and proposed remedies was submitted to the Sewer Wastewater and Sanitation Board.

Q How often were you communicating with people in various entities of washoe County during this whole process?

A It would go several times a week to a couple times a week. This was a process, a very long process.

Q Look at Exhibit 24. What is that?
A This was the -- a building permit for the garage and storage unit which is now the secondary dwelling.

Q And when was that built?
A The day applied was 4-28, 1994 and issued on May 11th of 1994.

Q Starting at page three and going back to the end of that exhibit, what is important about those documents?

A Well, the second page of that is, there was -- a grading final that had a correction notice done. And there was two other corrections that were denied. And there is no final completed for that project.

Q And the documents starting at page three of that exhibit that go all the way to the end --

THE COURT: Why don't you begin with the Bates numbers.

BY MR. MOORE:
Q LIND 0034 through LIND 040 . What are those documents?

A These are what was -- part of this is part of the plan review. Some of it is truss calculations. There on LIND 0035 is three correction notices from the inspector to the builder and the rest of it looks like some structural calculations. And then some as-built drawings -- or proposed drawings of the new structure in '94.

Q And what, if anything, about this structure do you see here? What is it its intended purpose?

A Its intended purpose was a garage below with storage above.

Q Would you turn to Exhibit 28? What's Exhibit 28?

A Exhibit 28 is an e-mail from myself to Don Jepsen, who is the building official at that time for Washoe County.

Q Do you recognize additional exhibits --
e-mails in this exhibit?

A $\quad$ I do.

Q And what are these e-mails about?

A They are about a couple of things. They are about the upper building and the lower storage garage building, about trying to get records, working with them and trying to get permits together for the lower building and also trying to release the permit for safe power on the upper building.

Q Essentially the process that you are having to go through in this case?

A Yes.

THE COURT: Counsel, we are going to take our afternoon break.

MR. MOORE: Okay, your Honor.

THE COURT: So we'll be back at quarter of.
(At this time a recess was taken.)

THE COURT: Be seated. You may continue.

MR. MOORE: Thank you, your Honor. Before we took a break, we were reviewing Exhibits 23 and 28. They have not been offered into evidence. I would offer them into evidence.

MR. HALL: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Admitted.

BY MR. MOORE:
Q Ron, can you turn to Exhibit 30? Do you recognize that document?

A I do.

Q What is that?
A This was one of the SWSB board meetings regarding the Lindberg residence.

Q And what happened at this meeting if you recall?

A It looks like this was the second meeting with the approval allowing the variance for the secondary dwelling.

Q The meeting that happened prior to this meeting, the approval of the variance, do you know approximately when that would have occurred, the first meeting?

A It was at least a month or two beforehand. They only meet every so often.

Q What issues did they present at that first hearing?

A I wasn't at the first meeting so I don't remember. I would have to look at my documents.

Q No problem. If there were issues that were raised between the first meeting and the second meeting
what steps were taken to correct those?
A It would all come down to the septic system. The new steps were probably a redesign of the second design for the septic system.

Q And after this variance was granted what steps were taken after that?

A Then it went back to Building and then back to Planning for their approvals.

Q Do you know when those approvals were done?
A I sure don't. I don't remember.
Q Looking at Exhibit 31 --
THE COURT: Counsel let me ask you this. We are going through these exhibits for what purpose?

MR. MOORE: To show the steps that he took.
THE COURT: You are not saying that she had to go through this.

MR. MOORE: No.
THE COURT: Aren't we interested in how much it cost?

MR. MOORE: Yes. And we are close. It will take us two more exhibits to get there. THE COURT: Okay. BY MR. MOORE:

Q Exhibit 31, what is that?

A This is an e-mail regarding it looks like the process for the last steps in the variance on the Health Department side.

Q Can you turn to Exhibit 33? And do you recognize Exhibit 33?

A I do.
Q And what is it?
A This is the approval from the Planning Department with conditions.

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

A We have.
Q And the steps that were taken after the variance was granted?

A Yes.
Q Let's go ahead and look at Exhibit 40.
A This is our final invoice to the Lindbergs for the work up to this point.

Q And $I$ noticed it is significantly less than the first estimate that we saw. Why is that?

A This was -- we were billing them basically for my time as a consultant. The rest of the subs and items the Lindbergs paid direct.

Q And were you paid this amount?

A I was.

Q No further questions.
THE COURT: \$5,000 total?

THE WITNESS: For us, your Honor.
CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. HALL:

Q When you do work of this nature, are you familiar with the resulting invoice in value that's created?

A Just common knowledge as a contractor, not as an agent or real estate agent or an appraiser.

Q But you would have some idea of just how much the improvements that you have made on this property have increased its value?

A Not really.

MR. MOORE: Outside the scope.
THE WITNESS: That's not my forte.

THE COURT: Cross examination.

MR. HALL: I'm sorry, your Honor?

THE COURT: It is outside the scope. That's
it. It is outside the scope of his expertise.
MR. HALL: Okay.
BY MR. HALL:

Q You stated you two have had a fairly long
relationship with Mr. Lindberg?
A That's correct.
Q About how far back does that go?
A I would say probably close to 20 years in construction.

Q And does he consult you about projects he is considering?

A Sometimes he does.
Q In this case did he?
A This case he did.
Q How early in the process did he consult you about doing what you did?

A It was sometime after he bought the property. He was wanting to -- wanted to look at that upper shed style building. He wanted to see what his options were to make it more usable for his use.

Q Had you done the project for him out in Washoe Valley?

A Which project?
Q Are you aware that Mr. Lindberg owns another parcel where he basically has done the same thing?

A No. I knew he had a place out there, but that's all $I$ know is that he lived somewhere.

Q Now, as I understand it, the upper property,
the -- the upper mother-in-law quarters room I guess we are calling it -- the upper property, did that have -how far had that progressed in the permit that had been issued during the ownership?

A The storage building that was converted?
Q Yes.
A It looks like it had gone through, from what I remember, frame. So the framing inspection had been done.

Q And inspected and permitted?
A A permit was pulled for the entire building, a storage building/garage. There is inspections along the way. The farthest inspection it looks like it got to was a framing inspection.

Q What was the remaining after that?
A There would have been electrical, plumbing, if there was any kind of plumbing in it, like a hose bin. There would have been drywall.

There would have been insulation. And there would have been final grading and $C$ of $O$, certificate of occupancy.

Q Is there any reason why you couldn't simply have gone forward on that permit, reactivated that somehow?

A That permit was expired and never finished.
And the building that exists today was not what was permitted in '96 through the county. So we had to rectify the conversion from a storage building to a residence.

Q Are you telling me it was the county's regulations that had changed so that you couldn't complete the original project?

A No. The regulation hadn't changed. It was permitted as a garage slash storage building, so we can't just pull the permit for a garage and then build an apartment.

We have to build that garage and get a final as such. You can re-permit something as a remodel and an alteration to something else. But each permit has to be finalled along the way.

Q I see. How about the other accessory unit, the barn, whatever you want to call it? Had that -- had work been done on it?

A There was no work being done on it. It
was -- there was no record of it. The county didn't even have a record of it. So we tried to just include it in the permit for the storage building conversion to residence purely for record keeping sake for the county
and the assessor's office.
Q Clarify for me, if you would please, how much sewage capacity was added? How much larger of a tank was put in?

A Without reading the sheet, I don't remember. And I didn't -- I wasn't the contractor for the sewage.

Q During your testimony someone said two units of 500 each?

A I threw out a random number and it is probably incorrect.

Q That concludes my questions.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. MOORE: Your Honor, we just -- some housekeeping items. We reviewed Exhibit 43 and 64, but they were not offered into evidence and we would offer them in at this time.

THE COURT: 43 and 64?
MR. MOORE: Yes.
THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. HALL: Just one moment, your Honor.
THE COURT: Your exhibit list there dated, what, August -- 20 to 22, that's what you are going by?

MR. MOORE: Yes.
THE COURT: And everything that you want in is
in?
MR. MOORE: I believe so, your Honor. I don't think Exhibit 5 is important. It is a check for earnest money deposit. But $I$ guess $I$ would offer it.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. HALL: No objection.
MR. MOORE: Other exhibits are potentially related to other issues and so, if they come up, I'll go through them.

THE COURT: All right. Are you resting?

MR. MOORE: I am.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Hall.

MR. HALL: Yes, we call Amina Johnson. - OOO-

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

## DIRECT EXAMINATION:

BY MR. HALL:

Q State your name for the record again.

A Amina, A-M-I-N-A, Marie, Carmazzi Johnson
Johns.

Q And could you briefly relate for us your experience in real estate?

A I've been doing real estate for approximately 30 years. I recently became a broker. I have sat on numerous committees. As a matter of fact, I was co-chairman of the professional standards. I perform mediation for the Reno Association, Reno/Sparks Association of Realtors. I am a member of the National Association of Realtors.

THE COURT: When did you become a broker? THE WITNESS: After my husband passed in
2016. So about 2017 .

BY MR. HALL:
Q And have you spent your full-time doing real estate sales during this period?

A I am a full-time real estate agent, yes.
Q How many sales would you estimate that you have conducted?

A In a year?
Q Yes.
A Or over my whole span?
Q Either way you want to report.
A I do approximately 45 -- 45 -- about 160 transactions a year myself.

Q I'll direct your attention now to the subject property. How did you first meet the Reynoldses?

A Mr. and Mrs. Reynolds were acquaintances. She was a doctor -- she was a doctor of mine and asked me to come and look at her property.

Q And what did they first ask you to do?
A They asked me to do what was called a certified market analysis that is supplied by the title company. And that pulls comparable sales, gives me or them the demographics of schools, companies around the area. Comparable sales.

Q What other information, if any, did they have available?

A They were telling me about their property, what they have done to the property, when they purchased the property, what they felt the property was worth. At that point in time $I$ think when we were talking about it the market analysis that $I$ had produced from Centennial Title Company, who does my comparable sales, was a little bit lower than what they felt their property was worth.

Q So there was -- was there a disagreement about the value of the home?

A There was. At that juncture there was a disagreement about what they felt their home was worth.

So what I did was I explained to them that this is just an opinion. And it was just comparable sales that $I$ had received from the title company. So if they felt that my price was not in line with what they wanted to get for the property, I suggested --

Q What was your price?
A It was about I think 365 , 370 . I can't
remember. It was around -- it was much lower.
So they felt their property was worth much more. So what $I$ do with every client when they feel that way is $I$ recommend that they go to a professional and have the property appraised. I gave them the name of three appraisers. I gave them Richard Lace, Jim Bailey and John Rafael.

Q When did that appraisal report -- when was it completed?

A The appraisal -- well, they wanted to list the property. But again there was a discrepancy in what I felt the price value was. So they listed the property, did the documents. But we were holding off on the documents until the appraisal came in. So the appraisal came in prior to the listing being actually consummated.

Q Were you given or shown a copy of that appraisal?

A No. I had the listing documents all signed by them and they called me up and said that their appraisal was in and that their property appraised for approximately $\$ 400,000$. And that's what they wanted to list it for.

I said -- I explained to them that a consumer likes to see things under the high number, so I suggested to them that, if they listed under the $\$ 400,000$ like at $\$ 390,000$ or $\$ 395,000$ or whatever, I would pay the $\$ 100$ difference.

So it was like 399,900, I would pay the $\$ 100$ difference if they got an offer at the $\$ 400,000$ price.

- I had to consult with my broker because I was not a broker at the time. So I had to basically make sure that he was okay with that.

Q So then did you fill out a listing form?
A Yes. At that time prior to the appraisal we sat down and $I$ did the listing agreement.

And how $I$ do that is $I$ sit down with the client and $I$ ask them if they are aware of -- if the garage is attached. If what the -- if the stove is gas or electric. If the appliances stayed or what stayed or did not stay. If there was a family room. All this information that was obtained in my listing agreement was
by the sellers.
After that is done what $I$ do is -- well, the first thing I do before I take the listing is I do what's called a Duties Owed. It is explaining to the seller that at that time $I$ represent only them and that there is a possibility that a seller -- a buyer will come in recommended by another agent.

However, that if a buyer came in represented by me I would have them sign an additional document called a consent to act.

After the Duties Owed was signed by me and the listing agreement was filled out by them, what $I$ do is I give them what's called a Seller's Real Property Disclosure Statement.

And I am not allowed by our board to touch that document, meaning $I$ can't even put in the date or the address. And what that Sellers Real Property Disclosure Statement says and what $I$ tell them when $I$ hand it to them is, "When in doubt fill it out. So any information you tell me about your property -- if you had a leak in your dishwasher or the garbage disposal doesn't work, anything you know about your property -- because you know it better than $I$ do -- fill it out. Because, if you fail to disclose something, you could be sued."

At that time $I$ gave this to the Reynoldses and they filled it out. And on it, it specifically asked, "Is there a septic?" It doesn't ask the size. It just says, "Is there a well?" What it does -THE COURT: Is that in evidence?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: What's the Exhibit Number?
THE WITNESS: I don't know where it is in the exhibits.

MR. MOORE: The Sellers Real Property
Disclosure Form.
THE COURT: What were you looking at?
MR. MOORE: Exhibit 1.
THE WITNESS: It is the Sellers Real Property
Disclosure Statement. And it is Exhibit 1 .
THE COURT: Would you use the exhibit book?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: Rather than --

THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE COURT: Then we have a record of what you are looking at.

THE WITNESS: So Exhibit 1. So under
Exhibit 1 is the Sellers Real Property Disclosure Statement. And on that statement it is a little
deceiving because -- a normal seller does not know that what it is saying is, "Are you aware of any problems?" MR. MOORE: Object to form. She is stating information. She is speculating.

THE COURT: When you say that other people don't know -- are not sure?

THE WITNESS: I apologize. On this form, when you give this to a seller, you let them know numerous things. That -- that the form states that it says, "Are you aware of any problems or latent defects with your property?" So that's where I tell them, "When in doubt, fill it out."
So it is asking on the electrical, "Are you
aware of any issues?"
"No. No."
And this is all filled out by a seller. I can't mark on it. There is no signature for an agent. It is just filled out by the seller and then given to a buyer.

BY MR. HALL:
Q Do you even suggest to them what an answer might be?

A I'm sorry?
Q Do you even suggest to the buyer what -- to
the seller what an issue might be?
A And the --
Q Or an answer to one of these questions?
A No, I don't know their property. But, if there was an issue, I told them to make sure they disclose it in their Sellers Real Property Disclosure Statement.

So in respect here, it is kind of a little ambiguous because all it is asking is, "Are you aware of any problems with the septic?" So they obviously say, no, they are not aware of any problems with the septic.

The other thing is, were there any previous moisture conditions or water damage? They said no.

Any structural defects? No.
Any construction modifications, repairs made without any building permits. They said no.

That is what they conveyed to me.
They asked me -- in this form, what is the water source? They say well. I wouldn't know.

And then if there was a water waste disposal. And then it tells them the reason under Nevada Revised Statute why they have to disclose as a seller for -- so that they give the correct information on to a potential buyer.

So that's the document. They sign it. Once an offer is received by the seller, a copy of this form is given to them. It has changed over the years. It used to be like 15 days before close of escrow, but now it is done five days after we get the offer, within five days after we get the offer, for the potential buyer to review and approve it.

Q Did they disclose to you any projects that had been started but not completed with regard to the accessory building?

A No, they did not. According to the real property disclosure statement they said all permits were in place.

Q And did you walk the property, look at it with them and discuss things?

A I did.
Q Did they point out to you anything that was improper or a problem?

A No. No, not at all. As matter of fact, their mother, Mrs. Reynold's mother, and her brother were living in the second unit.

Q Would you see as you walked the property with the Reynoldses any conditions that you felt were improper or -- could create a problem?

A No. It was a typical rural property. It was beautiful.

Q Well cared for?
A Very well cared for, yes.
Q What was next in the process of --
A What happens next is that I start to market the property. And as a marketing tool we use the comp analysis of the profile that $I$ have a copy of. We use a profile and that's how we get in and market the property. It is just a marketing tool. So I take the information that the seller gives me and then $I$ put it in there with a -- saying it has trees. It has whatever. All the documentation in here is supplied off of that listing form.

Some of the information, if you have an APN on a piece of property, if you have the assessor's parcel number, the computer when you input it, it will pick it up that it's either a single family residence or low density. It will pick it up automatically.

But on the listing form, it will ask you where your information came from, whether it came from the seller, the appraiser, the assessor, whomever. That will ask you where your information is. That goes into the MLS and then it goes -- it is out there as a
marketing tool.
So after that was done -- or after the listing was taken $I$ waited until $I$ heard from the Reynoldses in reference to the appraiser that they selected to use about the price. And they called me up and said, "Okay. We are ready for you to input it."

And that's where they came up with the price
and everything. So I said that's great. As another marketing tool what $I$ would suggest that you do is that you leave that appraisal on your table so that anybody can see it if they wanted to know about the property specifically at that time the price.

Q So you suggest that the appraisal report be there as a means of disclosing to the potential buyer?

A That is the easiest way to get that appraisal out there to the public, to whomever sees the house.

Because I don't put that appraisal in an MLS listing because, one, it shouldn't be available to anybody. It is not my property. It is the seller's property.

So the best way to get it out to any potential buyer that comes to that house is to leave it on the table and let them look through it.

Q All right. And you say you didn't see that
appraisal at that time?
A I have never seen that appraisal. The only time I have ever seen that appraisal is during these proceedings. They never gave it to me. It just was on the table. I did not bring a buyer to that house during that time. I just didn't have a buyer. Nobody called me, so I didn't see the appraisal because I didn't have a buyer.

Q Now that you have seen the appraisal, does it disclose the square footage of the septic system?

A The septic? No. Appraisals usually do not show -- they only show that there is a septic there. They do not relay the size of the septic system. That comes during the offer process.

Q So did you in fact list the property?
A I did in fact list the property. And at some juncture there was an offer received. But the people didn't qualify.

And then later on $I$ received -- another person showed it. There were some showings on it. And then $I$ receive an e-mail from Mr. Kincannon asking me questions about the property that $I$ could not answer.

So i immediately called my seller and said, "Listen, there is a potential buyer out here. But there
are some questions in here $I$ cannot answer, $I$ don't know the answers to." And that's where apparently an e-mail went back and forth between the seller, myself and Mr. Kincannon.

Q What were the issues that were brought up in those questions?

A They asked about the depth of the well. There were just numerous things. How old was the roof?

There was a lot of questions. So what I did is $I$ went through it. Wrote the questions -- the answers down with my seller because he was busy. I wrote them down and obviously he told me that it was a 1500-gallon tank. And $I$ transposed it to 15,000-gallon tank. Made a mistake.

But that information was never inputted into an MLS. That was just in my file. And then it went to Mr. Kincannon for him to give to his potential buyer prior to them writing an offer.

Q And with that, the next response to the answers to the questions was writing an offer?

A Correct. At that time -- during this time $I$ got ill and $I$ had to relinquish the listing to my broker. I was ill for probably about a week or two there. I relinquished the listing to the broker.

Only the broker can remove the listing out of the MLS. Me, even being his wife, cannot use his number and take it out of an MLS. At some point in time Mr. Johns took the listing over after December 1st of 2012. That next day or so Mr. Johns takes the listing over and I seek -- I am going through seeing doctors.

And he puts it back into the MLS.
On January 3rd or around that time an offer comes in from Mr. Kincannon based upon -- an offer comes in on the previous listing, meaning my previous listing, because we had been communicating. Mr. Kincannon did not look into the MLS to see that a new agent or broker had that listing. So he sent the offer to my e-mail address.

I am now recovering in bed with a laptop. And Mr. Johns gets this offer and then he allows me -and I am a licensed real estate agent -- I communicate back and forth via e-mail to Mr. Kincannon and his wife, Tammy Kincannon. Okay.

I believe it is Brian Kincannon.
So we communicate back and forth. An offer
was sent to the sellers. I'm not sure if Mr. Johns delivered it or if it was e-mailed.

And then they elected to counteroffer -- on
Exhibit 3. They -- the offer is on Exhibit 4.

On Exhibit 3 the sellers elect to counteroffer the price. The price of the Lindberg offered was 375.

The price that the seller elected to counter at was 385 with an escrow with Gloria Brewbick. Limited cost of repairs to not exceed $\$ 500$, I believe. $\$ 500$. And then the pellet stove they had -- they already knew that there was certification on the pellet stove, that it was certified.

Although they would have had to provide our office with a certification form or they would have to go out and get it certified by a licensed professional.

On or about the 4 th of January, this is
accepted by the Lindbergs.
After that is completed, then what you look at is the Lindbergs then have to open up escrow with the escrow company and deposit earnest money in escrow to secure the property and to make it a legal, binding contract.

So they put the money into escrow as earnest money as per Exhibit 4 which I believe was $\$ 1,500$. And then a copy of this offer and the counteroffer is opened up with the escrow officer and then the process begins. After that is opened, the lender for the

Lindbergs would normally -- with this -- I apologize. With this offer comes a couple things which were not here.

One would be the prequalification letter on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Lindberg as well as their duties owed stating that their agent -- which I believe is exhibit -- I have -- the Duties Owed from the -- I don't see it here. The Duties Owed from the Lindbergs' agent which states that he specifically represents them.

And I apologize. I can't find it, but it is in the offer. It states that he represents the buyer. Typically -- because when we have a potential seller and potential buyer and they are represented by different parties, the seller will pay those fees, half of the commission fees, to both agents. So they would get half and $I$ would get half.

After that the escrow is opened. The lender would then order the appraisal. However, in this particular case -- and there is no documentation to this case -- the approval letter that was supplied to us was only on Mr. and Mrs. Lindberg. And unfortunately during a period of time Mr. and Mrs. Lindberg for some reason could not either qualify or did not have the down payment because they had to add mom onto the transaction.

So at some juncture, which is not in our files, mom goes on the loan with them.

Q Let me stop you for just a second. When you got the listing originally did you also 'sign' that the company would have the property? Did you put your for-sale sign --

A Yes, the for-sale sign would go on the property once all the documents -- yes, were completed.

Q And when you received the offer, did it -did anyone advise you whether they had seen it on the multiple listing service or on the sign?

A Did they advise me that they had seen it on the MLS?

Q Where did they first see it?
A Only on the MLS. I do not do fliers on my properties.

Q Go ahead with your narrative. What was the first problem that occurred once the escrow is open?

A The first problem that occurred once the escrow opened was that there was an issue with qualifying. So at some point in time Mrs. -- one of the Lindberg's parents went on title -- or on the loan with them. At that time the appraisal was ordered for the buyers. So --

MR. MOORE: Your Honor, I have allowed the narrative to go for a little longer. I think she mentioned the first step was to pre-qualify. I would like this to go in an orderly fashion.

THE COURT: If you can ask questions in direct testimony.

What problems if any arose at the outset?
THE WITNESS: After -- when -- the problems started to arise when the inspections were being done.

On Exhibit 4 on KW 12 the buyer elected to include a pest inspection and a home inspection that they would pay for. Then they waived their heating, cooling, oil. They waived their survey. They included a fireplace inspection.

They included a well, quality and quantity septic inspection and pumping and then they waived -- or they asked for reinspections to be paid by the seller. At that time after that happens the seller -- because the buyer asked the seller to pay for the well and septic, the buyer -- the seller would then coordinate for somebody from the choice of the buyers -- in this case I believe it was Bruce McKay. I don't know -- for the well people to come out and do what was called a well quantity and quality test to determine the flow of the well, that
it was deep enough and the water quality test. Mr. Johns attended that inspection.

Mr. Kincannon did not. So the seller, Mr. Harry Reynolds, and Mr. Johns were both there. Mr. Kincannon and the buyer were not there.

Q Specifically with regard to the septic system were there questions asked about that and how did that --

A Well, there were issues with the well.
Issues with the well, with the quality and quantity.
When it gets to the septic inspection which is then again a buyer's inspection, again Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Johns were there. Mr. Kincannon and the buyer were not there. There were no issues. There were no questions. There were no issues. They dug up the lids. Mr. Kincannon did e-mail -- we told him the inspection was being done, if he wanted to attend. No. He said all he wanted to do in an e-mail is that he wanted to have risers put in on there.

Because there is an e-mail back and forth. The risers are the lids that make it easier for a buyer to have access to both lids. So that was left open.

Those lids were left open for a while. But what we had to address immediately was the issue with the well and the quality and quantity.

So Mr. Kincannon was contacted via phone and said, "Listen, there are issues here. Apparently there was -- "

And $I$ apologize because it is not in any of these. There was a holding tank in the garage that they needed to fix or replace or whatever and then the water quality did not pass the lab. So they had to put in a reverse osmosis in the primary residence only.

So the sellers paid to have that tank fixed and repaired or whatever they did. And they also put a reverse osmosis system into the primary residence.

And then they went above and beyond and put it into the in-law quarters because their mother and her brother were living there. They wanted to make sure it was safe. They didn't know there were any issues.

When the septic inspection came along, again,
this is a buyer's inspection. Miss Reynolds -Mrs. Reynolds had to order it because they were the legal owners of the property.

So that septic inspection then went to title for the buyer's agent and the buyer. It should have gone on to the buyer's agent, but it went specifically to Mrs. Reynolds and to the title company.

Q Now. Up to this point in time had anyone
suggested there was a problem with the relationship between the size of the lot and the number of structures?

A No.
Q Any issue about the size -- or the number of structures and the sewer capacity?

A No.
Q What was the next step in the process?
A The next step was to -- after those
inspections were done, the next step would be for the buyer to do his pest inspection and then a structural inspection.

And he had to do all these inspections within the 21-day period as for the offer and acceptance KW 12. So he had to do all this due diligence and do his inspections at this time with the inspector of his choice.

I don't remember who he had. I believe it is exhibit -- it is number seven. He used a company called North American Associated Inspection. At that time the pest inspection and the inspection usually are done about the same time.

And all these inspections that are done normally the buyer's agent is there on every one: The appraisal, the pest, the structural, the septic, the
well.
I'm there on every one of my inspections in case something comes up that $I$ want to resolve with my potential buyer at the time.

And this inspection, the building inspection from this company, Arnold Inspection Services, and the pest inspection that was done, the only people who showed up for those inspections would have been the agent who was able to get into the home and/or the buyer. I don't know who was at those inspections.

But that would have been their agent. Issues did arise out of the pest inspection. And issues did arise out of the home inspection. There was -- you would have to look through the inspections.

MR. MOORE: And, again, your Honor, this is a narrative.

THE COURT: Hold on. Wait until the next question.

BY MR. HALL:
Q Did the report come in on the septic system?
A It had come in, $I$ believe -- I don't know at what point in time. But it had come in and it was delivered to Mr. Kincannon.

Q Again, did anyone ask or discuss the
relationship between the number of structures and the sewer capacity?

A No. They did not contact us. They could have contacted Waters. I would not have known. But they did not address it.

Q And did you see a copy of the report on the septic system?

A The septic -- when Mr. Kincannon was going back and forth, I asked him if he had a copy of the septic report. Because $I$ didn't know where it was. So Miss Reynolds sent us a report and we forwarded it on to Mr. Kincannon.

Did we look at it? No. We just probably forwarded it on for their review because we wanted them to be aware of what happened since they were not in attendance.

Q With regard to all the inspections that occurred on the property, were there some required repairs?

A Normally what happens after all the inspections are done, the buyer's agent will provide the seller's agent with what's called a Notice of Required Repairs. That is telling the seller that these are the items that he found during his inspection and/or due
diligence that he wants repaired. That these are his concerns and what he wants done to the property.

We never received that Notice of Required Repairs. Because of that, we continued on with the transaction. I'm assuming -- I'm not going to even assume. So at that juncture all the --

THE COURT: Wait until the next question. BY MR. HALL:

Q Let me drop back just a little bit here. When you made the listing -- excuse me, when you prepared the listing for input into the multiple listing service, did any of the information on that listing cause you concern?

A No. Because all of it -- the seller conveyed that he never had any problems with the well. Never had any problems with the septic. That all of his permits were in place. That he was done with his mother-in-law quarters; that it was a beautiful little utopia.

Q And if there was a violation of zoning code potentially disclosed in a multiple listing service ad, is that something that you would recognize, that an ordinary agent would recognize?

MR. MOORE: Objection. Calls for expert opinion.

THE COURT: She has been working in the field for 20 years. She is qualified to answer that.

THE WITNESS: It is on the assessor's site which picks it up that it is a single family residence. It also has the zoning as LDS, low density. So it had the zoning and the single family residence, yes. BY MR. HALL:

Q Okay. So -- strike that.
All right. Let's go back to the reports being received. At a point in time after all the reports are in, is there a meeting or something to discuss the results of the reports?

A That is actually between the buyer and the buyer's agent. How we would -- how we receive, as a seller and the seller's agent, is we receive that Notice of Required Repairs stating, "These are the concerns over all the inspections we have: The structural, the pest, the septic, the well, all those, these are what we want resolved."

And we know that we have $X$ amount of dollars, which was $\$ 500$, to do that with. If they exceeded the $\$ 500$, then the parties go back to the negotiating table to resolve the issues which were the concern of the potential buyer.

Q Okay. In this case what was done with regard to solving problems?

A We never received a Notice of Required Repairs. So it just went forward. As far as the seller and the seller's agent would have been concerned, they are fine with everything because the well was taken care of and that it far exceeded the $\$ 500$ that they had in the Notice of Required Repairs.

So since we didn't receive in a timely manner the Notice of Required Repairs there is a clause in the contract I believe which is Exhibit 4. It says in here, if any inspections are not completed and delivered to the seller by the deadine set forth, buyer is deemed to have waived the right to the inspection and seller is released from the liability for the cost of repairs and inspections which would have reasonably been identified, had it been -- the conditions been revealed about those inspections.

Buyer is released from any and all
obligations to the seller and is entitled to refund the earnest money deposit and the seller -- the buyer could have walked if he was not happy.

THE COURT: What page is that on?
THE WITNESS: That's on page -- it is KW 12.

Exhibit 4. KW 12 and it is on the inspection process. BY MR. HALL:

Q To your knowledge, is there a statute that pertains to the duties of an agent for -- a condition of the property?

A If something comes up that does not match what a seller tells us -- for instance if the -- if the seller says the well is okay and the well isn't okay, we have to notify that agent immediately, which was done in this case.

If something comes up on the septic and it says it isn't okay and we have knowledge of it, we have to notify them immediately with the hopes that they were there during the inspections.

Nothing came out of any of those. Just like the buyer's agent should have advised us when they had the pest and structural done if there were any issues that they wanted resolved. We were never told that there were any issues.

Q What happened next with regard to this sale?
A What happens next is that the deadline for the inspections is done as per the fourth page, Exhibit 4 of the Offer and Acceptance. None of those items were received within the timeframe that he was to do them. So
the next thing that would be done is all documents would be placed into escrow by the buyer's agent for -- so that they are a part of everybody's package.

And the next part would be that they would do their final -- final walk through. We would hear from the appraisal, the buyer's appraisal, only if there was a issue of price.

So we never received anything on the appraisal. So the next stop would be to do their final walk through.

Q Tell me about the final walk through. What does that consist of?

A I don't believe it is in here. The final walk through is the day before close of escrow after the buyer has gone to escrow to sign and their loan docs are there, after the buyer goes to sign and then sees all these reports that he had done, the escrow officer would say specifically on these reports -- and some of them are not in here -- "Have you seen this document?"

Specifically on Exhibit 7, KW 24, "Here is
your structural report. You had your -- somebody go out there and tell you the structural integrity of the house. You ordered it. Did you receive a copy and do you approve it?"

And then the buyers sign. So on the well, on the septic, every report that was put into escrow -- the well, the septic, the pest, structural -- all these were put into escrow at the time of signing with the neutral third party who is the escrow officer.

And the escrow officer, Miss Gloria Brewbick, says, "Have you read this report and do you approve it?" And the buyers sign it.

That is the case in this transaction. So they did it on number Exhibit 7, which was their structural, on Exhibit 9, which was their well, on Exhibit 10, which is their septic.

I do not see the pest report. I do not see the appraisal report because we are not allowed to have access to those reports. We are not as agents allowed to see those appraisals. So I'm not allowed to get the buyer's appraisal. It is the property of the buyer.

Q Are you acquainted with Miss Brewbick, the escrow officer?

A Yes.
Q Are you aware of her background?
A She has been in the real estate business an escrow officer for over 45 years. I use her exclusively to make sure that all my files are intact.

Q And to your knowledge is she competent?
A Very competent.
Q Conducts the walk through properly?
MR. MOORE: Objection. Calls for speculation. MR. HALL: That's true.

Q Have you experienced problems with
Miss Brewbick's performance during a walk through?
MR. MOORE: Object to relevance.
THE WITNESS: No. Because my --
THE COURT: Hold on. Overruled.
BY MR. HALL:
Q Go ahead.
A Miss Brewbick doesn't do the walk-through.
The walk-through is performed by the buyer and the buyer's agent. And it is not in here. It is here attached to these documents. A day before close of escrow a real estate agent will approve all their inspections and make sure they are satisfied with them in escrow.

A day before closing, in case -- just in case
a property is vacant -- this is for the purposes of making sure all the repairs were done so they can satisfy themselves. But specifically in case a property is vacant and that it wasn't vacant in that period of time
before closing. So the day before -- actually this was done on the 26 th of February -- the buyer and his agent do a walk through on the property to outline any items on any of their reports that were not completed so they can stop the escrow. They can say, "We are not closing." In this particular case the walk-through, which is not made a part of this, which was part of the whole offer, they said fine for inspections and they signed it. So they waived it.

And in here it says, "All repairs previously
requested of the seller have been either personally inspected or receipts of work completed have been provided to the buyers and we do approve all the repairs. If there were any inspections requested in the Offer and Acceptance Agreement that they chose not to do, they hereby waive them."

THE COURT: Let me ask some questions here. From what $I$ hear of you, your testimony, now you are a broker and -- or an agent for many years, right?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: So you know both sides. When you take a listing the sellers make certain representations to you, right?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: And then under our law we have the disclosures law that they are subject to treble damages if they don't disclose. So I would imagine it is like approaching a green light. You are assuming that the guy coming at the right angle is going to stop because he has a red light.

THE WITNESS: I hope so.
THE COURT: So I imagine your assumption is what they put in those disclosure statements is accurate? THE WITNESS: Correct.

THE COURT: Is there a legal responsibility for an agent or broker to verify everything that's put on that disclosure form?

THE WITNESS: No. And the reason being is because it is out of our area of expertise. If we -- in the old days a broker used to be able to act as an appraiser.

THE COURT: But you don't have to verify?
THE WITNESS: No.
THE COURT: Okay. Now, Mrs. Cartinella said that there was a red flag when she looked at something that, from what $I$ gather, is within the area of knowledge of a broker or an agent. And that is the zoning designation of the lot and its low density housing, low
density residence. And there are three units on there. Okay. Did that raise a flag for you?

THE WITNESS: It was -- no. Well, it was Mr. John's listing. In the beginning when it was mine, no, it didn't. Because it was listed as a single family residence, not a multi-family residence, which you cannot have out in that area without a special use permit or special zoning change. When that property was listed, the sellers were adamant that when the Building Department came out they approved --

MR. MOORE: Objection. Calls for hearsay. THE COURT: No. It is not hearsay. There is no assertion that $I$ am aware of yet. She is talking about how she reacted to what the inspectors said.

MR. MOORE: I believe she is responding to how the buyer reacted.

THE WITNESS: Seller.
MR. MOORE: The seller?
THE WITNESS: Yes. What they conveyed to me.
THE COURT: The sellers were adamant that when
the Building Department came out they approved --
MR. MOORE: Calls for hearsay.
THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: They conveyed to us that they
had had to go through steps to get permits to have this converted. And during this permit process they had to make -- they had a contractor come.

THE COURT: They lied to you, right?
THE WITNESS: They lied to me. And, hence, they lied on their Sellers Real Property Disclosure Statement. And, hence, that's why we are all here.

THE COURT: And, as far as the septic system, there was an inspection. And the -- what that said is that it works. It doesn't talk about the hook-ups that were going into it, right?

THE WITNESS: No. And -- you know, as a broker, if $I$ may say, it has always been my concern that -- because you never know what's out there -- that these septic people and these -- actually McKay is probably one of the best -- don't go above and beyond and
tell you this stuff because there are numerous properties -- and $I$ just sold two -- that were semi-custom and custom homes that were four bedrooms on thousand gallon tanks.

MR. MOORE: States facts not in evidence.
Move to strike.
MR. HALL: Not offered for the truth of the statement.

THE COURT: I'll ignore that. But it is not your function as an agent or broker to dig up the septic system and see where it is hooked up?

THE WITNESS: We are trained and we are told and we are advised by our legal counsel for the boards that is out of our area of expertise. Our job is to market and sell a property. Leave the expert -- leave all these inspections to the experts. That's why they have those inspections.

BY MR. HALL:
Q Is there a statute that refers to that?
A There is a statute $I$ believe -- there is a statute that -- it is -- I'm sorry, I don't have it. My brain is just going. But there is a statute that says that we as real estate agents are not allowed to go out of our area of expertise. We are to leave it to the professionals.

That would be like me doing an appraisal. I can give them an idea, but $I$ can't tell them the true value of the property. That's why lenders have appraisals done. And each appraisal -- when a buyer has an appraisal, with the new laws in effect, that lender has to send that appraisal over to that potential buyer and they have to sign that they have received it, read it
and approved it.
THE COURT: Okay. The other part of that red flag that Mrs. Cartinella noticed was your statement in Exhibit 2 at page KW 7, that paragraph that says, "Three separate units: Property, in-law quarters or guest house, office or studio or tack room, the possibilities are endless."

THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: Now, that's sort of an invitation
to say, "Do whatever you want to it," but there is a limitation on the amount of capacity of that septic system.

THE WITNESS: And at the direction of the county, meaning if whatever you are going to do with this, you have to file -- you have to follow county requirements. You have to follow state, local -- you have to follow -- sure, you can do all this to this; but you have to comply with any requirements the state or government agency or county requires you to do to it.

And, honestly, in this case when the -- when the Reynoldses said they had all this done, they basically said on their earlier Property Disclosure Statement that this was done.

THE COURT: Next question.

BY MR. HALL:
Q Are you acquainted with a statute that deals with the buyers options at the time of close of escrow?

A Yes. If the buyers find something in -while doing their due diligence or through this transaction that they are not happy with or that the seller is not willing to fix or repair because it exceeded the limited cost of repairs or whatever, they can walk. They can walk away from the transaction.

THE COURT: Wait a minute. I just thought of something.

When you put that the -- total living space was 3880, wouldn't that involve the utilization of those other buildings?

THE WITNESS: Correct. So --
THE COURT: Now, wouldn't that -- ring a bell
as far as, well, wait a minute. How could they do that if it's not hooked up anywhere or anything like that? THE WITNESS: Not only hook up, because I wouldn't know about that, but it did raise a red flag with me. So I immediately called our attorney for the board and I called our board Linda Cocker and I said, "I have an issue here. And $I$ need some direction on it from our board and our attorney. The seller is saying that
his overall square footage is this amount, based upon the in-law quarters and based upon this little office and the house. How do I do that?"

And she said, "You are okay to put the overall square footage inside the MLS as long as you say that information came from the seller. But to cover your bottom," which I did in my listing, "I would outline -and you don't need to do this. But to cover my bottom I would outline how much square feet is in each unit," which is what $I$ did in my listing.

Mr. Johns did not pick that up because the offer had already come in. But -- and it is not a requirement. But at some point in time somebody is going to say, "How did you come up with that square footage?" Nobody questioned that in this case. No buyer questioned it.

That specifically came from the seller. I can't sit there and call my seller a liar. All $I$ can say is, "Okay, you do understand that, when they see the square footage, they are going to ask where it came from and they are going to do their investigation to make sure that that is the accurate square footage. And also you are going to have an appraisal from the buyer that says this. So you had better be prepared to state that that's
what it is."
THE COURT: Now, your conversations during the course of the negotiations for sale were strictly with the other agent or were you talking to the plaintiffs?

THE WITNESS: I have never met the plaintiff.
THE COURT: Because all conversations went through their agent?

THE WITNESS: Usually it is only through my seller and my agent -- or the other agent. We are not allowed to --

THE COURT: Okay. So that's a no. All right. BY MR. HALL:

Q Are you aware of any problem with developing the closing of this property transaction?

A No, I was never notified of any issues until the lawsuit.

Q Was a demand made to you informally, that is by letter, to compensate or pay damages?

A There was a demand made. Apparently my sellers settled out. And then later on it became a demand that they wanted to make some sort of a remedy with me and $I$ did offer them $\$ 5,000$.

MR. MOORE: Objection. Move to strike. That was done during this case, your Honor.

THE COURT: What's that?
THE WITNESS: I misunderstood the question.
I'm sorry.
MR. HALL: I have no further questions.
THE COURT: Yes. Sustained.
MR. HALL: I have no further questions, your
Honor.

## CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. MOORE:

Q Good afternoon, Miss Johns.
A Good afternoon.
Q You have which binder in front of you? 1 through 55; is that right?

A $\quad 1$ through 55, yes.
Q Did $I$ hear you correctly when you testified you mentioned that you had sat down with your seller before they had obtained an appraisal?

A That is correct.

Q You would agree with me that the appraisal in this case was obtained on September 5th, 2012?

A I don't know the date. I'm sorry.
Q If I represented to you that is the date on the appraisal do you have any reason to disagree?

A It doesn't -- I wouldn't. But it doesn't
necessarily mean that's when $I$ took the listing, yes.
Q But you testified that you met with them before the appraisal was done?

A That is correct.

Q That would have been before September 5th?
A That is correct.
Q And you mentioned that they had filled out some forms with you; is that right?

A That is correct.

Q And did they fill out the residential listing form that is exhibit -- Exhibit 60? I don't think you have that. If you don't, I'll grab it. May I approach, your Honor?

THE COURT: Go ahead.
BY MR. MOORE:
Q Is this okay?
A Yeah.
Q Do you see Exhibit 60?
A I do.

Q Did they fill out that form before the appraisal was had?

A Yes.
Q And so the handwriting was done before
September 5th?

A The handwriting was done -- I'm sorry. I don't understand your question.

Q The handwriting on this form was that done before September 5th?

A It says it was done on September 21 st.
Q But you mentioned, you just said, you just testified to me that they filled out this form before they had obtained the appraisal?

A That is correct. Well, they could have come to my office and filled it out. I don't remember. There was a lapse there where they didn't want to put in the price until they had their appraisal.

Q And so the handwriting on this form was filled out before September 21st?

A It was, according to this, the $21 s t$.
Q But you mentioned that you filled out this form before the appraisal, right?

THE COURT: When was the appraisal?
MR. MOORE: September 5th.
THE WITNESS: Well, they would have come into my office to do their final signatures and it says right here they did it on the $21 s t$, I don't remember. BY MR. MOORE:

Q But you mentioned, you testified, I believe
twice already, that this form was filled out before the appraisal?

A It could have been filled out, yes. It may not have been signed to basically allow me to list it until the 21st. Because they could have backed out if it didn't appraise.

Q And the reason $I$ ask that question is because on page 3 of Exhibit 60 it says, "Agent requests appraisal be done to verify pertinent info."

A I'm sorry. Where are you at on that?
Q Page 3 of Exhibit 60. It is in the upper
third, underneath the main house. It says, "The agent requests appraisal be done to verify pertinent info."

A I'm sorry. Where are you seeing this?
Q The upper third of the document on page three, R-E-Y 29 at the bottom. The upper third of that document. Do you see, "Agent requests appraisal be done to verify pertinent information"?

A Correct.
Q So you -- when you filled out this form it was before the appraisal. So you informed them that they should get an appraisal?

A Correct.
Q To verify the pertinent information related

```
to the square footage of the house?
```

A It doesn't say square footage. It says pertinent information.

Q But the information just above that sentence is the square footage of the house?

A That's the square footage they gave me. But that wasn't to verify it from the appraisal, no.

Q What other pertinent information is referenced in these MLS remarks?

A It is the price. That was just notes to myself.

Q Is the price in here?
A No, because we hadn't gotten it yet.
Q Would you turn back to Exhibit 59?
A Yes.
Q Do you recognize this document?
A I do.
Q Is it a document that you disclosed to your
clients --

A It is.
Q -- in this case?
It is entitled Duties Owed By Nevada Real
Estate Agent?
A It is.

Q Does it provide that a Nevada real estate agent under Section A (3), "Shall disclose to each party to the real estate transaction as soon as practicable any material and relevant facts, data or information which licensee knows or with reasonable care and diligence the licensee should know about the property and each source from which licensee would receive compensation"?

Did I read that correctly?
A Yes.
Q And you agree with that statement?
A Yes.
Q Could you turn to Exhibit 69?
A Yes.
Q That's the wrong -- document. I apologize.
Can you refer back to Exhibit 60?
A $\quad 60$ ?
Q Yes.
A Okay.
Q Looking at this document about in the middle of the document?

A On which page?
Q On the first page, $R$ E $Y$ 27. Where it says the total living space amounts. Do you see that?

A Yes.

Q Next to that it says source of square footage and it is checked owner and appraiser; is that right?

A That's correct.
Q Would you turn to Exhibit 64? Exhibit 64 is portions of the appraisal that was obtained by your clients in this case?

A I would assume so.
Q And it is dated at the top of the first page JJVL 031 as September 5th, 2012?

A Correct.
Q Did you give this to your attorney?
A This appraisal?
Q Yes.

A No, I did not.
Q Never?
A Never.
Q How did your attorney get it and produce it in this case?

A Through this -- just like I'm getting stuff through this lawsuit, I assume, or from the Reynolds's attorney. I don't know.

Q How did your attorney produce this and assert it was part of your file with his initial disclosures made in this matter?

A I have no idea. He asked me for all of my files and then he put together his file. This document was not in my file.

Q Exhibit 3, you mentioned -- you testified that - -

A I'm sorry, Exhibit 3?

Q Yes.

A Going back?

Q It is going to be in the first binder.

A Yes.

Q You mentioned at the time that counteroffer and offer were made in this case that you were bedridden; is that right?

A Yes.

Q And that Mr. Johns was dealing with the offer and the counteroffer; isn't that right?

A Correct, but $I$ had my laptop, yes.
Q Exhibit 3 is in your handwriting, is it not?
A It is.
Q You also mentioned in this case that during the process there was a prequalification issue that the Lindbergs could not become qualified because they were adding their mother, Mr. Lindberg's mother, to the transaction. Do you recall testifying to that?

A No. What $I$ said was there was a reason why she was added, either for qualification purposes or down payment purposes. I have no idea why she was added.

Q And you mentioned that the qualification process was stalled because of that?

A I don't know if it was stalled, no. I just said she was added eventually. She wasn't a part of the original offer.

Q Was it not your testimony just now in this courtroom that the issue -- that the issue of qualification stalled this transaction?

A It didn't stall the transaction. She was added at some point. The transaction still proceeded forward.

Q Could you look at Exhibit 61?
61 has not been admitted. I would move to admit it. And the same with 59, your Honor. I apologize.

THE COURT: Any objection to 59 or $61 ?$
MR. HALL: No objection.
BY MR. MOORE:
Q Do you recognize this document?
A I am assuming it was attached to the offer and acceptance letter.

Q And it is a prequalification letter saying that my clients, solely Mr. and Mrs. Lindberg, are qualified in this matter?

A That was attached to the offer, correct.

MR. HALL: No objection to Exhibit 61. What was the other --

THE COURT: 59.

MR. MOORE: 59. Isn't it true that Mrs. Lindberg is John Lindberg's mother.

THE COURT: No objection. That will be admitted. BY MR. MOORE:

Q She was added to this transaction at the very last minute?

A To be honest with you, I don't know when she was added. I just know she was added.

Q Would you look at Exhibit 67?

A Yes.

Q Do you see this addendum to escrow instructions that adds Judith L Lindberg as a buyer?

A Yes.

Q And it is dated February 28th, 2013?

A Yes.

Q That was the date of closing, correct?

A Yes. But I wouldn't -- would have gotten this document in my closing package. Because this would have come from title.

Q So you would have only learned about Mrs. Lindberg being added to the transaction either at the very end or after this deal had closed?

A This was -- probably at the very end, correct. She just was not on the initial approval --pre-approval letter.

Q You testified that Mr. Lindberg and Mr. and Mrs. Lindberg were responsible for the inspection of the septic in this case?

A They ordered it, yes.
Q They were responsible for it?
A It was on their -- yes, they -- it was one of their inspections.

Q You are familiar that in this case with offers made in real estate transactions that a buyer or a seller can indicate who is responsible for which inspections in any given case, aren't you?

A Only for payment. But they can request or waive any inspection.

Q And who is responsible to pay for and get this inspection in this case?

A The seller was responsible for payment. It was the responsibility of the buyer to order its inspections.

Q Where does it say that?
A That's just a normal protocol. You can't -the buyer doesn't own the real estate. So some agencies like McKay, some agencies like Waters, will not allow a person who doesn't own a house to order an inspection. It is not their house.

Q In this case, isn't it true that in the offer my clients requested a septic pumping and a septic inspection and it was to be paid for by the seller?

A That is correct.
Q During your testimony just now I heard you testify -- I counted it. I counted it -- I heard you testify three times that you never got the Notice of Required Repairs in this case?

A That is correct.
Q That's not true, is it?
A I have never seen the Notice of Required Repairs in this case.

Q Would you turn to Exhibit 70 please? And could you turn to JJVL -- I believe it is 1, 2, 3?

A Okay.

Q Do you see that document?

A Yes.

Q Is it an e-mail from you dated February 13th, 2013, to Brian Kincannon?

A Yes.

Q And does it state at the very top, "As per the Notice of Required Repairs received on December 12th, 2013."? Does it state that?

A It does, but I never received them.

Q What are you talking about right here?

A - -

Q What are you talking about? "As per the Notice of Required Repairs received on February 12th, 2013"?

A It says he was going to submit a Notice of Repairs. I never got them.

Q It says, "As per the Notice of Required Repairs received on February 12th, 2013," right?

A I never received them.

Q Right.

A It says that, yes; but we never got them.

Q Your e-mail is dated February 13th, 2013?

A Correct.

Q And then here it says -- you mentioned -- you
said in your testimony in this case that, "My clients decided to put a reverse osmosis system on both houses."

A Uh-huh (affirmative).
Q That's actually not true. That was an offer by your client after the Notice of Required Repairs came in and showed that these were necessary?

A No, that's not correct.
Q Let's read the rest of your e-mail. "At this juncture the seller is willing to do the following repair items. Raise well casing above grade and bring to code. Installed new 366 pressure tank. 2250.02 HVAC return air filter. Fix gas valve leak. Install reverse osmosis system in both houses." Did I read that correct?

A You did.
Q You also claim in this case that my client had limited the repairs that would be needed to $\$ 500$. Right?

A Correct.
Q That's not true either, is it?
A It is on the counteroffer.
Q Well, you said that my client listed the repairs to $\$ 500$.

A That was on the counteroffer. That's what we countered.

Q But that's not on the offer?

A They asked for -- more repairs. The counteroffer said they would only pay up to $\$ 500$. They asked for $\$ 2,500$. And on the - - they asked for $\$ 2,500$ for repairs. The counteroffer said we would only pay up to \$500.

Q But you testified that my client had stated that they would only --

A What $I$ probably meant was he agreed to it. MR. MOORE: No further questions.

MR. HALL: Nothing further from me, your

Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You are finished and you may step down.

MR. HALL: I'm afraid -- I believe I'm out of witnesses. I don't a witness available, your Honor. THE COURT: Who is your next witness?

MR. HALL: Gloria Brewbick.
THE COURT: Were they out there before?
MR. HALL: I thought she was. I don't know if
she --

THE COURT: How many more witnesses do you
have?
MR. HALL: I need to discuss that with my
client. But probably just her.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. MOORE: Your Honor, if I may, Gloria
Brewbick was the subject of a --
THE COURT: Is that the next witness.
MR. MOORE: -- a Motion in Limine by my
office. She -- the court limited her ability to testify about what actually happened in this case, not about what should happen in any given action. I believe you granted that Motion in Limine.

MR. HALL: That's not a problem. I wouldn't go there anyway.

THE COURT: I guess we'll go into adjournment and pick up tomorrow. Do you want to call her?

MR. HALL: I'm sorry?
THE COURT: Do you want to call her?
MR. HALL: Do you have her number?
THE WITNESS: Are we calling her as a witness or calling her on the phone? Do you want to see if she can come over is that what we are asking?

THE COURT: If she was here and left we can pick up again tomorrow. If you are not going to call her, then $I$ guess you both rest.

THE WITNESS: May I use the restroom?
(At this time a recess was taken.)
THE COURT: Be seated please. Your witness is not available?

MR. HALL: She has gone into an escrow closing, your Honor. I spoke with her directly and she said it would be very inconvenient for her to leave. She did say she could be available at 11 o'clock tomorrow. Mr. Moore said 11 o'clock is fine with him.

THE COURT: 11 o'clock?
MR. HALL: Yes.
THE COURT: That's okay with me. Do you want to argue this case tomorrow?

MR. MOORE: Yes. I think so. I believe that's their last witness.

MR. HALL: We'll argue.
MR. MOORE: I'm ready to go.
THE COURT: Okay. As far as that order, she was included with a bunch of other people.

MR. MOORE: Right.
THE COURT: And it was denied as far as she is concerned.

MR. MOORE: I thought your Honor --
MR. HALL: She was excluded?
THE COURT: She was excluded from the --

MR. MOORE: Right.

THE COURT: But it says she was involved in the -- was involved in the underlying case. So her testimony based on her observations of the underlying case are admissible.

MR. MOORE: That's what $I$ meant to say.
THE COURT: Okay. That's the area.
MR. MOORE: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HALL: Okay.

THE COURT: So then we'll see you tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock. You can leave the stuff here, if you want, because nobody is coming in tomorrow.

```
(At this time the foregoing proceedings concluded.)
```
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



|  | 122:13 <br> housing [1] - 101:24 <br> husband [1] - 70:11 <br> HVAC [1] - 122:11 | ```71:12, 73:24, 74:20, 76:4, 77:23, 79:11, 79:15, 79:21, 79:23, 82:15, 93:12, 107:6, 112:18, 112:24, 113:3, 113:4, 113:8, 114:4 informed [1] - 112:21 inherent \({ }_{[1]}\) - 20:4 initial [5] - 26:13, 31:19, 55:22, 115:23, 119:8 input [3]-79:17, 80:6, 93:11 inputted \({ }_{[1]}-82: 15\) inside [1] - 107:5 inspected [2]-66:10, 100:12 Inspection [2]-90:19, 91:6 inspection [36] - 14:13, 14:19, 55:22, 55:24, 66:8, 66:13, 66:14, 87:11, 87:14, 87:16, 88:2, 88:10, 88:11, 88:15, 89:16, 89:17, 89:20, 90:10, 90:11, 90:20, 91:5, 91:7, 91:12, 91:13, 92:24, 95:14, 96:1, 103:9, 119:11, 119:22, 119:24, 120:8, 120:12 inspections [29] - 21:10, 37:17, 43:16, 66:12, 87:9, 90:9, 90:12, 90:15, 90:22, 91:2, 91:8, 91:10, 91:14, 92:17, 92:21, 94:17, 95:12, 95:16, 95:18, 96:14, 96:22, 99:18, 100:8, 100:14, 104:8, 104:9, 119:16, 119:20, 120:3 inspector [4]-56:9, 56:10, 59:11, 90:15 inspectors [1] - 102:14 install [3] - 50:2, 50:7, 122:12 installed [1] - 122:11 installing [1] - 48:3 instance [2] - 39:11, 96:7 instances [1] - 49:16 instructions [1] - 118:20 insulation [1] - 66:19 intact [1] - 98:24 integrity [1] - 97:22``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { intended }[2]-59: 16, \\ & \text { 59:17 } \\ & \text { intent }[1]-25: 4 \\ & \text { interested }[2]-29: 19, \\ & 62: 18 \\ & \text { investigate }[1]-29: 23 \\ & \text { investigated }[1]-23: 2 \\ & \text { investigating }[1]- \\ & \text { 30:4 } \\ & \text { investigation }[6]- \\ & 23: 21,24: 10,24: 12, \\ & \text { 24:19, 24:23, 107:21 } \\ & \text { invitation }[1]-105: 9 \\ & \text { invoice }[3]-45: 10, \\ & 63: 17,64: 8 \\ & \text { invoke }[1]-4: 6 \\ & \text { invoked }[1]-4: 8 \\ & \text { involve }[1]-106: 13 \\ & \text { involved }[9]-5: 19, \\ & 5: 24,6: 10,6: 21,7: 3, \\ & 32: 14,41: 16,126: 2, \\ & 126: 3 \\ & \text { issue }[11]-42: 14, \\ & 77: 1,77: 5,86: 20, \\ & 88: 23,90: 4,97: 7, \\ & 106: 23,116: 21, \\ & 117: 10 \\ & \text { issued }[4]-21: 1,50: 8, \\ & 58: 16,66: 4 \\ & \text { issues }[20]-17: 23, \\ & 31: 23,43: 6,61: 19, \\ & 61: 23,69: 8,76: 14, \\ & 82: 5,88: 8,88: 9, \\ & 88: 13,88: 14,89,2, \\ & 89: 15,91: 11,91: 12, \\ & 94: 23,96: 17,96: 19, \\ & 108: 15 \\ & \text { items }[7]-11: 22, \\ & 63: 23,68: 14,92: 24, \\ & 96: 23,100: 3,122: 10 \\ & \text { itself }[1]-16: 17 \end{aligned}$J <br> James $_{[2]}-12: 8$, <br> 17:20 <br> January $_{[4]}-28: 14$, <br> $31: 14,83: 8,84: 13$ <br> JE $_{[1]}-19: 4$ <br> Jepsen $^{[1]}-59: 22$ <br> JEROME $_{[1]}-1: 8$ <br> $\operatorname{Jim}_{[1]}-72: 13$ <br> JJVL $_{[2]}-115: 9$, <br> 120:23 <br> Joan $_{[4]}-1: 22,127: 4$, <br> 127:18, 127:19 <br> job $[1]-104: 6$ <br> JOHN $_{[2]}-1: 10,2: 4$ <br> John $_{[8]}-41: 18$, <br> $44: 15,45: 20,45: 24$, <br> $46: 1,56: 16,72: 14$, <br> 118:9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { John's }[1]-102: 4 \\ & \text { JOHNS }[2]-3: 9,69: 15 \\ & \text { Johns }[18]-12: 9, \\ & \text { 15:15, 16:4, 16:20, } \\ & \text { 17:3, 17:20, 19:4, } \\ & 69: 24,83: 4,83: 5, \\ & \text { 83:15, 83:21, 88:2, } \\ & \text { 88:4, 88:11, 107:11, } \\ & \text { 109:10, 116:15 } \\ & \text { JOHNSON }[2]-3: 9, \\ & \text { 69:15 } \\ & \text { Johnson }[9]-12: 8 \text {, } \\ & \text { 15:15, 16:3, 16:19, } \\ & \text { 17:2, 17:20, 19:4, } \\ & \text { 69:13, 69:23 } \\ & \text { judge }[1]-38: 13 \\ & \text { JUDGE }[1]-1: 8 \\ & \text { Judicial }[1]-127: 5 \\ & \text { JUDICIAL }[1]-1: 6 \\ & \text { Judith }[1]-118: 20 \\ & \text { juncture }[5]-71: 23, \\ & 81: 17,86: 1,93: 6, \\ & \text { 122:9 } \end{aligned}$K <br> keep $[3]-21: 9,24: 18$, <br> $49: 22$ <br> keeping $[1]-67: 24$ <br> Kelly $[1]-57: 15$ <br> kept $[1]-12: 6$ <br> kick $[1]-30: 14$ <br> Kincannon $[17]-$ <br> $81: 21,82: 4,82: 17$, <br> 83:9, 83:11, 83:17, <br> 83:18, 83:19, 88:3, <br> 88:5, 88:12, 88:15, <br> 89:1, $91: 23,92: 8$, <br> $92: 12,121: 4$ <br> kind $[7]-5: 18,5: 23$, <br> $23: 10,46: 11,66: 17$, <br> $77: 8$ <br> kinds $[2]-6: 20,26: 24$ <br> kitchen $[2]-43: 5$, <br> $50: 15$ <br> knowing $[1]-17: 4$ <br> knowledge $[7]-$ <br> $25: 19,32: 4,64: 10$, <br> $96: 3,96: 12,99: 1$, <br> 101:22 <br> known $[21]-9: 12$, <br> $9: 14,15: 11,15: 13$, <br> $15: 14,15: 16,16: 4$, <br> $17: 4,17: 22,19: 5$, <br> $19: 6,19: 10,19: 12$, <br> $19: 14,19: 23,31: 24$, <br> $39: 5,39: 8,39: 9$, <br> $40: 5,92: 4$ <br> knows $[2]-20: 5$, <br> $114: 5$ <br> Kw $[6]-87: 10,90: 13$, <br> $95: 24,96: 1,97: 20$, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 105:4 | letter [7] - 22:13, 85 | 72:22, 73:1, 73:16, | 0:1, 6 | lead |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 31:10 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| lab | $\begin{aligned} & \text { liability [2]-25:3, } \\ & 95: 15 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Miss }[16]-4: 20,5: 3, \\ 9: 6,9: 16,12: 18, \end{gathered}$ |
| Lace [1] | liar [1] - 107:18 | , | [ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:15, 16:3, 16:19, } \\ & \text { 17:2, 39:4, 92:11, } \end{aligned}$ |
| Lakeside [2]-8:21 | library [1] - 25:8 | 86:4, 86:11, 93:10, | manner [1] - 95:9 |  |
|  | license [3] - 8:16 | 3:12, 93:20, | $E_{[1]}-6$ | $\begin{aligned} & 98: 6,98: 18,99: 7, \\ & 99: 13,109: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| lan | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 18,8: 19 \\ & \text { licensed [2] - 83:16, } \end{aligned}$ |  | Marie [4]-69 |  |
| lapse [1] - 111:11 |  | 107:7, 107:10 | 7:18 | mistake [1] - 82:14 <br> misunderstood [1] - |
| laptop [2] | 84:1 | 110:1, 110:10 | 27:1 |  |
| 116:17 | $\begin{gathered} \text { licensee }[3]-114: 5, \\ 114: 6,114: 7 \end{gathered}$ | Listing [1] - 7:2 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 109:2 } \\ & \text { mixed [1] - 42:5 } \end{aligned}$ |
| large [1] - 43:3 |  | literally [1] - 37:2 | market [6] - 38 |  |
| larger [2] - 47:24, 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { licenses }[1]-8: 14 \\ & \text { lids }[4]-88: 14,88: 20 \\ & 88: 21,88: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { lived [1] - } 65$ | $71: 8,71: 18,79: 6$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { last }[6]-6: 1,7: 20,8: 8 \\ 63: 2,118: 14,125: 14 \end{array}$ |  | living ${ }_{[7]}-27: 19,43: 3$, | $79: 9,104$ | 80:17, 82:16, 83:2, |
| laten | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lied [3] - 103:4, 103:5, } \\ & \text { 103:6 } \end{aligned}$ | 106:12, 114:2 | $79: 10,80: 1,80$ | 86:13, 86:15, 107:5, |
| Law [2]-2:5, 2:10 |  | Ioa | match [1] - 96: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 86:13, 86:15, 107:5, } \\ & 113: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| la | light [2] - 101:4, 101:6 | 7:15 | terial [1] - 1 | mobile [1] - 25:15 <br> modifications [3] - |
| 18:3, 23:17, 27:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { likely [1] - 13:22 } \\ & \text { Limine [2]-124:6, } \\ & \text { 124:10 } \end{aligned}$ | lo | matter [7]-9:20, 17:6, |  |
|  |  | location [1] - 54:1 | $18: 3,70: 5,78: 1 \text { s }$ | $22: 14,24: 8,77: 15$ <br> moisture [1]-77:13 |
| 40:3, 40:16, 40:19, |  | locations [1] - 8:2 | $115: 24,118: 3$ |  |
| 7 |  | look [26] - 10:8, 10:20, | McKay [3] - 87:22 | mom [2] - 85:24, 86:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 43: 17,46: 2,48: 9 \\ & 48: 17,48: 19,48: 22 \end{aligned}$ | limited [5] - 57:21, | 11:14, 11:16, 11:18, | 103:15, 120:7 | moment [1] - 68:20 <br> money [6]-37:17, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 84: 5,106: 8,122: 16 \\ & 124: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:22, 12:12, } 35: 18 \\ & 41: 19,44: 2,49: 5 \end{aligned}$ | mean [5] - 11:9, 23:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { money }[6]-37: 17, \\ & 69: 4,84: 17,84: 20, \end{aligned}$ |
| $89: 13,93: 17,101: 1$ | $\operatorname{LIND}_{[3]}-59: 6,59: 10$ | $55: 18,57: 1,58: 1$ | meaning [3] - 74:16 | 84:21, 95:21 |
| Iaw | Linda [1] - 106:22 | 5:14, | $83: 10,105:$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { monitor [2]-48:12, } \\ & 50: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| law |  | :14, 80:23 | $\text { means [1] - } 80$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 42: 19,45: 11,45: 1 \\ & 45: 23,47: 19,48: 2 \end{aligned}$ | Lindberg [16] - 10:6, | 15, 91:14, | meant [3] - 22: | monitoring [1] - 48:10 |
| $49: 13,52$ | 42.7, 44.11, 61.7 | $92: 13,117: 15$ | 6 | monitors [1] - 48:13 |
| laws [2] - |  |  | [1] - 70 | onth [1] - 61 |
| $104$ | $\begin{aligned} & 85: 5,85: 21,85: 22, \\ & 118: 2,118: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $12: 2,42: 11,101: 2$ | $0: 1$ | Montner [1]-51:12 <br> MOORE [84]-2:4, 4:5, |
| lawsuit [2] - 108:16 115:20 | 118:20, 119:5, <br> 119:10, 119:11 | looking [12]-11:2 | meeting [11] - 47:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 10,4: 19,10: 1 \\ & 11: 4.11: 7.11: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| L | Lindberg's [3]-86:22, | 4:1 | :13, | $1: 13,12: 17,16$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { leach }[3]-47: \\ 48: 13 \end{gathered}$ |  | $: 11,75: 12$ | $61: 21,61: 24,94: 1$ | $17: 1,18: 7,18: 1$ |
| lead [2] - 16:23, 56:1 | Lindbergs [6] - 63:17, |  | meetings [2]-46: | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 14,18: 17,19: 1 \\ & 20.8 \quad 32 \cdot 15 \quad 33 \cdot 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| leading [1] - 16:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 63:23, 84:14, 84:16, } \\ & 85: 1,116: 22 \end{aligned}$ | 55:20, 59:11, 61:10, |  | $33: 15,33: 18,33: 21,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { leak [2] - 74:21, } \\ & 122: 12 \end{aligned}$ | Lindbergs' $[1]-85: 8$ | $63: 1,66: 7,66:$ | mention [1] - 29: | $34: 5,34: 7,34: 10$ |
| learn [4] | line [6] - 35:2, 42:13, | oude | mentioned [13] - | $34: 14,36: 8,38: 18$ |
| 13:15, | $72: 4$ | low [6] - 11:17, 11:24, | $: 19,12: 13,87:$ |  |
| learned [1] - 11 | lines [3]-47:17, 48:1, | 79:18, 94:5, 101 | 11: | 51:11, 51:14, 54:10, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { least }[3]-24: 6, \\ & 61: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $48: 2$ | lower [6] - 42:19, | $1: 24,116: 4$ | $59: 5,60: 15,60: 19$ |
|  | list $[7]$ - 23:5, 68:21, | 43:15, 60:5, | $6 \cdot 11,116 \cdot 20$ | 61:1, 62:14, 62:17, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { leave }[7]-80: 10 \\ & \text { 80:22, 104:7, } \\ & 104: 16,125: 6, \\ & 126: 12 \\ & \text { left }[3]-88: 21,88: 22, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72: 17,73: 5,81: 15 \\ & 81: 16,112: 4 \end{aligned}$ <br> listed $[8]-15: 3,22: 21$, | Lund [2] - 8:20, 8:23 | $7: 4,121: 2$ | 2:20, 62:23, 64:16, |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 49:7, 72:19, 73:8, } \\ & \text { 102:5, 102:8, 122:21 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $-43: 2$ | $75: 10,75: 13,76: 3$ |
| left [3]-88.21, 88.22, |  |  |  | $99: 4,99: 8,102: 11$ |
| legal [6] - 32:15 | Iisten [2]-81:24, 89:2 | 34:15, 40:24 | $114: 19$ | 2:15, 102:18, |
| 84:18, 89:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { listing [51] - } 7: 18 \text {, } \\ & 11: 22,12: 20,12: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\mathbf{m}$ | might ${ }_{[2]}$ - 76:22, 77:1 | 102:22, 103:21, |
|  | 13:3, 13:4, 13:12, | 81:21, 82:2, 83:13, | mine [3] - 35:10, 71:4 |  |
| $84: 24,85: 17,104: 2$ | 13:17, 20:15, 26:13, | $83: 17,88: 15,88: 1$ | 102:4 | 110:15, 111:19, |
| $84: 24,85: 17,10$ | $27: 20,29: 11,31: 2,$ | 83:17, 88:15, 88:1 88:19, 121:3, |  | 111:23, 117:21, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { lenders }[1]-104: 20 \\ & \text { less }[1]-63: 19 \end{aligned}$ | 31:20, 36:6, 36:7, |  | 06:17, | :8, 118:12, |
| less [1]-63:19 | 36:9, 36:11, 38:5, |  | 118:14 | 124:6, 125:13, |


|  | ```93:8, 93:23, 94:7, 96:2, 99:4, 99:5, 99:8, 99:11, 102:11, 102:15, 102:18, 102:22, 103:21, 103:23, 104:10, 106:1, 108:12, 108:23, 109:4, 109:6, 109:9, 110:15, 111:19, 111:23, 117:20, 117:21, 118:5, 118:8, 118:12, 123:10, 123:11, 123:15, 123:18, 123:20, 123:24, 124:3, 124:6, 124:11, 124:15, 124:17, 125:4, 125:10, 125:13, 125:15, 125:16, 125:19, 125:22, 125:23, 126:1, 126:6, 126:8, 126:10 multi [3]-7:18, 12:2, 102:6 multi-family [2] - 12:2, 102:6 multi-listing [1] - 7:18 multiple [5] - 12:21, 20:15, 86:11, 93:11, 93:20 Multiple [1] - 7:20 N name [5] - 4:23, 41:13, 42:1, 69:22, 72:12 narrative [3]-86:17, 87:2, 91:16 National [3]-7:6, 8:10, 70:8 national [2] - 7:8, 8:13 nature [1] - 64:7 necessarily \({ }_{[2]}\) - 36:23, 110:1 necessary [2] - 52:19, 122:6 need [4] - 52:6, 106:23, 107:8, 123:24 needed [10] - 46:7, 47:23, 50:10, 50:11, 50:12, 51:1, 54:16, 89:6, 122:16 needs [1] - 24:5 negotiating [1] - 94:22 negotiations [1] - 108:3 neutral [1] - 98:4 NEVADA [4] - 1:7, 1:20, 4:1, 127:1``` | ```Nevada [14] - 2:6, 2:11, 6:23, 7:1, 7:12, 7:17, 10:17, 21:9, 31:7, 77:21, 113:22, 114:1, 127:6, 127:15 never [23]-42:18, 53:14, 67:1, 81:2, 81:4, 82:15, 93:3, 93:15, 95:3, 96:18, 97:8, 103:14, 108:5, 108:15, 115:15, 115:16, 120:16, 120:20, 121:9, 121:16, 121:19, 121:21 new [11] - 44:22, 49:18, 53:8, 53:9, 54:17, 54:18, 59:13, 62:3, 83:12, 104:22, 122:11 next [21] - 4:3, 9:22, 45:7, 79:5, 79:6, 82:19, 83:5, 90:7, 90:8, 90:9, 91:17, 93:7, 96:20, 96:21, 97:1, 97:4, 97:9, 105:24, 115:1, 123:17, 124:5 nice [2]-29:20, 30:13 nobody [3] - 81:6, 107:15, 126:13 none [1] - 96:23 normal [2]-76:1, 120:5 normally [3] - 85:1, 90:23, 92:20 North [1] - 90:19 Northern [1] - 7:17 note [2] - 14:7, 14:8 notes [3] - 113:10, 127:9, 127:13 nothing [2]-96:15, 123:11 notice [3] - 14:6, 37:6, 58:22 Notice [13] - 92:22, 93:3, 94:15, 95:3, 95:8, 95:10, 120:16, 120:20, 121:7, 121:13, 121:15, 121:17, 122:5 noticed [2]-63:19, 105:3 notices [1] - 59:10 notified [1] - 108:15 notify [2] - 96:9, 96:13 nowhere [1] - 49:15 NRS [4] - 15:18, 17:21, 24:21, 25:1 Number [1] - 75:7 number [19]-14:5,``` | $\begin{gathered} \text { 22:24, 25:18, 28:1, } \\ 31: 24,32: 8,32: 21, \\ 54: 3,55: 23,68: 9, \\ 73: 7,79: 17,83: 2, \\ 90: 2,90: 4,90: 18, \\ 92: 1,98: 10,124: 17 \\ \text { numbers }[1]-59: 4 \\ \text { numerous }[4]-70: 5, \\ 76: 8,82: 8,103: 17 \\ \mathbf{N V}_{[1]}-1: 22 \end{gathered}$  | ```offering [1] - 12:23 offers [1]-119:18 office [12]-5:13, 6:11, 13:8, 23:18, 27:8, 68:1, 84:11, 105:6, 107:2, 111:10, 111:21, 124:7 officer [6] - 84:23, 97:17, 98:5, 98:6, 98:19, 98:23 offices [1] - 25:9 official [1]-59:22 often [2] - 58:6, 61:18 oil [1] - 87:13 old [3] - 42:18, 82:8, 101:16 once [6] - 22:19, 48:11, 78:1, 86:8, 86:18, 86:19 one [48] - 13:11, 14:4, 14:6, 14:9, 14:11, 14:12, 15:4, 15:5, 16:17, 20:1, 20:5, 21:14, 22:13, 24:2, 25:18, 28:6, 29:8, 29:13, 30:12, 30:24, 32:23, 33:6, 34:22, 37:4, 39:21, 40:2, 40:3, 40:13, 43:2, 44:17, 48:20, 49:7, 56:14, 56:20, 56:22, 57:20, 61:6, 68:20, 77:3, 80:18, 85:4, 86:21, 90:23, 91:2, 103:16, 119:15 one-half [1] - 48:20 oOo [5] - 1:9, 4:2, 4:12, 41:5, 69:14 open [5] - 56:24, 84:16, 86:18, 88:21, 88:22 opened [5] - 43:8, 84:22, 84:24, 85:17, 86:20 opinion [21] - 10:6, 15:14, 15:23, 15:24, 17:8, 17:19, 18:4, 18:8, 18:24, 19:3, 19:7, 19:13, 21:4, 23:5, 23:15, 30:21, 35:21, 37:11, 72:2, 93:24 opinions [6] - 10:8, 12:23, 39:4, 39:7, 39:23, 40:4 options [5] - 44:15, 44:21, 44:24, 65:15, 106:3 order [8] - 55:14, 55:23, 56:3, 85:18, 89:18, 120:2, 120:8, 125:17``` |
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WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 22ND, 2018; RENO, NEVADA - ○O○-

THE COURT: Good morning. Counsel, are you ready?

MR. HALL: Yes. We have to get Gloria Brewbick in please.

GLORIA BREWBICK
produced as a witness on behalf of the Defendant, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

## DIRECT EXAMINATION:

BY MR. HALL:
Q State your name and address please?
A My name is Gloria Brewbick. And my address
is 3273 Spring Creek Circle, Reno, Nevada.
Q And what is your occupation?
A I am an escrow officer with First Centennial Title.

Q How long have you been employed there?
A I've been employed at First Centennial for ten years.

Q And what is your title?

A Senior escrow officer.

Q How long have you been doing that kind of work?

A I have been doing escrow for 44 years.
Q Have you seen a change in the way business is done over those 44 years?

A Yes, sir, we have.

Q Would it be a fair characteristic of the process as it is today that there are lots of forms that need to be filled in during the process of escrow? MR. MOORE: I'll object, your Honor. I believe she was allowed to testify about her knowledge about the facts of this case.

MR. HALL: I am laying a foundation.
THE COURT: This is background. I'll allow it. Go ahead. BY MR. HALL:

Q Are there lots of forms involved in this process?

A Yes, there is additional paperwork these days.

Q Some mandated by the state or Real Estate Division?

A There are certain forms mandated for all
industries. What's required of me is probably different than what is required of a real estate agent.

Q Can you just briefly describe what the escrow process, how it -- when it is opened and closed?

A With the escrow process -- this is just simplistic. When we receive an offer and acceptance, we start a preliminary title search to check to see the ownerships of the property. We contact the principles, if we need to order pay off's and obtain information. We do escrow instructions based on the contract, as far as sales price, timeframes. We wait for loan documents, if there is a loan involved. And then we call in all clients to sign their paperwork and close the transaction. It is just a simple explanation.

Q Yes. Did you -- were you the escrow officer for an escrow between Mr. and Mrs. Reynolds and Mr. and Mrs. Lindberg in January of 2013?

A Yes, I was.
Q And did you conduct the entire escrow process start to finish?

A Yes, sir.
Q Did you bring your file with you here today?
A Yes, sir, I have it as subpoenaed.
Q Could you find within that file documents
signed -- signing off on inspections?
MR. MOORE: I haven't seen that subpoena or the documents.

THE COURT: Now, are they outside of the exhibits that --

MR. HALL: They are, yes, they are, your
Honor.
THE COURT: -- that you produced?
MR. HALL: Our position is that they should have been in counsel's file, in the documents he produced.

THE COURT: But they weren't and then you were to meet and show exhibits you were going to introduce. And you didn't meet.

MR. HALL: I made -- when I made my -- page by page look at the exhibits, I thought they were there. I mean, when $I$ say page by page, I mean tab by tab. They are documents. They are in the escrow to this case. They were important as $I$ understand to what happened in the case.

THE COURT: Why didn't you show up Thursday or Friday?

MR. HALL: Thursday or Friday?
THE COURT: Yeah. For the marking of
exhibits.
MR. HALL: We were still trying to get our exhibits together, your Honor. We hadn't completed that process. And we saw the exhibits that counsel had produced and decided we wouldn't need extra -- any extra exhibits. When $I$ was putting my examination of witnesses together, $I$ realized we didn't have these documents. I have the documents. They've been -- each side has the documents. It is not that they are -- not in the case or relevant to the case or known to the case.

THE COURT: I know. We have certain rules that have been set up and need to be followed. And that's what that section is for where you mark the exhibits that you are going to be using for trial and have them marked or at least talk about which ones are objectionable and what is not objectionable.

And that, as well as the trial statements, were filed late. That's what the motions for sanctions is about.

MR. HALL: I understand that, your Honor. Again, my explanation is simply that $I$ thought that -Mr. Moore had put all the documents in relative to the escrow. When I looked through these certain documents they were not there.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Moore?
MR. MOORE: And, your Honor, it is also concerning to me that this is apparently the result of a subpoena served upon this witness requesting documents that I haven't seen and we are well beyond -- I haven't seen the subpoena. We are well beyond the discovery deadlines. This isn't a chance to get additional discovery.

THE COURT: Is that based on a subpoena duces tecum?

MR. HALL: She didn't receive it -- a subpoena duces tecum. I asked her to bring the file with her, which she agreed to do.

MR. MOORE: She testified that it was via subpoena but --

MR. HALL: Your Honor, they are an integral part of the documents that should be -- that were in this escrow and they are -- I mean, they are selected pages that have been taken out that are very, very important --

MR. MOORE: And all these documents --
MR. HALL: -- and received by Mr. Moore.
MR. MOORE: All these documents were produced, your Honor, previously in this case. We provided what we believe was pertinent to prove our case to the Court last

Thursday. We also put that in our pre-trial statement back in February. We also indicated what we would be doing in this case for many, many months. If they felt like they needed some additional documents that were in this file, they could have done it in February, last Thursday. They could have done it many, many, many months ago. So I don't believe there is anything in there that $I$ am worried about. I just want to keep the process the process.

MR. HALL: I believe that Mr. Pereos was -THE COURT: Who?

MR. HALL: Nick Pereos, your Honor. He was counsel before.

THE COURT: Pereos.
MR. HALL: And I believe they were produced.
THE COURT: Counsel admitted that they were produced.

MR. HALL: Right.
THE COURT: The objection is that you didn't produce them at the time for the exchange of exhibits to be marked. And you didn't file a trial statement showing that you are going to be using them.

MR. HALL: All $I$ can say is -- there was no effort on my part to surprise anyone.

THE COURT: I'm sure there wasn't. It is just that the procedure hasn't been followed and counsel is objecting to the lack of conformity to the procedure that's prescribed.

MR. HALL: The only thing $I$ guess $I$ can say to that, your Honor, is -- I apologize. But these documents are really -- should be in the case. They should have been in the documents. What $I$ am trying to say here is -- there are documents that are here that are in the -- in the area or excuse me in the subject matter that $I$ am asking for the documents from her. And by that what $I$ mean is -- they are inspection reports that are signed off by the Lindbergs.

THE COURT: All right. I'll go ahead and let you ask these questions. But then the sanction motion that's been filed will be more addressed to you rather than your client's case.

MR. HALL: I'm sorry. Say that again.
THE COURT: They'll be addressed to you rather than your client's case. Go ahead and ask the questions. MR. HALL: All right.

Q Near the end of the escrow in this case, did you meet with the buyers and have certain documents signed by them?

A During the course of the escrow, they appeared in our office and we signed escrow papers, loan papers and any inspections that were given to us.

Q So what $I$ am interested in is the inspection reports. Do you have those with you today?

A I have the file. Is there a specific one that you are looking for?

Q The final -- the walk through.
MR. MOORE: Just I thought we reviewed that yesterday, your Honor. I could be wrong, but $I$ thought we went through that with Miss Johnson.

THE WITNESS: Excuse me, these files are big.
I do have a copy of the walk through.
MR. HALL: Could we have that marked?
MR. MOORE: Is this an original or are we
going to need to make copies?
THE WITNESS: It is an original, sir.
THE CLERK: That will be Exhibit 78, your
Honor.
MR. MOORE: This is already an exhibit.
THE COURT: It is?
MR. MOORE: I believe so. I'll try to find
it. He can go ahead and ask questions.
THE COURT: Let's hang on. Because we don't
want duplicates. What's it called?
MR. HALL: Final walk through.
MR. MOORE: And it has a line crossed through it. That's the only reason, I recognize the line crossed through it, your Honor. I'll try to find it while we go forward.

THE CLERK: Go ahead. That's Exhibit 78. BY MR. HALL:

Q Handing you what's marked for identification as Exhibit 78, what is that document?

A The document is a Walk Through and Property Condition Release.

Q And is that a form that you use in each escrow that you handle?

A The Walk Through and Property Condition Release is executed with the parties, with their agents. They'll just supply a copy to escrow.

Q Is that an original?
A This is an original. So perhaps they did it in my office. I don't know. It is an original signature.

Q All right. And you are familiar with the signature by -- bearing the documents that you have?

A The walk through is signed only by the buyer
as that was all that was required.

Q Okay. I would like to offer Exhibit 78 into evidence.

Tell us what information it disclosed -THE COURT: I was looking at the trial exhibit list. Do you have an objection to the admission, Mr. Moore?

MR. MOORE: I don't, your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. We'll admit it.

BY MR. HALL:
Q First of all, tell me about the diagonal line through the document. What is that intended to accomplish?

MR. MOORE: Objection. Calls for speculation. MR. HALL: Is that line made by you? THE WITNESS: No.

BY MR. HALL:

Q It was on the document when you received it then?

A I couldn't answer that. It is not my writing.

Q Is that a typical way to express coverage of the items that are drawn through?

MR. MOORE: Same objection.

THE COURT: I haven't seen the document. If she didn't do it --

Did you see it being done?
THE WITNESS: I can't honestly answer that yes
or no.
THE COURT: All right. Well, then next
question.
MR. HALL: I'm sorry?
THE COURT: Next question.
Objection sustained.
BY MR. HALL:
Q In your meetings with the Reynoldses, was this document brought out, spoken of, any attention paid to this by you in this process?

A With The Walk Through and Property, I'm not present when walk through's are done. That's -- not something as an escrow officer that $I$ am present when they are done. And per this Walk Through and Property Condition Release, a seller doesn't need to acknowledge it unless there is a repair issue.

Q And it is signed off in the appropriate place by the Reynoldses, correct?

A The Reynoldses did not need to sign it because the seller does not need to, if repairs aren't
required. So it is signed only by the buyer, sir.
Q I'm sorry. I misspoke. The title of the document, full title, is Walk Through and Property Condition Release. Is that what this document is intended to accomplish; that is a release of issues relating to the condition of the property?

MR. MOORE: Calls for a legal conclusion.
THE COURT: I guess he is asking if she knows what that document means.

THE WITNESS: I know what it means from
experience. But I'm an escrow officer, not a real estate professional.

BY MR. HALL:
Q What does it mean from your experience?
A That they are satisfied with the conditions.
THE COURT: Why don't we take a break? Brad,
if you would take that and make a -- two copies of it.
THE DEPUTY: Yes, your Honor.
THE COURT: Three copies.
BY MR. HALL:
Q While we are doing that, do you have another -- do you have -- let me just ask it this way. Do you have other forms that document that certain inspections have been made to the property?

A I am sorry. I don't understand your question.

Q Are there other documents in your file signed by the Reynoldses that show -- agreement that certain inspections have been completed?

A Are there certain inspections that are signed that are in my file? Is that the question?

Q Yes.

A Yes, there are.

Q Can we have those, please?

A You can have everything $I$ have.

MR. MOORE: And, your Honor, there are
multiple inspections that are exhibits. I --
MR. HALL: Let me look through and compare with what we have got.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. HALL: I agree that we have --

THE COURT: Start with --

MR. MOORE: And, your Honor, the document that
I thought was Exhibit 78 is actually -- isn't. It is part of Exhibit 51. It has a line through it. So it was my error, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Well, 61 is the letter dated January 3rd.
MR. MOORE: It is part of 51.
THE COURT: 51.
MR. MOORE: It is the second page of
Exhibit 51.
THE COURT: 51 is not in.
MR. MOORE: I don't believe we ended up having
that one in.

THE COURT: All right. Next question.
Are you finished looking at what you were
looking at as far as inspections go?
MR. HALL: Yes.
THE COURT: All right.
BY MR. HALL:

Q Handing you back -- I guess I'd better have it marked.

THE CLERK: Do you want this as one document, counsel?

Exhibit 79, your Honor.
BY MR. HALL:
Q Handing you what's marked for identification as Exhibit 79, those are documents we just took from your file. Those documents are signed by the Reynoldses.

A These are documents that are signed by the -buyers.

Q Okay. I'm getting them confused. Lindbergs.
A They are signed by the buyers.
Q What are those documents?

A Well water analysis. Waters Vacuum Truck Service. Waters Vacuum Truck Service and Waters Vacuum Truck Service.

Q And by the language are they -- provided to show that the inspection has been made and accepted by the Lindbergs?

MR. MOORE: Calls for a legal conclusion.

THE COURT: It's not a legal conclusion if
that's what they say. I don't know.

THE WITNESS: It is acknowledging the --
acknowledged by their signatures that they have seen this information, yes, if that is the question.

THE COURT: 'They' being the?

THE WITNESS: They being the buyers.
THE COURT: All right.
BY MR. HALL:

Q And showing their acceptance of the tests shown in each of those documents?

A They have signed and acknowledged, read and approved above their signature.

Q All right. Move for the admission.

MR. MOORE: Your Honor, I believe they are already admitted as Exhibits 8 and 9.

MR. HALL: I don't think we have all of the pages.

THE COURT: 8 and 9?
MR. MOORE: 8 and 9.
THE COURT: Yes. Eight is well water analysis report. Nine is septic system inspection.

MR. HALL: Two of those are in here, but this has additional inspections.

THE COURT: All right. 79.
BY MR. HALL:
Q I think I'll move for the admission.
MR. MOORE: No objection.
THE COURT: Admitted.
BY MR. HALL:
Q Miss Brewbick, was the escrow successfully completed?

A Yes, sir, it was completed and recorded. Do you want the exact date we physically recorded?

Q Now, the dates of these documents that were just produced are $I$ believe January 18th, 2013; is that correct?

A I think you took my document. I can't see
the date.

Q Just tell us the dates on those documents.

A The well water is 2-8-13. Waters, one report, is 1-18-13.

Another Waters is $1-16,2013$. And another Waters 1-18-2013.

Q Was there anything that occurred between the signing of these releases that we have just looked at and the close of escrow?

A I wouldn't know that, sir.

MR. MOORE: Object to the form, referring to it as a release.

THE COURT: Yes. Whatever it is. When is the day of escrow?

THE WITNESS: The escrow closed on 2-18 -excuse me 2-28-2013. That was the close of escrow date. BY MR. HALL:

Q Do you have any documents or do you have any independent recollection that there was -- were any problems brought up in that escrow between the dates of these inspections and the close of escrow on February 28th?

A I wouldn't have that knowledge.
Q Who would have that knowledge?

A That knowledge would be through the real estate professionals.

Q All right. That completes my questions, your Honor.

MR. MOORE: I have no questions for this witness.

THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
MR. HALL: Thank you.
THE COURT: You are excused.

THE WITNESS: Did I get back all my originals?

MR. HALL: Your Honor, when we were discussing
the continuing the trial from yesterday afternoon to today, you asked me how many witnesses I had and who my witnesses would be. And I told you Gloria Brewbick for sure and possibly one other. I had to check with my client. We would like to call Pamela Molini. She is here.

MR. MOORE: I have two objections. One is --
THE COURT: Who is it?

MR. MOORE: Pamela Beko Molini. I have two
objections, your Honor. One, counsel has already acknowledged yesterday we were told that Gloria Brewbick would be the only witness.

THE COURT: I'm not concerned about that.

MR. MOORE: The second item, your Honor, is that Miss Beko Molini was withdrawn as an expert by former counsel Nick Pereos in revised pre-trial disclosures dated March 9th, 2018.

THE COURT: Never -- renamed.
MR. MOORE: On Monday, she was included in the trial statement -- late filed trial statement. And I didn't hear that she was going to be called here. So I haven't -- I didn't object.

THE COURT: All right. She was named as an expert and was withdrawn by prior counsel and was never redesignated. So I can't allow her to testify.

MR. HALL: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Any other witnesses?
MR. HALL: No. The defendants rest.
THE COURT: All right. Mr. Moore, any
rebuttal?
MR. MOORE: No rebuttal, your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Are you prepared to
argue?
MR. MOORE: If we could, I would like to confer with my client and could we start after the lunch break?

THE COURT: Oh, I was just going to go all the
way through. But we'll take a lunch break.
MR. MOORE: How long did you want to break for? Ten minutes, your Honor, if we may?

THE COURT: And then what?
MR. MOORE: And then I'll start and we can go until we are done.

THE COURT: I don't care one way or the other.
MR. MOORE: Whatever you want to do.
MR. HALL: I would prefer to take at least a short break. We are ready to do our closing.

THE COURT: Why don't we do this?
Why don't we break until 12 o'clock and then come in at 12:00 and we'll go until we are finished.

MR. MOORE: One thing, your Honor. Before we commence closing, $I$ did want to correct an error that $I$ made in -- I referred to a case Ewing versus Bissell. And $I$ informed the court in my opening that it was a case against a seller's agent in front of the Nevada Supreme Court. It actually was against the seller.

THE COURT: I read that.
MR. MOORE: But the same principles apply in
this case. And then, your Honor, prior to today we submitted invoices up until December of 2017 from my law office. And we are interested in submitting invoices up
until -- up until last month if that's a possibility. MR. HALL: If he is going to support them, I don't object.

THE COURT: You are going to have them marked and admitted, right?

MR. MOORE: Right.
THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.
THE CLERK: That will be Exhibit Number 80, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. MOORE: And no other items of clean up,
your Honor. So I guess we can take a break until noon. THE COURT: All right. 12 o'clock.
(At this time a recess was taken.)
THE COURT: Be seated please. All right,
counsel. Are you ready?
MR. MOORE: Thank you, your Honor. I appreciate the time that we have been afforded to present our case.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. MOORE: And, as $I$ stated in my opening
statement in this case, this is a perfect example of why consumers here in Nevada hire realtors. They are licensed professionals. They are hired because they have
knowledge of the industry. They have knowledge of zoning requirements, things of that nature, which the average consumer might not know. They also help us as consumers to provide accurate disclosures and to make sure that items that are listed and shown out to the public are correct.

They also walk us through the multiple documents that are part of a real estate transaction.

One thing that Miss Brewbick said on the stand that $I$ am certainly agreement with is the amount of documentation has gone up in real estate transactions. So they are there for that reason. Realtors aren't hired in this case just to cash a check at the end of the transaction. They are here to help us get through the transaction.

And this transaction, your Honor, be certain has been nothing short of a nightmare for my clients. Multiple meetings. Multiple applications. Tens of thousands of dollars to try to correct the problem that was known prior to this transaction.

THE COURT: But it wasn't known by this defendant.

MR. MOORE: Well, we are going to get into
that. I'll argue the evidence that shows knowledge of multiple things.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. MOORE: And I'll continue through that as we go. And because consumers rely on realtors, the Nevada legislature deemed it necessary to pass legislation that establishes -- that establishes statutory duties that realtors owe to all parties to a transaction. They have to disclose known information under NRS 645.252(1)(a).

They have to disclose information that they should have known under that statute. They have to act reasonably in real estate transactions as stated in NRS 645.252(2).

Here in this case, when testifying on the stand, Miss Johnson repeated several times that she did not represent my clients in this transaction.

But under Nevada law that doesn't matter.
Under Nevada law there are duties owed to all parties under these specific statutes that $I$ have just cited.

Miss Johnson also explained on the stand that, if my clients had been her clients, she may have acted differently towards them. That's also immaterial
because under this statute -- because those duties under this statute are owed to all parties to the transaction. So who you represent in the real estate transaction is immaterial.

In this case, there are three things that $A J$ Johnson and James E Johns did not disclose or that they did not do which they either knew or which they should have known as shown by the evidence. The zoning -- the number one issue, the zoning in this area is low density suburban.

And, according to Exhibit 25, which is in evidence, that allows one residential structure and one accessory building that's no more than half the size of the main residential structure.

So in this case we have a main building. It is 2180 square feet. We have another building that was actually 1460 square feet but which was advertised as 1700 square feet.

That in and of itself is a violation of the zoning requirements. Additionally, having a third building on the -- this property is a violation of those zoning requirements which is found in the washoe county Code at section 110.306 .25 .

Here Miss Johnson testified that she
understood the zoning requirements for this area. She went through and talked about low density suburban zoning. This is knowledge that she had. Yet she allowed this listing to go forward first in September of 2012 .

And then again Mr. Johns in December of 2012 listed it as single family residential, when in fact, as it stood at that very moment, that property violated those zoning requirements.

Because Miss Johnson testified that she was aware of the zoning requirements for this area, she knew that that was a violation. At best, if she didn't know, she should have known that it was a violation.

You can have one residence, but -- and one accessory building, not two accessory buildings. So the listing is incorrect. And my client had to deal with that issue related to zoning for two years, almost two years.

Going to meetings, having their first applications turned down at hearings. They had to go back to the drawing board. They had to get surveys. They had to put in a new septic. They had to disconnect the second building from the main septic. They had to do and spend lots of money.

Ron Cohen testified about the time and the
multiple steps that were required so that my client could obtain a variance to have three structures on this property.

In the opening statement from opposing counsel, he stated that all the things of which my clients are complaining that these were all disclosed to them prior to closing, but there is no evidence in the record that shows that this zoning violation was presented to my client or that this was known to my client.

That is why my client sued his own realtor and that is why my client sued the remaining defendants in this case. Because nobody did their job. It is that simple on that issue.

The second issue that we complain of is that the property is listed as having 3,880 square feet of total livable space. But that an appraisal that was obtained on September 5th, 2012, shows the true size as 3,640 square feet.

Exhibit 63 shows an appraisal that was provided by the Reynoldses, the sellers in this case. Exhibit 64 is a partial appraisal provided by Miss Johnson's former attorney in the initial disclosures in this case.

Miss Johnson claims on the stand that she never saw this appraisal until this lawsuit. That simply isn't true, your Honor. It was produced by her attorney in initial disclosures, not after this case was a year old or two years old. In initial disclosures.

How did he get it unless Miss Johnson had it
in her file?
We also believe that a preponderance of the documentary evidence proves that she had this appraisal as early as September.

Exhibit 60 at page one, the first page of that document, shows the -- which is the property listing form. If you remember, your Honor, it is the property listing form that Miss Johnson filled out. It is in her handwriting. And on that first page it says the wrong square foot, 2180 for the main house and 1700 for the second house. And it says the source of that information is from the owner and from an appraisal.

Also on the third page of -- sorry. That
Exhibit 69, your Honor, which is various e-mails at Bate stamp number JJVL 52, Miss Johnson sent an e-mail during negotiations in this job. An offer was made on January 3rd. The counter offer was then made on January 4 th by e-mail.

With the counteroffer that was sent Miss Johnson said my clients are only making a counteroffer because they obtained an appraisal. See attached.

That also shows that she had the appraisal in her possession during this transaction. So, your Honor, it is our contention that the documentary evidence proves that Miss Johnson had the appraisal during this transaction and that she didn't disclose the right square footage.

Now she may say, "I didn't look at the appraisal," or, "I don't recall seeing square footages listed," but that doesn't matter. As a professional in the industry, as a licensed realtor, she should have known the appropriate square footage. It is set forth in a few locations in that appraisal.

Which brings me, your Honor, to what's gone on in this case since August 20 th until today. Various statements made on the stand, as Miss Johnson continued to talk and give narrative responses, she just kept digging a hole for herself on issues that she shouldn't have been trying to mislead anyone.

I don't even know where to begin. But what I will do is I'll start at the finish. The final moments of testimony yesterday. Miss Johnson testified three
times that she had never received the Notice of Required Repairs in this case. Exhibit 70, however, at JJVL 123 -- and I want to read this just so I get it right.

In an e-mail from Miss Johnson to Brian
Kincannon dated February 13th, 2013, she states, "As per the Notice of Required Repairs received on February 12th, 2013," the day before. She did receive it.

THE COURT: What were the required offenses?
MR. MOORE: There were a number of items including issues related to the well. The casing was pretty low. It needed to be raised a little bit.

THE COURT: Was that fixed?
MR. MOORE: It said here in what the -- this same e-mail what the buyer -- what the seller offers to make these repairs.

So raise the well casing, install a new
pressure tank. Did some fixes to the HVAC return. Fix the gas valve and install reverse osmosis systems in both houses.

So those were the issues. She has no reason to try to say that she never received this --

THE COURT: But they weren't all fixed.
MR. MOORE: They were.
THE COURT: So you are --

MR. MOORE: The issue --
THE COURT: Credibility.
MR. MOORE: The truthfulness of this witness, your Honor. She doesn't have to say that she didn't receive it. She could say, "Yeah, I got it. Repairs were made."

This is immaterial to this case, quite frankly, your Honor. So, if she is going to stretch the truth on things that are immaterial, she is stretching the truth on the things that really matter.

So that's item number one.
In this same e-mail, she is -- she testified
that -- on the stand yesterday she testified that my client decided to install a reverse osmosis system at both houses and that it was not an offer made by her client. She said that on the stand. But Exhibit 70 says, "At this juncture the seller is willing to do the following repair items."

The fifth item, install reverse osmosis systems in both houses. That was an offer made by her client. And she said that that -- "No, my client didn't make that offer."

Miss Johnson's ability, your Honor, to tell
the truth is paramount here because she is the only
person that's been offered by her side as a potential expert in this case.

On the stand you recall Miss Johnson called her client a liar. She said that her client lied to her about the permitting. If you are going to say that in open court, it had better be based on evidence other than your own testimony. You need documents.

THE COURT: You have the documents. You had your client saying that he wanted to fix the electrical in the one unit and when they found out there was no permitting that's how that was discovered. Now, what $I$ don't know is whether that predated the Reynoldses occupancy of that house or it happened during. That's not in evidence. So the only conclusion is they knew it; she didn't. Because she didn't have to dig up the ground.

MR. MOORE: We did sue her clients for that, your Honor. We did raise that as a claim, which, as you know, has been settled. But there needs to be proof that they are not telling the truth with these permits for you to be able to say that.

THE COURT: They didn't have any permits. As far as I'm concerned, that's the truth.

MR. MOORE: They didn't have any permits.

THE COURT: It ended in '94.
MR. MOORE: But they are not in here today to testify to say, "I never even talked to my realtor about whether I had permits or not."

THE COURT: They signed a disclosure form.
MR. MOORE: I know. I understand that. But
she said, "They told me specifically that they had gotten permits." They are not here to defend themselves here today, your Honor. Moreover, her clients weren't telling the truth -- let's assume that they weren't -they were a part of this lawsuit as well, your Honor. There is no cross claim that was brought against her clients.

THE COURT: I saw that.
MR. MOORE: There was no affirmative defense saying that somebody other than these are responsible. There is no claim of indemnity contribution. None of that. So, if it were true, put it on record and prove your case.

Now, let's go to the beginning of her testimony in this case. On the first day Miss Johnson claimed that there was an offer made before my clients had made an offer.

But if you look at Exhibit 72, which are our
request for production to Miss Johnson, we asked her to produce any offers. The request for production number three we asked her to produce all offers that defendants Harry and Deann Reynolds received from any prospective buyers from September 1st, 2012 until the close of escrow on or about February 28 th.

The response was none. None. But she said in open court that offers had been made.

Exhibit 72, which are responses to
interrogatories which are signed under oath, under penalty of perjury by Miss Johnson, said that her brokerage, JE Johns \& Associate, only received a two-and-a-half commission. According to Exhibit 66 it is a three percent commission. There is no reason to be dishonest about these minor little things. But here we are.

At Exhibit 69 at JJVL 52, it mentions 'see attached' at the end of that e-mail in reference to the appraisal. On the stand Miss Johnson claimed that the attachment to that document were handwritten responses to questions about the septic system. But if you look at Exhibit 70 at page JJVL 110, there is an e-mail from the day before where she outlines all of the answers to the questions about the septic system and the other issues.

So, your Honor, these multiple issues go to the heart of the credibility of this witness. She said she didn't have the appraisal. The documents show that she did.

She said multiple other things throughout this case, but the documents showed the opposite.

That is a pattern that is what we are dealing with here. We want her to take responsibility and that's why we are here today in this case.

The third item that we complain of which was testified to by Sherrie Cartinella on the stand is that with all the information that these realtors knew about the septic system they also should have known that it was too small for this property. Miss Cartinella didn't limit her testimony to the remaining defendants in this case. She also said that my clients' realtor should have known that it was inadequate. The things that are known about the septic system is that it is on 1.12 -- the property is 1.12 acres. It has three separate units. It is zoned single family residential, low density suburban.

There is only one tank and it has a thousand
gallons. The documents show that all of that information was known by both realtors in this case.

THE COURT: Now, one thing clear up for me if you can.

MR. MOORE: Yes.
THE COURT: That second unit, the
mother-in-law quarters, at the time of the sale, was there a functioning bathroom in it?

MR. MOORE: This was.
THE COURT: There was, okay.
MR. MOORE: Bedroom and bathroom. And if you recall, Ron Cohen --

THE COURT: So the line is hooked up into the toilet of the main residence.

MR. MOORE: Exactly. Ron Cohen testified that there was -- the sewer from the detached house went to the main house and they had to separate it as part of what the county required.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. MOORE: So with all this information, they should have known there were multiple red flags, according to Miss Cartinella, that were ignored. This information about a septic system was never corrected.

And Sherrie Cartinella said there is no need to investigate further on these items. You should have known this. And it should have been disclosed. And the
only rebuttal we have here is Miss Johnson's testimony. The only rebuttal to -- that these items should have been known is Miss Johnson's testimony.

So, your Honor, under NRS 645.257 my clients are allowed to recover damages that are the proximate result of a failure to disclose information that is known or that should have been known.

And we contend that, but for this listing of the property and not disclosing the zoning issue that was known or should have been known, but for listing the incorrect square footage which was known or should have been known, and but for the failure to disclose the adequacy of the septic system, my clients would not have suffered any damages.

They would not have been faced with the requirement to hire attorneys. They wouldn't have had to have gone to the county. They wouldn't have had to pay tens of thousands of dollars to get this fixed. In this case, your Honor, my clients are not being unreasonable. They are not asking for the moon, sun and stars.

They are asking for very reasonable damages, which I would like to go through with you, your Honor, at this point.

Your Honor, we contend that because Miss

Johnson new the correct square footage, that an abatement of the price paid is an appropriate measure of damages, the difference between the square footage of 3880 square feet and 3660 square feet. We believe that it is appropriate that this is a measure of damages for this issue because there is not much else you can do about this problem.

An abatement is really the only available remedy for this. Because the square footage, the incorrect square footage, didn't cause my clients to have to go to the county. It didn't cause my client to have to submit all kinds of applications and spend thousands and tens of thousands of dollars to get a variance, the improper square footage itself.

So, your Honor, the difference between those two -- and $I$ rounded up this number to $\$ 23,800$. We would request those as damages against Miss Johnson for the incorrect square footage issue.

THE COURT: Counsel, let me ask you this.
This being 2012, 2013, the law about the
duties of the realtors changed in 2007; that they did not have to do any investigation or anything. So how do you justify that request?

MR. MOORE: She doesn't have to investigate
anything, your Honor. All the documents were in front of her. So she knew the difference.

THE COURT: The appraisal measured that out.
MR. MOORE: The appraisal says it specifically
in multiple locations.
THE COURT: All right.
MR. MOORE: Exhibit 63 and 64. It says the correct square footage which is 3640 , not 3880 .

THE COURT: All right.
MR. MOORE: We also contend that Miss Johnson knew or should have known the zoning issue and should have known septic system problems. Those are combined. Both of those issues are what caused my client to have to go to Washoe County to get a variance. You recall Ron Cohen saying they had to go get a variance for the septic. They also had to get a variance for the mother-in-law quarters which was in violation of the zoning requirements.

They had to abandon over 400 square feet of the mother-in-law quarters so that it wouldn't be more than half the size of the main house. So they now only have 934 square feet at the mother-in-law quarters instead of 1460 .

So we are only asking for the cost to make
that right. Permitting in the amount of $\$ 3,329.37$, which is shown in Exhibits 17, 18 and 29.

Impact fees, road impact fees, \$419.69.
Exhibit 32.
The septic improvements made by Montner, \$7,050, shown in exhibits 38 and 39 .

Ron Cohen Consulting $\$ 5,000$ Exhibit 40 for the amount of work he did charging only $\$ 5,000$.

Amazing.
Planning fees, this was so that they could get their new plans approved so that they could get a permit from Washoe County. $\$ 2,024.89$ at exhibits 13 and 17.

The boundary survey which was required by the county cost them $\$ 4,050$. They had to get the boundary survey so that they -- when they put in a new leach line they were certain that it wasn't too close to anybody else's property.
$\$ 4,050$.
Exhibit 15 .
Architectural plans, in the amount of $\$ 5,500$.
Again those plans were required to show where everything was so the county could know. Because the other stuff had been unpermitted. The county didn't even know some
of it was there. So they had to do architectural plans to show where everything was and also to show where they were going to put the new enlarged system with two tanks. That's shown in Exhibit 16.

Then also a pH water test. $\$ 290$. I don't believe that was an exhibit. But my client testified to the amount. And that totals $\$ 27,663.95$, your Honor. Also because we contend that duties of a realtor were violated in this case the realtor should not be entitled to the commission paid. So JE Johns \& Associates was paid a commission of $\$ 11,550$ as shown in Exhibit 66.

So we would ask for these amounts as damages. In addition, we would request an award of attorney's fees. We request that, your Honor, because, but for nondisclosures, my clients would not have been required to hire an attorney to try to protect themselves.

At the beginning of this case when I talked about Sean Brohan, he has been disbarred. He has been disbarred partially because of this case. He charged my clients -- invoices $\$ 6,825$, but he took $\$ 10,260$ from my clients. I don't know that we are going to ask your Honor to pay those. But there they are. Then we have my fees from the -- up until December of 2017, \$7,457.25.

Shown in exhibits 45 and 50. Those are fees that were spent by my office for over a year.

THE COURT: But against all the defendants.
MR. MOORE: Against all the defendants. Until
there was a settlement. There was a settlement in the summer of 2017 , mid 2017.

THE COURT: But thereafter. Summer 2017 until
now.
MR. MOORE: And all my invoices, your Honor, are given by the month so you'll know by which month. Costs for us during this time weren't very much. \$631, as shown in Exhibit 50 .

After December of 2017 when things were
looking like they were going to go to trial and we were completing discovery. We are filing multiple motions with the court, multiple other amounts of work, I agreed to take the case for my client after December of 2017 on a contingent bases.

But during that time period the actual costs spent on my fees, incurred by my office, are $\$ 29,677$ which are supported by Exhibit 80 .

And the costs, including deposition costs and things of that nature, $\$ 4,393.09$, also shown in Exhibit 80 .

So, your Honor, we would request that the court use this as a contingent case and isn't interested in awarding actual fees here that there be awarded $\$ 12,484.34$ or if the court would award actual fees $\$ 42,158.34$.

Your Honor, these fees were incurred to vindicate statutory rights by my client.

THE COURT: Were they reasonable?
MR. MOORE: I believe so.
THE COURT: I didn't hear any testimony.
MR. MOORE: Then, your Honor, we thank you again for your time. We believe my clients have shown by a preponderance of the evidence what happened in this case and why they are entitled to a judgment in their favor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Counsel, when we started I asked you about the settlements. And the amount of settlements that you mentioned was --

MR. MOORE: $\$ 57,500$-- 50 from the seller. $\$ 7500$ from the other realtor. And, your Honor, those issues -- I believe we briefed them for the court previously. Especially with the seller, those are related to statutory duties that are distinct and different from the claims against the realtors here.

THE COURT: But they are based on -- the portion that's tripled is based on damages suffered by the buyer.

MR. MOORE: Correct.
THE COURT: All right. So that's 15 or so thousand dollars. Right?

MR. MOORE: No. If we had pursued our claims to conclusion against the seller we would have asked for over $\$ 40,000$ in damages related to repairs. We are not requesting --

THE COURT: All these damages you mentioned would have been because of the seller. Right?

MR. MOORE: No. And I believe we have outlined why these are also the responsibility of the realtors that remain in this case because they knew or should have known about these issues. Their duties are distinct. They have to disclose information that is known or that should have been known to them. If they fail to do that, they have to pay statutory damages. It is not tort. It is not contract. There is no joint and several liability related to that. The same is true with the seller, your Honor. Because those are statutory damages. There is no joint and several liability. There is no right of contribution or indemnity in those
situations. There have been no claims as $I$ said in the beginning of my closing. There have been no claims for contribution or indemnity anyway in this case by the remaining defendants.

THE COURT: How do you justify $\$ 7,500$ for the sellers?

MR. MOORE: The settlement for -- we settled with the seller for 50 .

THE COURT: 50. But 7500 for the -- seller's realtor.

MR. MOORE: Our realtor, the buyer's realtor. THE COURT: Right. Right. Buyer's. Because you said they had the same. Because of who they represent they had the same responsibilities.

MR. MOORE: Exactly. That was a reasonable offer that was made and accepted by my client. And, if you would like to know, we made the same offer to the other side.

THE COURT: Was there an offer of judgment for $75 ?$

MR. MOORE: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
MR. HALL: Your Honor, I would like to sit
here.

THE COURT: Sure. Go ahead. But just talk
loud.
MR. HALL: I will. Thank you.
Now that the smoke has cleared around all of the fluctuations in calculations of the square footage in this property, the actual resulting numbers 3,640 is only 240 square feet less than what was in the $M$ L $S$. That's not a big difference. That's well within a zone of reasonableness. And $I$ would submit that -- the testimony about what that should have told my client is just not true because there is not that much difference between the two numbers.
If you relate it to -- let me just -- say
this.
The amount of square footage was finally known at 3640 , as Mr. Moore says. That was corrected. The buyers became aware of that square footage. They agreed to take the property with that description of the amount of square footage intact and waived it pursuant to the documents that we have produced here today, 78 and 79.

They have waived any claim based on that. However, I would point out one additional matter with respect to that, your Honor. The
difference -- the claimed misrepresentation of square footage may have resulted in some valuation of the 240 square feet and that paid as damages. But there is nothing in the discrepancy in the originally advertised square foot and what we know is the correct number there is nothing in that that causes the defendant to have -the plaintiff to have damages.

There is no proximate cause between that problem in description and what they are claiming to have to do.

In other words, you don't bring a cause of action that someone struck you in the nose and then prove that you have got a problem in your lower back, not related to the punching in the nose and that's what's going on here. There is just no proximate cause connection between the damages they are seeking and the problems that they claim were the justification for those damages.

I'm just going to scroll back quickly through Mr. Moore's comments.

Mr. Moore argues that abatement is the only remedy. But that's not what's really going on here. What's happening is the -- Lindbergs are adding and remodeling their property so as to enhance its value and
they have that value that will results.
It is -- it is unbelievable to me that the remedy for now having -- or for having that second residence on the property is to build a wall so as to -on the inside so as to eliminate a portion of the residential and call it storage.

How does that -- I don't understand I guess how that makes it comply with the zoning. It seems to me to be a trick.

But, in any event, my point is that the Lindbergs now after their remodel have a property that is enhanced in value $I$ would say just -- as a matter of law.

Mr. Moore makes much of my client's testimony and attacks her credibility. He attacks her credibility on matters that aren't material or important to this case. She has repeatedly said that she did not have the initial appraisal. And any argument that she did have that appraisal is pure speculation. You can refer to something in a later document and say per the appraisal and not have had the appraisal at that point in time.

His claim that Miss Johnson lied is just not supported.

Your Honor, the first issue that $I$ want to address is the zoning versus use -- what $I$ label as
zoning versus use issue. And I would like to point out to the Court some of the provisions in the documents that will negate that claim. First of all, with regard to code compliance -- and code compliance here is a generic term referring, I submit, to all of the codes applicable, all codes.

And what the offer and acceptance at page five provides is that, "Any information relating to square footage, land use or its use and/or improvements of the land are approximate and estimates only."

With that language, my computation showing a difference of only 240 square feet becomes very relevant. "Neither seller nor broker involved make any representation or guarantee regarding the accuracy. Any oral or written -- I'll skip that. Any oral or written representations by seller or broker regarding the age of improvements, size and square footage of parcels or buildings or location of property lines may not be accurate."
"Apparent -- apparent boundary line
indicators indicate that the -- let me start over. Apparent boundary line indicators such as fences, ditches, walls or other barriers may not represent the true boundary line. Brokers are not obligated to
investigate the status of permits." Right there in the offer and acceptance they -- the buyers -- the broker and the agent are not representing -- excuse me just a second. The status of permits.

This whole business about the electrical that was uncovered is actually an issue involving the status of permits. A permit had been taken. The construction started. Not completed. But there is a permit there. So there we are. That fits within that category.
"The information contained in the multiple listing service computer or advertisements and feature sheets pertaining to this property are not warranted or guaranteed by the brokers. Errors and/or omissions in inputting information while uncommon, are possible."

So there you have the multiple listing service, not being guaranteed by their having been listed the way they were.
"Buyer shall be responsible for verifying the accuracy of pertinent information. Deposit of all funds necessary to close escrow shall be deemed as final acceptance of the property."

I mean here we are with a closed escrow where you have an offer and acceptance agreement that says when the escrow closes that's the end of the hunt.
"Seller agrees to hold all brokers in the transaction harmless and to defend and indemnify them from any demand action or proceeding resulting from any omission or alleged omission by the seller's statements." That paragraph, your Honor, practically closes the case all by itself. There is more.

If we go to the offer and acceptance page two, sellers real property disclosure form. "The seller will provide buyer with at the time of written acceptance a completed Sellers Real Property Disclosure Form which by this reference will be incorporated into this agreement. Buyer shall return and acknowledge a copy to the seller within four working days of receipt. Buyer understands that the above Seller's Real Property Disclosure Form is for disclosure purposes and is not a substitute for property inspections by experts, including, but not limited to, engineers, geologists, archaeologists, general practitioners, specialty contractors, such as roof contractor and pest control operators. Buyer is urged to retain such experts as believed are appropriate. Buyer understands and acknowledges that the broker in the transaction cannot warrant the condition of the property or guarantee all these acts have been disclosed by the seller. Both
parties acknowledge brokers will not be investigating the status of permits, location of property lines and/or code compliance."

Here again we have a contract provision that says code compliance cannot be an issue.

THE COURT: Where it talked about seller
agrees to indemnify, there was no cross claim.
MR. HALL: I'm sorry?
THE COURT: You read seller agrees to
indemnify the brokers or the agents if there are any problems.

MR. HALL: Yes.
THE COURT: You didn't seek that.
MR. HALL: No. I agree with that, your Honor. I came in very late in the case and -- well -- I'll leave it at that.

THE COURT: Indemnification pops up after responsibilities with the principal. All right. What else?

MR. HALL: Yes. Referring now to NRS 113.140, "Disclosure of unknown defect and required form does not constitute wordily duty of buyer and proposition buyer is to exercise reasonable care." That's statutory.

A completed disclosure form -- again I'm
reading from 113.140 .
"A completed disclosure form does not
constitute an express or implied warranty regarding any condition of the residential realty. Neither this chapter nor Chapter 645 of NRS relieves a buyer or prospective buyer of the duty to exercise reasonable care." I'm sorry. "To protect himself."

Again, we are -- are advised by that statute or directed by that statute that the buyer has duties and that the buyer's duty with regard to the issues that are -- arose during this escrow were far more -- excuse me, the burden of those discoveries and disclosures were pursued more by the sellers than they were by the buyers.

We have not heard what steps the buyers took to protect themselves during the course of the escrow.

So the evidence shows, I submit, that the buyers were negligent. When we look at the walk through sheet, for example, we have them simply drawing a line through everything and saying 'accepted as is' in effect. I'm not quoting the actual words.

But it is an acceptance that all of the problems that have been identified have been fixed or waived. And the title of the document, your Honor, is Release. So we have got a release. We have got a
waiver. Again, your Honor, there are paragraph in the statutes of Nevada and documents that handle every issue in this case that decide or are decisive of every issue in this case.

I'm going on now to septic size. And, again, your Honor, Exhibit 9 shows us that there was a septic tank investigation at the request of the Lindbergs. The accurate size of the tank was disclosed in that report as a draining of the tank and measured by Waters Septic Service.

In that actual form the Waters Inspection Report has that same line drawn diagonally through the document and has the word 'accepted' under the signatures of the Lindbergs.
So any issue related to the septic size was taken care of during escrow and waived and raised at the time of close of escrow. Again, in that document Exhibit 9 it says the buyer's responsibility -- it is the buyer's responsibility to have the system checked. Sellers and agents do not warrant and are not responsible for problems after close of escrow. And, again, your Honor, the walk through also excuses any noncompliance with regard to the size of the septic tank.

I would like to address NRS 113.140,
disclosure of unknown defects is not required.
MR. MOORE: Your Honor, I would object.
That's -- that statute applies to the seller. Not to -not to the seller's agent.

MR. HALL: Let me skip down. That's not accurate. Buyer to exercise reasonable care.

Let me find that. I can't put my finger on it right now. But $I$ believe my notes are accurate and that you will find that language in NRS 113.130. Again we have the Waters Vacuum Truck Service document signed off by the Lindbergs. And we have an additional document, information regarding well and septic system dated $1-3-13$ signed off by the Lindbergs.

Also in the document information regarding private well and septic system, this language is set forth. "Real estate agents have no special training, knowledge or experience concerning these systems," referring to septic systems. "The seller is required by law to disclose any problems with these systems on the seller's real property disclosure form.
"The sellers disclosure is not a substitute for thorough and professional inspections of the system by licensed professionals. The buyer is strongly urged to obtain such inspections." And performance in the past
is not an indicate -- $I$ can skip through that. The point is that knowledge about septic systems is not within the limit of what -- not included in what a real estate agent should know about a septic system.

Again, your Honor, we walk through language that would apply. At the bottom just above their signatures on the walk through property conditions release, it says, "We understand there are no warranties on any item or system after close of escrow, unless otherwise stated in the offer and acceptance," and there is nothing of that nature stated in the offer and acceptance.

Then there are what $I$ would call the disclaimers and assignments and responsibilities that would be applicable to every issue in this case, your Honor. Again, that would be the offer and acceptance agreement at page two would be the SRPD form. All of the sellers inspection reports -- excuse me, all of the inspection reports ordered by the buyers.

And -- well, we can just go on here.
In exhibit -- I think $I$ have already made
this point. Exhibit 34 , page two specifically addresses code compliance and said that the sellers are not responsible, are not going to pursue an investigation of
code compliance and that that duty falls on the buyer.
THE COURT: Are you talking realtors or agents
or brokers, not the sellers.
MR. HALL: I'm sorry. What did I say?
THE COURT: You said sellers are not
responsible.
MR. HALL: I see, okay. Again, I pointed out status of permits, the buyer is responsible for that, not the seller.

The walk through release, it claims we have inspected. We have found all items in good working order and accepted. Repairs were done and accepted. And then there were -- it is the word waiver. And no warranties. That's signed by the Lindbergs.

Exhibit 7 is the Uniform Building Inspection
Report. It is signed by the Lindbergs under the handwritten note read and approved. Your Honor, these documents and statutes provide an overlapping blanket in this case on any issue that has been raised by the plaintiffs. Each and every complaint that they have is covered by at least one of these provisions if not 3 or 4.

The bottom line is there is no room at the close of escrow for a claim of the nature of what they
have brought into this case. These are the documents. This is what they say. They provide a complete defense to the defendants and I'll submit the matter on that bases, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Moore.
MR. MOORE: Thank you, your Honor. Claiming that misidentifying the size of this house by 240 square feet is not a big deal, that's surprising. That's 16 percent of the guest house size.

THE COURT: What about his argument that they knew that because of the appraisal that sets out the different sizes? And then they said, "Well, that's okay we'll go ahead and accept it anyway."

MR. MOORE: We don't know exactly what was provided to Mr. Kincannon. But my client testified that he only saw the portion of the appraisal that dealt with the price, the $\$ 400,000$. He didn't look at anything else.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this. I was thinking while you both were talking --

MR. MOORE: Yes.
THE COURT: If $I$ were a buyer and $I$ hire a realtor and they go ahead and -- I don't talk to the other realtor. And I don't talk to the buyers. Okay.

So all my conversations are with my agent. They talk to the other agent. They don't talk to the buyers.

So the only conversations and communications are between agent and agent.

MR. MOORE: Sure.
THE COURT: Okay. So the responsibilities you say that the statute insists upon also cover the buyer's agent.

MR. MOORE: We are not disputing that.
THE COURT: But then they -- should have said, "Hey, you know, you have a zone problem there. Or there appears to be a zone problem."

MR. MOORE: We are not disputing that.
THE COURT: But if they were made aware of it, then why did they sign the waivers and releases?

MR. MOORE: My client wasn't made aware of these issues. The claim that the -- square footage discrepancy was corrected, $I$ don't know when that happened. The listing was 3880 square feet. Nobody ever came in to my client, whether it is his agent or the other agent and said, "This is actually 3,640 square feet." Nobody ever said that in this case.

THE COURT: The appraisal sets out each individual unit, right?

MR. MOORE: Exactly. Which is why this realtor knew the square footage and never sought to correct the misidentification of the wrong square footage.

That's a duty that she owes to my client under this statute.

THE COURT: Again, in this scenario that $I$ am imagining, the brokers had to notice. You say she had to know it. Their broker had to notice and had a duty to communicate.

MR. MOORE: I'm not disputing that, your

Honor.

THE COURT: How does she make known to them a problem?

MR. MOORE: She tells my realtor. My client.

THE COURT: That's what I am saying.

MR. MOORE: And that never happened.

THE COURT: Says who?

MR. MOORE: She claims she never saw the appraisal.

THE COURT: She says she saw it before the close of escrow.

MR. MOORE: She said she never saw it until this lawsuit. That's her claim.

THE COURT: I'll have to go through that. MR. MOORE: Yes. So the issue is certainly, your Honor --

THE COURT: How would she know that it was smaller than it was?

MR. MOORE: We have shown the evidence, your Honor, that she did have it. The e-mail to my client's realtor. The fact that my client looked at the price.

THE COURT: Well, if she had it then your broker had it.

MR. MOORE: We don't know what was sent to my broker. All we know and all my client knows is the appraisal. All he reviewed with my client -- with his broker was the page that relates to price, $\$ 400,000$. That may have been all that was sent.

THE COURT: How about the bank's appraisal?
That's not in evidence. But they had to look at something.

MR. MOORE: And it is not in evidence. And $I$ don't want to bring anything else --

THE COURT: That's not in evidence.
MR. MOORE: Related to it.
THE COURT: I understand. But I'm saying, I'm putting myself in the seller -- or even the buyer's
position. And you are talking about realtors. When you sign, like Mr. Hall is saying, I accept --

MR. MOORE: I'll get into that in a minute.
THE COURT: Go ahead. Let me hear it.
MR. MOORE: That waiver language it doesn't waive anything related to NRS 645.252.

THE COURT: Known, should have known.
MR. MOORE: Right.
THE COURT: They don't have to dig up. They don't have to measure.

MR. MOORE: Exactly.
THE COURT: So what do they know and what should she have known?

MR. MOORE: She knew the square footage. She knew the zoning requirements.

THE COURT: She didn't measure it. So you are saying she didn't have the appraisal. How did she know that?

MR. MOORE: She had the appraisal. The evidence shows that she did.

THE COURT: So did the other fellow.
MR. MOORE: That's why we sued them both, your
Honor. I'm not disputing that.
THE COURT: How does she make it known? Just
from a practical reason. "I am a broker. I see there is something wrong here." You call the other broker and say, "There is something wrong here." And if that broker doesn't talk to his client, I'm responsible for it?

MR. MOORE: That phone call never happened.
Nobody ever called Mr. Kincannon. I didn't hear that testimony. Nobody called --

THE COURT: You talked to Mr. Kincannon -- I mean you are saying that he didn't do anything either. He just sat on his thumbs.

MR. MOORE: Exactly, your Honor. That's why we sued both realtors. We -- if Mr. Kincannon --

THE COURT: How about caveat emptor? Evidently that's alive and well.

MR. MOORE: If Mr. Kincannon had abided by these provisions of this statute he wouldn't have been brought into this lawsuit. The fact is he didn't. The fact is we sued him. The fact is this other realtor that remains also did not.

THE COURT: Same situation.
MR. MOORE: And that's why we sued her as well.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MOORE: There was a mention in closing of -- well, there is no proximate cause here for the difference in square footage. Well, my client bought a smaller house than was advertised. There is only one form to compensate that and that's an abatement, the difference between what they paid.

THE COURT: On a square footage bases?
MR. MOORE: That's the appropriate remedy. He also testified that, oh, you spent all this money. You spent $\$ 30,000$ plus thousand dollars trying to solve this and that enhanced the value? That doesn't make a lot of sense to me, your Honor. That's basically the equivalent of saying somebody comes up and hits you in the knee cap. You have to get your knee replaced. You now about a bionic knee. You have been enhanced. What are you complaining about? That doesn't make a whole lot of sense.

But in this case my clients only spent that money to avoid issues with the county. Remember, your Honor --

THE COURT: To wipe it out.
MR. MOORE: We were worried at the beginning. We have a $\$ 50,000$ potential estimate from Ron Cohen. The county might tell you to tear it all down. How about
that for freaking you out? A year after you bought a piece of property? Now, counsel read a bunch of language in the offer and acceptance. He read a bunch of language in the SRPD form. None of that language read by counsel waived the statutory requirement to disclose information that is known or that should have been known by a realtor.

Your Honor, if that was included in a document in a contract they would make NRS 645.252 a nullity, a nullity. And that is against public policy. But everything he read, none of it said that there is a waiver of anything that you are entitled to under NRS 645.252 .

These realtors still have to disclose information that they know or should have known. There has been no waiver of that here. And a waiver, your Honor, is -- the voluntary relinquishment of a known right. My client had no idea that these -- these disclosures were incorrect; that there had been a failure to disclose. So how can he waive something he doesn't even know happened until a year later? It just isn't feasible.

Also my clients aren't making any claim that this realtor had to investigate anything. All of the
information known to this realtor should have been disclosed. All of the information of this realtor should have known, as testified by Sherrie Cartinella, should have been disclosed.

Miss Cartinella said on the stand, "No. There is no need to investigate. If they had -- because they knew these things, they should have known these other things." So we are not saying there needs to be a duty to investigate.

We are claiming a failure to disclose known information or information that should have been known.

THE COURT: So you are saying right before close of escrow, a couple of days, when the appraisal was made known that she says she didn't get it earlier, that a bell should have gone off and she should have said to the other guy, "Hey, look. This is on one acre and there is one tank. We thought it was -- or I thought it was 15,000, maybe it was 1500. But Waters came out. He said, no, it is a thousand gallon tank. There is another bedroom over there. So we have four bedrooms supplying one 1,000 tank there may be a problem with that."

MR. MOORE: Exactly.
THE COURT: And that would solve --
MR. MOORE: And that is what we believe

Sherrie Cartinella testified to it.
So under those circumstances -- and, your Honor, the report for the septic came out five weeks before closing.

THE COURT: Five weeks.
MR. MOORE: Okay.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. MOORE: And then there was a statement that my client needed to exercise reasonable care here. How do you exercise reasonable care to prevent somebody from not disclosing you information? How do you exercise that reasonable care? I don't know how you do it. My client in this case did exercise reasonable care. They obtained all appropriate inspections. They obtained an inspection of the septic system and most other items.

So they acted reasonably. There is no
inspection that could have been asked for that would have disclosed what these realtors knew or what they should have known. There is no inspection that they could have ordered to get that. That's on the realtor.

THE COURT: Now, the tie in into the sewer line, that went into the house --

MR. MOORE: Right.
THE COURT: -- not into the tank.

MR. MOORE: Right.
THE COURT: So Waters wouldn't have seen oh, my gosh, there are two lines coming in here.

MR. MOORE: Yeah they wouldn't have seen the two lines. That's correct. And then there is a claim that, well, we waived the walk through. I don't know what would have -- what would have been disclosed by nondisclosures in this case in a walk through. They went and walked through the house. Would that have disclosed zoning violations? My client wouldn't have known. Would that have disclosed the square footage isn't right? My client wouldn't have known that. Would that have disclosed that the septic isn't appropriate? No. The septic is underground. And we already had a septic report that showed that it was working.

Now, we are not -- with the septic issue we are not claiming that there was a problem that -- it is not an actual size issue.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. MOORE: It is inappropriate. And that was
not disclosed. So, your Honor, we believe all the information that was presented in this case shows that multiple things were known by this realtor that should have been known by this realtor that were not disclosed
and all damages that we are asking for stem from that failure to disclose.

THE COURT: Thank you. Counsel, thank you. I'll take this matter under submission. Did you provide findings of fact and conclusions?

MR. HALL: I do have them. I don't have them
right here. But $I$ have them at my office.
THE COURT: Do you have a copy?
MR. MOORE: I don't have a copy. I was going
to hand deliver them to him. I'll do that immediately. THE COURT: Do that. Let me compare. What I do is I get a transcript and make sure $I$ have everything right in my notes. MR. MOORE: Yes. THE COURT: I have a lot of notes.

Interesting. Okay.
MR. MOORE: Thank you, judge.
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| 63:10 <br> communications [1] 62:3 <br> compare [2]-17:14, $72: 11$ <br> compensate [1]-67:5 <br> complain [2] - 30:15, 38:10 <br> complaining [2] - 30:6, 67:16 <br> complaint [1] - 60:20 <br> complete [1] - 61:2 <br> completed [8]-8:3, <br> 17:5, 20:18, 20:19, <br> 53:8, 54:10, 55:24, <br> 56:2 <br> completes [1]-22:3 <br> completing ${ }_{[1]}$ - 45:15 <br> compliance [6] - 52:4, <br> 55:3, 55:5, 59:23, <br> 60:1 <br> comply [1] - 51:8 <br> computation [1] - <br> 52:11 <br> computer [1] - 53:11 <br> concerned [2]-22:24, <br> 35:23 <br> concerning [2] -9:3, <br> 58:17 <br> concluded [1] - 72:20 <br> conclusion [5] - 16:7, <br> 19:10, 19:11, 35:14, <br> 47:8 <br> conclusions [1] - 72:5 <br> Condition [4]-13:12, <br> 13:15, 15:19, 16:4 <br> condition [3]-16:6, <br> 54:23, 56:4 <br> conditions [2]-16:15, 59:7 <br> conduct [1]-6:19 <br> confer [1]-23:22 <br> conformity [1]-11:3 <br> confused [1] - 19:1 <br> connection [1]-50:16 <br> constitute [2]-55:22, <br> 56:3 <br> construction [1] - <br> 53:7 <br> Consulting [1] - 43:7 <br> consumer [1]-26:3 <br> consumers [3] - <br> 25:23, 26:3, 27:5 <br> contact [1]-6:8 <br> contained [1] - 53:10 <br> contend [4] - 40:8, <br> 40:24, 42:10, 44:8 <br> contention [1] - 32:6 <br> contingent [2]-45:18, 46:2 <br> continue [1]-27:4 | ```continued [1] - 32:18 continuing [1] - 22:12 contract [4]-6:10, 47:20, 55:4, 68:9 contractor [1] - 54:19 contractors [1] - 54:19 contribution [3] - 36:17, 47:24, 48:3 control [1] - 54:19 conversations [2] - 62:1, 62:3 copies [3]-12:16, 16:17, 16:19 copy [5] - 12:13, 13:17, 54:12, 72:8, 72:9 correct [12] - 15:22, 20:23, 24:15, 26:6, 26:20, 41:1, 42:8, 47:4, 50:5, 63:3, 71:5, 73:13 corrected [3] - 39:21, 49:16, 62:18 cost [2] - 42:24, 43:15 costs [4] - 45:11, 45:19, 45:22 counsel [16]-4:3, 8:4, 10:13, 10:16, 11:2, 18:17, 22:21, 23:3, 23:11, 25:16, 30:5, 41:19, 46:16, 68:2, 68:4, 72:3 counsel's [1] - 7:10 counter [1] - 31:23 counteroffer [2] - 32:1, 32:2 COUNTY[2] - 1:7, 73:2 County [4] - 28:22, 42:14, 43:12, 73:6 county [8]-39:16, 40:17, 41:11, 43:15, 43:23, 43:24, 67:19, 67:24 couple [1] - 69:13 course [2] - 12:1, 56:15 court [7] - 24:17, 35:6, 37:8, 45:16, 46:2, 46:4, 46:21 Court [5] - 9:24, 24:19, 52:2, 73:5, 73:9 COURT[148] - 1:6, 4:3, 5:15, 7:4, 7:8, 7:12, 7:21, 7:24, 8:11, 9:1, 9:9, 10:11, 10:14, 10:16, 10:19, 11:1, 11:14, 11:19, 12:21, 12:24, 14:5,``` |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 47:19, 47:23, 50:3, } \\ & 50: 7,50: 16,50: 18, \\ & 72: 1 \\ & \text { date }[3]-20: 20,21: 1, \\ & 21: 16 \\ & \text { DATED }{ }_{[1]}-73: 15 \\ & \text { dated }[4]-17: 24, \\ & 23: 4,33: 5,58: 13 \\ & \text { dates }[3]-20: 21,21: 2, \\ & 21: 20 \\ & \text { days }[3]-5: 21,54: 13, \\ & 69: 13 \\ & \text { deadlines }[1]-9: 7 \\ & \text { deal }[2]-29: 15,61: 8 \\ & \text { dealing }[1]-38: 7 \\ & \text { dealt }[1]-61: 16 \\ & \text { Deann }[1]-37: 4 \\ & \text { December }[5]-24: 23, \\ & 29: 5,44: 24,45: 13, \\ & 45: 17 \\ & \text { decide }[1]-57: 3 \\ & \text { decided }[2]-8: 5, \\ & 34: 14 \\ & \text { decisive }[1]-57: 3 \\ & \text { deemed }[2]-27: 6, \\ & 53: 20 \\ & \text { defect }[1]-55: 21 \\ & \text { defects }[1]-58: 1 \\ & \text { defend }[2]-36: 8,54: 2 \\ & \text { defendant }[2]-26: 23, \\ & 50: 6 \\ & \text { Defendant }[3]-1: 14, \\ & 3: 8,4: 10 \\ & \text { defendants }[8]- \\ & 23: 15,30: 12,37: 3, \\ & 38: 15,45: 3,45: 4, \\ & 48: 4,61: 3 \\ & \text { Defendants }[1]-2: 9 \\ & \text { defense }[2]-36: 15, \\ & 61: 2 \\ & \text { deliver }[1]-72: 10 \\ & \text { demand }[1]-54: 3 \\ & \text { density }[3]-28: 9, \\ & 29: 2,38: 20 \\ & \text { Department }[1]-73: 8 \\ & \text { deposit }[1]-53: 19 \\ & \text { deposition }[1]-45: 22 \\ & \text { Dept }[1]-1: 13 \\ & \text { DEPUTY }[1]-16: 18 \\ & \text { describe }[1]-6: 3 \\ & \text { description }[2]- \\ & 49: 18,50: 9 \\ & \text { detached }[1]-39: 14 \\ & \text { diagonal }[1]-14: 11 \\ & \text { diagonally }[1]-57: 12 \\ & \text { difference }[9]-41: 3, \\ & 41: 15,42: 2,49: 8, \\ & 49: 11,50: 1,52: 12, \\ & 67: 3,67: 6 \\ & \text { different }[3]-6: 1, \\ & 46: 24,61: 12 \end{aligned}$ | differently $[1]-27: 24$ dig $[2]-35: 15,65: 9$ digging $[1]-32: 20$ DIRECT ${ }_{[2]}-3: 3,4: 13$ directed $[1]-56: 9$ disbarred $[2]-44: 19$, $44: 20$ disclaimers $[1]-$ 59:14 disclose $[13]-27: 9$, $27: 11,28: 6,32: 8$, 40:6, $40: 12,47: 17$, $58: 19,68: 5,68: 14$, $68: 20,69: 10,72: 2$ disclosed $[14]-14: 4$, $30: 6,39: 24,54: 24$, $57: 8,69: 2,69: 4$, $70: 18,71: 7,71: 9$, $71: 11,71: 13,71: 21$, $71: 24$ disclosing $[2]-40: 9$, $70: 11$ disclosure $[9]-36: 5$, $54: 8,54: 15,55: 21$, $55: 24,56: 2,58: 1$, $58: 20,58: 21$ Disclosure $[2]-54: 10$, $54: 15$ disclosures $[7]-23: 4$, $26: 4,30: 23,31: 4$, $31: 5,56: 12,68: 19$ disconnect $[1]-29: 21$ discovered $[1]-35: 11$ discoveries $[1]-$ $56: 12$ discovery $[3]-9: 6$, $9: 8,45: 15$ discrepancy $[2]-$ $50: 4,62: 18$ discussing $[1]-22: 11$ dishonest $[1]-37: 15$ disputing $[4]-62: 9$, $62: 13,63: 11,65: 23$ distinct $[2]-46: 23$, $47: 17$ District $[1]-73: 5$ DISTRICT $[2]-1: 6,1: 8$ ditches $[1]-52: 23$ Division $[1]-5: 23$ document $[23]-$ $13: 10,13: 11,14: 12$, $14: 18,15: 1,15: 13$, $16: 3,16: 1,16: 9$, $16: 23,17: 19,18: 16$, $20: 24,31: 12,37: 20$, $51: 19,56: 23,57: 13$, $57: 17,58: 10,58: 12$, $58: 14,68: 9$ documentary $[2]-$ $31: 9,32: 6$ documentation $[1]-$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 26:12 <br> documents [42] - <br> $6: 11,6: 24,7: 3,7: 10$, <br> $7: 18,8: 7,8: 8,8: 9$, <br> 8:22, 8:23, 9:4, 9:17, <br> $9: 20,9: 22,10: 4$, <br> 11:6, 11:8, 11:9, <br> 11:11, 11:23, 13:23, <br> 17:3, 18:21, 18:22, <br> 18:23, 19:3, 19:21, <br> 20:21, 21:2, 21:18, <br> 26:8, 35:7, 35:8, <br> $38: 3,38: 6,38: 22$, <br> $42: 1,49: 20,52: 2$, <br> $57: 2,60: 18,61: 1$ <br> dollars $[5]-26: 20$, <br> $40: 18,41: 13,47: 6$, <br> $67: 10$ <br> done $[8]-5: 6,10: 5$, <br> $10: 6,15: 3,15: 16$, <br> 15:18, 24:6, $60: 12$ <br> Dotson $[4]-1: 22$, <br> $73: 4,73: 18,73: 19$ <br> down $[3]-29: 19,58: 5$, <br> $67: 24$ <br> draining $[1]-57: 9$ <br> drawing $[2]-29: 20$, <br> $56: 18$ <br> drawn $[2]-14: 23$, <br> $57: 12$ <br> duces $[2]-9: 9,9: 12$ <br> duly $[1]-4: 10$ <br> duplicates $[1]-13: 1$ <br> during $[11]-5: 10$, <br> $12: 1,31: 21,32: 5$, <br> $32: 7,35: 13,45: 11$, <br> $45: 19,56: 11,56: 15$, <br> $57: 16$ <br> duties $[8]-27: 8$, <br> $27: 19,28: 1,41: 21$, <br> $44: 8,46: 23,47: 16$, <br> $56: 9$ <br> duty $[7]-55: 22,56: 6$, <br> $56: 10,60: 1,63: 5$, <br> $63: 9,69: 9$ <br>  | ```4:22 emptor \({ }_{[1]}\) - 66:14 end [4]-11:22, 26:14, 37:18, 53:24 ended [2]-18:6, 36:1 engineers [1] - 54:17 enhance [1]-50:24 enhanced [3] - 51:12, 67:11, 67:15 enlarged [1] - 44:3 entire [1]-6:19 entitled [5] - 44:10, 46:14, 68:12, 73:9, 73:10 equivalent \({ }_{[1]}-67: 12\) error \({ }_{[2]}\) - 17:22, 24:15 errors [1]-53:13 escrow [40]-4:19, 5:1, 5:4, 5:10, 6:3, 6:5, 6:10, 6:15, 6:16, 6:19, 7:18, 8:23, 9:18, 11:22, 12:1, 12:2, 13:14, 13:17, 15:17, 16:11, 20:17, 21:9, 21:14, 21:15, 21:16, 21:20, 21:21, 37:5, 53:20, 53:22, 53:24, 56:11, 56:15, 57:16, 57:17, 57:21, 59:9, 60:24, 63:22, 69:13 especially [1] - 46:22 establishes [2]-27:7 Estate [1]-5:22 estate [9]-6:2, 16:11, 22:2, 26:8, 26:12, 27:13, 28:3, 58:16, 59:3 estimate [1] - 67:23 estimates [1] - 52:10 event [1] - 51:10 evidence [16] - 14:3, 27:1, 28:8, 28:12, 30:7, 31:9, 32:6, 35:6, 35:14, 46:13, 56:16, 64:6, 64:17, 64:19, 64:21, 65:20 evidently \([1]\) - 66:15 Ewing [1] - 24:16 exact [1]-20:20 exactly [7] - 39:13, 48:15, 61:14, 63:1, 65:11, 66:12, 69:22 examination [1] - 8:6 EXAMINATION \({ }_{[1]}\) - 4:13 examined \({ }_{[1]}-4: 11\) example [2]-25:22, 56:18 exchange \({ }_{[1]}-10: 20\) excuse [6] - 11:10,``` | ```12:12, 21:16, 53:3, 56:11, 59:18 excused [1]-22:9 excuses [1]-57:22 executed \([1]-13: 16\) exercise [7] - 55:23, 56:6, 58:6, 70:9, 70:10, 70:11, 70:13 Exhibit [35]-12:18, 13:7, 13:10, 14:2, 17:20, 17:21, 18:4, 18:18, 18:21, 25:8, 28:11, 30:20, 30:22, 31:11, 31:20, 33:2, 34:16, 36:24, 37:9, 37:13, 37:17, 37:22, 42:7, 43:4, 43:7, 43:20, 44:4, 44:12, 45:12, 45:21, 45:24, 57:6, 57:18, 59:22, 60:15 exhibit [4]-12:20, 14:5, 44:6, 59:21 Exhibits [2]-20:2, 43:2 exhibits [13]-7:5, 7:13, 7:16, 8:1, 8:3, 8:4, 8:6, 8:14, 10:20, 17:13, 43:6, 43:12, 45:1 experience [3] - 16:11, 16:14, 58:17 expert [3] - 23:2, 23:11, 35:2 experts [2]-54:16, 54:20 explained [1]-27:22 explanation [2]-6:14, 8:21 express [2] - 14:22, 56:3 extra [2]-8:5 \begin{tabular}{l} \multicolumn{1}{c}{\(\mathbf{F}\)} \\ \hline faced \([1]-40: 15\) \\ fact \(_{[6]}-29: 6,64: 8\), \\ \(66: 18,66: 19,72: 5\) \\ facts \([1]-5: 13\) \\ fail \([1]-47: 19\) \\ failure \([5]-40: 6\), \\ \(40: 12,68: 19,69: 10\), \\ \(72: 2\) \\ fair \([1]-5: 8\) \\ falls \(^{[1]}-60: 1\) \\ familiar \(_{[1]}-13: 22\) \\ family \([2]-29: 6,38: 20\) \\ far \([4]-6: 10,18: 10\), \\ \(35: 23,56: 11\) \\ favor \([1]-46: 15\) \\ feasible \([1]-68: 22\) \\ feature \([1]-53: 11\) \end{tabular}``` | ```February [6] - 10:2, 10:5, 21:22, 33:5, 33:6, 37:6 fees [10]-43:3, 43:10, 44:15, 44:24, 45:1, 45:20, 46:3, 46:4, 46:6 feet [15] - 28:16, 28:17, 28:18, 30:16, 30:19, 41:4, 42:19, 42:22, 49:7, 50:3, 52:12, 61:8, 62:19, 62:22 fellow [1] - 65:21 felt [1] - 10:3 fences [1]-52:22 few [1] - 32:15 fifth \({ }_{[1]}\) - 34:19 file [11]-6:22, 6:24, 7:10, 9:12, 10:5, 10:21, 12:6, 17:3, 17:7, 18:22, 31:7 filed \([3]-8: 18,11: 16\), 23:7 files [1] - 12:12 filing [1] - 45:15 filled [2]-5:10, 31:14 final [4] - 12:8, 13:2, 32:23, 53:20 finally \({ }_{[1]}-49: 15\) findings \({ }_{[1]}\) - 72:5 finger [1] - 58:7 finish [2]-6:20, 32:23 finished [2]-18:9, 24:13 first \([9]-4: 10,14: 11\), 29:4, 29:18, 31:11, 31:15, 36:21, 51:23, 52:3 First [2] - 4:19, 4:22 fits [1] - 53:9 five \([3]-52: 8,70: 3\), 70:5 fix [2] - 33:17, 35:9 fixed [4] - 33:12, 33:22, 40:18, 56:22 fixes [1] - 33:17 flags [1] - 39:19 fluctuations [1] - 49:5 followed [2]-8:12, 11:2 following [1] - 34:18 follows [1] - 4:11 foot \({ }_{[2]}\) - 31:16, \(50: 5\) footage [24]-32:9, 32:14, 40:11, 41:1, 41:3, 41:9, 41:10, 41:14, 41:18, 42:8, 49:5, 49:15, 49:17, 49:19, 50:2, 52:9, 52:17, 62:17, 63:2,``` | ```63:4, 65:14, 67:3, 67:7, 71:11 footages [1]-32:11 FOR [1] - 1:7 foregoing [2] - 72:20, 73:12 Form [2]-54:10, 54:15 form [14]-13:13, 21:11, 31:13, 31:14, 36:5, 54:8, 55:21, 55:24, 56:2, 57:11, 58:20, 59:17, 67:5, 68:4 former [2]-23:3, 30:23 forms [4]-5:9, 5:18, 5:24, 16:23 forth \([2]\) - 32:14, 58:16 forward [2] - 13:6, 29:4 foundation [1] - 5:14 four [2]-54:13, 69:20 frankly [1] - 34:8 freaking [1]-68:1 Friday [2]-7:22, 7:23 front [2]-24:18, 42:1 full \({ }_{[2]}\) - 16:3, 73:12 functioning [1] - 39:6 funds [1]-53:19```G <br> gallon $[1]-69: 19$ <br> gallons $[1]-38: 22$ <br> gas $[1]-33: 18$ <br> general $[1]-54: 18$ <br> generic $[1]-52: 4$ <br> geologists $[1]-54: 17$ <br> given $[2]-12: 3,45: 10$ <br> GLADE $_{[1]}-2: 9$ <br> Gloria $_{[4]}-4: 5,4: 16$, <br> $22: 14,22: 22$ <br> GLORIA <br> got $-3: 9,4: 8$ <br> gosh $[1]-71: 3$ <br> ground $[1]-35: 16$ <br> guarantee $[2]-52: 14$, <br> $54: 23$ <br> guaranteed $[2]-$ <br> $53: 13,53: 16$ <br> guess $[5]-11: 5,16: 8$, <br> 18:14, 25:12, $51: 7$ <br> guest $[1]-61: 9$ <br> guy $[1]-69: 16$$\mathbf{H}$ <br> half $[3]-28: 13,37: 13$, <br> $42: 21$ <br> HALL [59] - 2:9, 4:5, <br> 4:14, 5:14, 5:17, 7:6, <br> $7: 9,7: 15,7: 23,8: 2$, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8:20, 9:11, 9:16, } \\ & \text { 9:21, 10:10, 10:12, } \\ & \text { 10:15, 10:18, 10:23, } \\ & \text { 11:5, 11:18, 11:21, } \\ & \text { 12:14, 13:2, 13:8, } \\ & \text { 14:10, 14:15, 14:17, } \\ & \text { 15:8, 15:11, 16:13, } \\ & \text { 16:20, 17:14, 17:17, } \\ & \text { 18:11, 18:13, 18:19, } \\ & \text { 19:19, 20:3, 20:9, } \\ & \text { 20:12, 20:16, 21:17, } \\ & \text { 22:8, 22:11, 23:13, } \\ & \text { 23:15, 24:9, 25:2, } \\ & \text { 48:23, 49:3, 55:8, } \\ & 55: 12,55: 14,55: 20, \\ & 58: 5,60: 4,60: 7, \\ & 72: 6 \\ & \text { hall }[1]-65: 2 \\ & \text { hand }[1]-72: 10 \\ & \text { handing }[3]-13: 9, \\ & 18: 14,18: 20 \\ & \text { handle }[2]-13: 14, \\ & 57: 2 \\ & \text { handwriting }[1]- \\ & 31: 15 \\ & \text { handwritten }[2]- \\ & 37: 20,60: 17 \\ & \text { hang }[1]-12: 24 \\ & \text { harmless }[1]-54: 2 \\ & \text { Harry }[1]-37: 4 \\ & \text { HARRY }[1]-1: 13 \\ & \text { hear }[4]-23: 8,46: 10, \\ & 65: 4,66: 7 \\ & \text { heard }[1]-56: 14 \\ & \text { hearings }[1]-29: 19 \\ & \text { heart }[1]-38: 2 \\ & \text { help }[2]-26: 3,26: 15 \\ & \text { hereby }[1]-73: 7 \\ & \text { herein }[2]-73: 10, \\ & 73: 11 \\ & \text { herself }[1]-32: 20 \\ & \text { himself }[1]-56: 7 \\ & \text { hire }[4]-25: 23,40: 16, \\ & 44: 17,61: 22 \\ & \text { hired }[2]-25: 24, \\ & 26: 13 \\ & \text { hits }[1]-67: 13 \\ & \text { hold }[1]-54: 1 \\ & \text { hole }[1]-32: 20 \\ & \text { honestly }[1]-15: 4 \\ & \text { Honor }[85]-5: 11,7: 7, \\ & 8: 3,8: 20,9: 2,9: 16, \\ & 9: 23,10: 12,11: 6, \\ & \text { 12:10, 12:19, 13:5, } \\ & \text { 14:8, 16:18, 17:12, } \\ & \text { 17:19, 17:22, 18:18, } \\ & 20: 1,22: 4,22: 11, \\ & 22: 21,23: 1,23: 13, \\ & 23: 18,24: 3,24: 14, \\ & 24: 22,25: 9,25: 12, \\ & 25: 17,26: 17,31: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31: 13,31: 20,32: 5, \\ & 32: 16,34: 4,34: 8, \\ & 34: 23,35: 18,36: 9 \\ & 36: 11,38: 1,40: 4 \\ & 40: 19,40: 22,40: 24, \\ & 41: 15,42: 1,44: 7, \\ & 44: 15,44: 23,45: 9 \\ & 46: 1,46: 6,46: 11, \\ & 46: 20,47: 22,48: 23, \\ & 49: 24,51: 23,54: 5, \\ & 55: 14,56: 23,57: 1, \\ & 57: 6,57: 22,58: 2, \\ & 59: 5,59: 16,60: 17, \\ & 61: 4,61: 6,63: 12, \\ & 64: 3,64: 7,65: 23, \\ & 66: 12,67: 12,67: 20, \\ & 68: 8,68: 17,70: 3, \\ & 71: 21 \end{aligned}$ <br> HONORABLE $_{[1]}-1: 8$ <br> hooked [1] - 39:11 <br> house [11] - 31:16, <br> 31:17, 35:13, 39:14, <br> 39:15, 42:21, 61:7, <br> 61:9, 67:4, 70:22, <br> 71:9 <br> houses [3]-33:19, <br> 34:15, 34:20 <br> hunt [1] - 53:24 <br> HVAC ${ }_{[1]}$ - 33:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68:19 } \\ & \text { incurred }[2]-45: 20, \\ & \text { 46:6 } \\ & \text { indemnification }[1]- \\ & 55: 17 \\ & \text { indemnify }[3]-54: 2, \\ & 55: 7,55: 10 \\ & \text { indemnity }[3]-36: 17, \\ & 47: 24,48: 3 \\ & \text { independent }[1]- \\ & 21: 19 \\ & \text { indicate }[2]-52: 21, \\ & 59: 1 \\ & \text { indicated }[1]-10: 2 \\ & \text { indicators }[2]-52: 21, \\ & 52: 22 \\ & \text { individual }[1]-62: 24 \\ & \text { industries }[1]-6: 1 \\ & \text { industry }[2]-26: 1, \\ & 32: 13 \\ & \text { information }[26]-6: 9, \\ & 14: 4,19: 15,27: 9, \\ & 27: 11,31: 17,38: 12, \\ & 38: 22,39: 18,39: 21, \\ & 40: 6,47: 17,52: 8, \\ & 53: 10,53: 14,53: 19, \\ & 58: 12,58: 14,68: 5, \\ & 68: 15,69: 1,69: 2, \\ & 69: 11,70: 11,71: 22 \\ & \text { informed }[1]-24: 17 \\ & \text { initial }[4]-30: 23,31: 4, \\ & 31: 5,51: 17 \\ & \text { inputting }[1]-53: 14 \\ & \text { inside }[1]-51: 5 \\ & \text { insists }[1]-62: 7 \\ & \text { inspected }[1]-60: 11 \\ & \text { inspection }[9]-11: 12, \\ & 12: 4,19: 8,20: 8, \\ & 59: 18,59: 19,70: 15, \\ & 70: 17,70: 19 \\ & \text { Inspection }[2]-57: 11, \\ & 60: 15 \\ & \text { inspections }[13]-7: 1, \\ & 12: 3,16: 24,17: 5, \\ & 17: 6,17: 13,18: 10, \\ & 20: 10,21: 21,54: 16, \\ & 58: 22,58: 24,70: 14 \\ & \text { install }[4]-33: 16, \\ & 33: 18,34: 14,34: 19 \\ & \text { instead }[1]-42: 23 \\ & \text { instructions }[1]-6: 10 \\ & \text { intact }[1]-49: 19 \\ & \text { integral }[1]-9: 16 \\ & \text { intended }[2]-14: 12, \\ & 16: 5 \\ & \text { interested }[3]-12: 4, \\ & 24: 24,46: 2 \\ & \text { interesting }[1]-72: 16 \\ & \text { interrogatories }[1]- \\ & 37: 10 \\ & \text { introduce }[1]-7: 13 \end{aligned}$ | ```investigate [6] - 39:23, 41:24, 53:1, 68:24, 69:6, 69:9 investigating [1] - 55:1 investigation [3] - 41:22, 57:7, 59:24 invoices [4] - 24:23, 24:24, 44:21, 45:9 involved [3] - 5:18, 6:12, 52:13 involving [1] - 53:6 is' \({ }^{[1]}-56: 19\) issue [22] - 15:20, 28:9, 29:16, 30:14, 30:15, 34:1, 40:9, 41:6, 41:18, 42:11, 51:23, 52:1, 53:6, 55:5, 57:2, 57:3, 57:15, 59:15, 60:19, 64:2, 71:16, 71:18 issues [12] - 16:5, 32:20, 33:10, 33:20, 37:24, 38:1, 42:13, 46:21, 47:16, 56:10, 62:17, 67:19 item [5]-23:1, 34:11, 34:19, 38:10, 59:9 items [9] - 14:23, 25:11, 26:5, 33:9, 34:18, 39:23, 40:2, 60:11, 70:15 itself [3] - 28:19, 41:14, 54:6```J <br> James [1] - 28:6 <br> January $[5]-6: 17$, <br> 17:24, 20:22, 31:23, <br> $31: 24$ <br> JE [2] - 37:12, 44:10 <br> JEROME $[1]-1: 8$ <br> JJVL [4] - 31:21, 33:2, <br> 37:17, 37:22 <br> Joan $[4]-1: 22,73: 4$, <br> $73: 18,73: 19$ <br> job $[2]-30: 13,31: 22$ <br> JOHN $[2]-1: 10,2: 4$ <br> Johns $[4]-28: 6,29: 5$, <br> $37: 12,44: 10$ <br> Johnson $[24]-12: 11$, <br> $27: 16,27: 22,28: 6$, <br> 28:24, $29: 9,31: 1$, <br> $31: 6,31: 14,31: 21$, <br> $32: 2,32: 7,32: 18$, <br> $32: 24,33: 4,35: 3$, <br> $36: 21,37: 1,37: 11$, <br> $37: 19,41: 1,41: 17$, <br> $42: 10,51: 21$ <br> Johnson's $[4]-30: 23$, <br> $34: 23,40: 1,40: 3$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| ```Law [2] - 2:5, 2:10 lawsuit [4] - 31:2, 36:11, 63:24, 66:18 laying [1] - 5:14 leach [1] - 43:16 least [3] - 8:15, 24:9, 60:21 leave [1] - 55:15 legal [3] - 16:7, 19:10, 19:11 Iegislation [1] - 27:7 legislature [1]-27:6 less [1] - 49:7 letter [1]-17:23 liability [2] - 47:21, 47:23 liar [1] - 35:4 licensed [3]-25:24, 32:13, 58:23 lied [2] - 35:4, 51:21 limit \([2]\) - 38:15, 59:3 limited [1] - 54:17 LINDBERG \({ }_{[1]}-1: 10\) Lindberg [1] - 6:17 Lindbergs [11] - 11:13, 19:1, 19:9, 50:23, 51:11, 57:7, 57:14, 58:11, 58:13, 60:14, 60:16 line [14]-13:3, 13:4, 14:11, 14:15, 17:21, 39:11, 43:16, 52:20, 52:22, 52:24, 56:18, 57:12, 60:23, 70:22 lines [4]-52:18, 55:2, 71:3, 71:5 list \({ }_{[1]}\) - 14:6 listed [5] - 26:5, 29:6, 30:16, 32:12, 53:16 listing [9] - 29:4, 29:15, 31:12, 31:14, 40:8, 40:10, 53:11, 53:15, 62:19 livable [1] - 30:17 Ioan [3]-6:11, 6:12, 12:2 Iocation [2]-52:18, 55:2 locations [2] - 32:15, 42:5 look [9] - 7:16, 17:14, 32:10, 36:24, 37:21, 56:17, 61:17, 64:17, 69:16 looked [3]-8:23, 21:8, 64:8 looking [5] - 12:7, 14:5, 18:9, 18:10, 45:14 Ioud [1] - 49:2 low [4]-28:9, 29:2,``` | 33:11, 38:20 <br> lower [1] - 50:13 <br> lunch [2]-23:22, 24:1 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 55:12, 55:14, 55:20, } \\ & \text { 58:2, 58:5, 60:4, } \\ & \text { 60:7, 61:6, 61:14, } \\ & \text { 61:21, 62:5, 62:9, } \\ & \text { 62:13, 62:16, 63:1, } \\ & \text { 63:11, 63:15, 63:17, } \\ & 63: 19,63: 23,64: 2, \\ & \text { 64:6, 64:11, 64:19, } \\ & \text { 64:22, 65:3, 65:5, } \\ & \text { 65:8, 65:11, 65:14, } \\ & \text { 65:19, 65:22, 66:6, } \\ & \text { 66:12, 66:16, 66:22, } \\ & \text { 67:1, 67:8, 67:22, } \\ & \text { 69:22, 69:24, 70:6, } \\ & 70: 8,70: 23,71: 1, \\ & 71: 4,71: 20,72: 6, \\ & 72: 9,72: 14,72: 17 \\ & \text { multiple } 151-17: 13, \\ & 26: 7,26: 19,27: 2, \\ & 30: 1,38: 1,38: 5, \\ & 39: 19,42: 5,45: 15, \\ & 45: 16,53: 10,53: 15, \\ & 71: 23 \end{aligned}$$\mathbf{N}$ <br> name $[2]-4: 15,4: 16$ <br> named $[1]-23: 10$ <br> narrative $[1]-32: 19$ <br> nature $[4]-26: 2$, <br> 45:23, 59:11, $60: 24$ <br> near $[1]-11: 22$ <br> necessary $[2]-27: 6$, <br> $53: 20$ <br> need $[11]-5: 10,6: 9$, <br> 8:5, 8:12, 12:16, <br> 15:19, 15:23, 15:24, <br> $35: 7,39: 22,69: 6$ <br> needed $[3]-10: 4$, <br> $33: 11,70: 9$ <br> needs $[2]-35: 19,69: 8$ <br> negate $[1]-52: 3$ <br> negligent $[1]-56: 17$ <br> negotiations $[1]-$ <br> $31: 22$ <br> NEVADA $[4]-1: 7$, <br> $1: 20,4: 1,73: 1$ <br> Nevada $[11]-2: 6$, <br> $2: 11,4: 17,24: 18$, <br> $25: 23,27: 6,27: 18$, <br> $27: 19,57: 2,73: 6$, <br> $73: 15$ <br> never $[12]-23: 5$, <br> $23: 11,31: 2,33: 1$, <br> $33: 21,36: 3,39: 21$, <br> $63: 2,63: 17,63: 19$, <br> $63: 23,66: 6$ <br> new $[6]-29: 21,33: 16$, <br> $41: 1,43: 11,43: 16$, <br> $44: 3$ <br> next $[3]-15: 6,15: 9$, <br> 18:8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| nick [1] - 10:12 | 73:1, 73:2 | ownerships [1] - 6:8 | pH [1] - 44:5 | 69:21, 71:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nick [1] - 23:3 | off's [1] - 6:9 |  | phone [1] - 66:6 | problems [7]-21:20, |
| nightmare [1]-26:18 | offenses [1] - 33:8 | P | physically [1]-20:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 42: 12,50: 17,55: 11, \\ & 56: 22,57: 21,58: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| nobody [5] - 30:13, | 31:22, 31:23, 34:15, | page $[15]-7: 15,7: 16$, | 15:2 | procedure [2]-11:2, |
| 62:19, 62:22, 66:7, | 34:20, 34:22, 36:22, | 7:17, 18:3, 31:11, <br> 31:15, 31:19, 37:22 | Plaintiff [2]-1:11, 3:4 | 11:3 |
| 66:8 | 36:23, 48:16, 48:17, | 31:15, 31:19, 37:22, $52: 7,54: 7,59: 17,$ | plaintiff [1]-50:7 | proceeding [1] - 54:3 |
| noncompliance [1] - | 48:19, 52:7, 53:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 52:7, 54:7, 59:17, } \\ & 59: 22,64: 14 \end{aligned}$ | plaintiffs [1] - 60:20 | proceedings [3] - |
| 57:22 | 53:23, 54:7, 59:10, | pages [2] - 9:18, 20:4 | Plaintiffs [1]-2:4 | 72:20, 73:10, 73:14 |
| nondisclosures [2] 44:16, 71:8 | 59:11, 59:16, 68:3 <br> offered [1] - 35:1 | paid [6] - 15:13, 41:2, | planning $[1]-43: 10$ <br> plans [4]-43:11, | PROCEEDINGS ${ }_{[1]}$ - 1:17 |
| none [5] - 36:18, 37:7, | $\begin{array}{r} \text { offers [4] - } 33: 14, \\ 37: 2,37: 3,37: 8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44: 10,44: 11,50: 3, \\ & 67: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $43: 21,43: 22,44: 1$ | process [10] - 5:9, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 68:4, 68:11 } \\ \text { noon }[1]-25: 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 37:2, 37:3, 37:8 } \\ & \text { office [6] - 12:2, } \end{aligned}$ | Pamela [2]-22:16, | plus [1]-67:10 <br> point [7]-40:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 10,5: 19,6: 4,6: 5, \\ & 6: 19,8: 4,10: 9, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\text { nose }[2]-50: 12,50: 14$ | 13:20, 24:24, 45:2, | rs [2] - 12:2, 12:3 | $49: 23,51: 10,51: 20,$ | $15: 14$ |
| note [1] - 60:17 | $45: 20,72: 7$ | papers [2]-12:2, 12:3 <br> paperwork [2] - 5:20, | 52:1, 59:1, 59:22 | produce [3] - 10:20, $37.2,37 \cdot 3$ |
| notes [5] - 58:8, <br> 72.13, 72.15, | $\begin{gathered} \text { officer [5] - 4:19, 5:1, } \\ 6: 15,15: 17,16: 11 \end{gathered}$ | paperwork [2] - 5:20, 6:13 | pointed ${ }_{[1]}-60: 7$ | $\text { 37:2, } 37: 3$ <br> produced [10]-4:9, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 12.10, \\ & 73: 13 \end{aligned}$ | old [2] - 31:5 | paragraph [2] - 54:5, | POLAHA [1] - 1:8 <br> policy $[1]-68 \cdot 10$ | $7: 8,7: 11,8: 5,9: 22,$ |
| nothing [4]-26:18, | omission [2] - 54:4 | 57:1 | pops [1] - 55:17 | 10:15, 10:17, 20:22, |
| 50:4, 50:6, 59:11 | omissions [1] - 53:13 | paramount [1] - 34 | portion [3] - 47: | 31:3, 49:20 |
| notice [2]-63:8, 63:9 | one [26] - 12:6, 18:7, | parcels [1] - 52:17 | 51:5, 61:16 | production [2] - 37:1, |
| Notice [2] - 33:1, 33:6 | 18:16, 21:3, 22:15, | part [7] - 9:17, 10:24, | position [2]-7:9, 65:1 | 37:2 |
| NRS ${ }_{\text {[10] }}-27: 10$, $27 \cdot 13,40 \cdot 4,55 \cdot 20$, | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 18,22: 21,24: 7, \\ & 24: 14,26: 10,28: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17: 21,18: 1,2 \\ & 36: 11,39: 15 \end{aligned}$ | possession [1] - 32:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { professional }[3] \text { - } \\ & 16: 12,32: 12,58: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| 27:13, 40:4, 55:20 <br> 56:5, 57:24, 58:9, | 28:12, 29:13, 31:11, | partial ${ }_{[1]}$ - 30:22 | possibility [1]-25:1 | professionals [3] - |
| 65:6, 68:9, 68:12 | 4:11, 35:10, 38:21, | partially [1] - 44:20 | possibly [1]-22:15 | 22:2, 25:24, 58:23 |
| nullity ${ }_{[2]}$ - 68:10 | 39:1, 49:23, 60:21, | parties [5] - 13:16, | potential [2] - 35:1, | proof [1] - 35:19 |
| number [7]-28:9, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:4, 69:16, 69:17, } \\ & 69: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 27:8, 27:20, 28:2, } \\ & 55: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 67:23 | Property [7]-13:11, 13:15, 15:15, 15:18, |
| $37: 2,41: 16,50: 5$ | ones [1]-8:15 | pass [1]-27:6 | practical [1] - 66:1 | $16: 3,54: 10,54: 14$ |
| Number [1] - 25:8 | OOO [3]-1:9, 4:2, 4:7 | past [1] - 58:2 | practitioners [1] | property [28]-6:8, |
| numbers [2]-49:6, | open [2]-35:6, 37:8 | pattern [1] - 38:7 | 54:18 | 16:6, 16:24, 28:21, |
| 49:12 | opened [1]-6:4 | pay [4] - 6:9, 40:17, | pre [2]-10:1, 23:3 | 29:7, 30:3, 30:16 |
| NV [1] - 1:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { opening [3] - 24:17, } \\ & 25: 21,30: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 44:23, 47:19 } \\ \text { penalty }[1]-37: 11 \end{gathered}$ | pre-trial [2] - 10:1, | $\begin{aligned} & 31: 12,31: 13,38: 14, \\ & 38: 19,40: 9,43: 18, \end{aligned}$ |
| 0 | operators [1] - 54:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{per}_{[3]}-15: 18,33: 5, \\ & 51: 19 \end{aligned}$ | predated [1] - 35:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 6,49: 18,50: 24, \\ & 51: 4,51: 11,52: 18, \end{aligned}$ |
| o'clock [2]-24:12, 25:13 | opposite [1] - 38:6 | percent [2] - 37:14, | prefer [1]-24:9 <br> preliminary ${ }_{[1]}-6: 7$ | 53:12, 53:21, 54:8, |
| 25:13 <br> oath [1] - 37 | oral [2]-52:15 |  | prepared [1] - 23:19 | 54:16, 54:23, 55:2, |
| $\text { object }[5]-5: 11 \text {, }$ | order [2]-6:9, 60:11 | $10: 12,10: 14,23: 3$ | preponderance [2] | proposition [1] |
| 21:11, 23:9, 25:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rdere } \\ & 70: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { perfect }[1]-25: 22$ | 31:8, 46:13 | 55:22 |
| 58:2 | original [5] - 12:15, | performance [1] - | prescribed [1] - 11:4 present $[4]$ - 15:16 | prospective [2]-37:4, |
| objecting ${ }_{[1]}-11: 3$ | 12:17, 13:18, 13:19, | $58: 24$ | $15: 17,25: 18,73: 8$ | 56:6 |
| objection [6] - 10:19, 14:6, 14:14, 14:24, | 20 | perhaps [1] - 13:19 <br> period [1] - 45:19 | presented [2] - 30:9, | protect [3] - 44:17, $56: 7,56: 15$ |
| 15:10, 20:14 | originals [1]-22 | $\text { perjury }{ }_{[1]}-37: 11$ | 1:22 | prove [3]-9:2 |
| objectionable [2] - | osmosis [3]-33:18, | permit [3] - 43:12, | pressure [1] - 33: | 36:19, 50:12 |
| 8:16 | $34: 14,34: 19$ | 53:7, 53:8 | prevent 11 - 70 :10 | proves [2] - 31:9, 32:6 |
| objections [2]-22:18, 22:21 | otherwise [1] - 59:10 | permits [10]-35:20, $35: 22,35: 24,36: 4$, | previously [2] - 9:23, | provide [5]-26:4, 54:9, 60:18, 61:2, |
| obligated [1] - 52:24 | outlines [1] - 37:23 | $36: 8,53: 1,53: 4,$ | 46:22 | 72:4 |
| obtain [3] - 6:9, 30:2, | outside [1] - 7:4 | $53: 7,55: 2,60: 8$ | price [5] - 6:11, 41:2, | provided [5] - 9:23, |
| 58:24 <br> obtained [4]-30:18, | overlapping ${ }_{[1]}$ - | permitting [3] - 35:5, $35: 11,43: 1$ | principal ${ }_{[1]}-55: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:7, 30:21, 30:22, } \\ & 61: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| $32: 3,70: 14$ | owe [1] - $27: 8$ | person [1] - 35:1 $\text { pertaining }[1]-5$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { principles [2]-6:8, } \\ & 24: 21 \end{aligned}$ | provides [1] - 52:8 |
| occupation [1]-4:18 | owed [2] - 27:19, 28:2 owes [1] - 63:5 | pertinent [2]-9:24, | private [1] - 58:15 | provision [1] - 55:4 <br> provisions [3]-52:2, |
| occurred ${ }_{[1]}$ - 21:7 <br> OF [6]-1:7, 1:17 | own [2] - 30:11, 35:7 | $53: 19$ | problem [9]-26:20, $41: 7,50: 9,50: 13$, | 60:21, 66:17 |


|  |  |  | ```requirement \({ }_{[2]}\) - 40:16, 68:5 requirements [8] - 26:2, 28:20, 28:22, 29:1, 29:8, 29:10, 42:18, 65:15 residence [3]-29:13, 39:12, 51:4 residential [6]-28:12, 28:14, 29:6, 38:20, 51:6, 56:4 respect [1] - 49:24 response [1] - 37:7 responses [3]-32:19, 37:9, 37:20 responsibilities [4] - 48:14, 55:18, 59:14, 62:6 responsibility [4] - 38:8, 47:14, 57:18, 57:19 responsible \([7]\) - 36:16, 53:18, 57:20, 59:24, 60:6, 60:8, 66:4 rest [1]-23:15 result [2] - 9:3, 40:6 resulted [1]-50:2 resulting [2]-49:6, 54:3 results [1]-51:1 retain [1] - 54:20 return [2]-33:17, 54:12 reverse [3] - 33:18, 34:14, 34:19 reviewed [2]-12:9, 64:13 revised [1]-23:3 Reynolds [2]-6:16, 37:4 REYNOLDS \({ }_{[1]}\) - 1:13 Reynoldses [7] - 15:12, 15:22, 15:23, 17:4, 18:22, 30:21, 35:12 rights [1] - 46:7 road [1] - 43:3 Ron [6] - 29:24, 39:10, 39:13, 42:14, 43:7, 67:23 roof [1]-54:19 room [1] - 60:23 rounded [1]-41:16 rules [1]-8:11None``` |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | realty $[1]$ - 56:4 | releases [2]-21:8, |  |  |
|  | reason [5] - 13:4, | 62:15 |  |  |
|  | $26: 13,33: 20,37: 1$ | relevant [2] - 8:10, |  |  |
| pure [1]-51:18 | $66: 1$ | $52: 12$ |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reasonable [10] - } \\ & \text { 40:21, 46:8, 48:15, } \\ & \text { 55:23, 56:6, 58:6, } \\ & 70: 9,70: 10,70: 12, \\ & 70: 13 \end{aligned}$ | relieves [1]-56:5 relinquishment [1] 68:17 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 68: 17 \\ & \text { rely [1] - 27:5 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  | rely [1] - 27:5 <br> remain [1]-47:15 <br> remaining $[3]-30: 12$ |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reasonableness [1] - } \\ & \text { 49:9 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  | $38: 15,48: 4$ |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { reasonably }[2] \text { - } \\ 27: 13,70: 16 \end{gathered}$ | remains [1] - 66:20 |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { remedy [4] - 41:9, } \\ & 50: 22,51: 3,67: 8 \end{aligned}$ |  | 31:17, 39:4, 51:3, |
|  | receipt [1] - 54:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { remember [2]-31:13, } \\ & 67: 19 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  | remodel [1] - 51:11 <br> remodeling [1] - 50:24 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { section [2] - } 8: 13, \\ & 28: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | received $[7]$ - $9: 21$, | renamed [1] - 23:5 | $38: 8,47: 14,57: 18$ | see [6] - 6:7, 15:3, |
|  |  | RENO [2] - 1:20, 4:1 | $57: 19$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 33: 21,37: 4,37: 12 \\ & \text { recess [1] }-25: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Reno [4] - 2:6, 2:11, } \\ 4: 17,73: 15 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { responsible }[7] \text { - } \\ & 36: 16,53: 18,57: 20, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 24,32: 3,60: 7 \\ & 66: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | recognize [1] - 13:4 | $\begin{gathered} 4: 17,73: 15 \\ \text { repair [2] - 15:20, } \end{gathered}$ | 36:16, 53:18, 57:20, 59:24, 60:6, 60:8, | seeing [1] - 32:11 |
|  | recollection [1] - | $34: 18$ | 66:4 | seeking [1] - 50:16 <br> selected [1] - 9:18 |
|  | $21: 19$ | Repairs [2] - 33:2, |  |  |
|  | $36: 18$ | 33:6 | result [2] - 9:3, 40:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { seller [23] - 15:19, } \\ & 15: 24,24: 19,33: 14, \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { repairs [5] - 15:24, } \\ 33: 15,34: 5,47: 9 \end{gathered}$ | resulted ${ }_{[1]}-50: 2$ | 34:17, 46:19, 46:22, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { recorded [2]-20:19, } \\ & 20: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33: 15,34: 5,47: 9 \\ & 60: 12 \end{aligned}$ | resulting [2] - 49:6, | $47: 8,47: 12,47: 22$ |
|  | recover [1] - 40:5 | repeated ${ }_{[1]}-27: 16$ | results [1]-51:1 | $48: 8,52: 13,52: 16$ |
|  | RECROSS [1] - 3:3 | repeatedly [1] - 51:16 | retain [1] - 54:20 | $54: 1,54: 8,54: 13$ |
| read | $\begin{aligned} & \text { red [1] - 39:19 } \\ & \text { redesignated }{ }_{[1]}- \end{aligned}$ | replaced [1]-67:14 | return [2]-33:17, | $\begin{aligned} & 54: 24,55: 6,55: 9 \\ & 58: 3,58: 18,60: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | Report [2] - 57:12, |  |  |
| 60:17, 68:2, 68:3 |  | report [5] - 20:8, 21:4, | reverse [3]-33:18, $34: 14,34: 19$ |  |
| 6 | REDIRECT [1] - 3:3 <br> refer ${ }_{[1]}-51: 18$ | $57: 8,70: 3,71: 15$ | reviewed [2] - 12:9, | $\begin{gathered} \text { seller's [5] - } 24: 18 \\ 48: 9,54: 4,58: 4 \end{gathered}$ |
| re | refer [1]-51:18 reference [2]-37:18, | 57:8, 70:3, 71:15 <br> Reporter [1] - 73:5 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 48: 9,54: 4,58: 4, \\ & 58: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| rea | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reference [2]-37:18, } \\ & 54: 11 \end{aligned}$ | reports [4]-11:12, <br> 12:5, 59:18, 59:19 | revised [1] - 23:3 | Seller's [1] - 54:14 <br> sellers [10]-30:21 |
| Re | referred [1] - 24:16 |  | Reynolds [2] - 6:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sellers [10] - 30:21, } \\ & \text { 48:6, 54:8, 56:13, } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { referring }[4]-21: 11, \\ 52: 5,55: 20,58: 18 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
|  | 52:5, 55:20, 58:18 regard [3] - 52:3, | $28: 3,48: 14,52: 23$ | REYNOLDS ${ }_{[1]}$ - 1:13 | 57:20, 58:21, 59:18, $59: 23,60: 3,60: 5$ |
|  | $56: 10,57: 23$ | representation [1] - 52:14 | Reynoldses [7] - | Sellers [1] - 54:10 |
| $58: 16,58: 20,59: 3$ | regarding [5] - 52:14, | representations [1] - 52:16 | $35: 12$ |  |
| re | $52: 16,56: 3,58: 12$ | $52: 16$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sense [2] - } 67: 12, \\ & 67: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| re | $\begin{aligned} & 58: 14 \\ & \text { relate [1] - 49:13 } \end{aligned}$ | representing [1] - $53: 3$ |  |  |
| 4 | $\text { related }[9]-29: 16,$ | request [8]-37:1, | Ron [6] - 29:24, 39:10, |  |
|  | $33: 10,46: 23,47: 9$ |  | 39:13, 42:14, 43:7, | separate [2]-38:19, |
|  | $64: 22,65: 6$ | 37:2, 41:17, 41:23, |  | 39:15 |
|  |  | $57: 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { roof }[1]-54: 19 \\ & \text { room }[1]-60: 23 \\ & \text { rounded }[1]-41: 16 \\ & \text { rules }[1]-8: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { September }[4]-29: 4, \\ 30: 18,31: 10,37: 5 \\ \text { septic }[27]-20: 8, \\ 29: 21,29: 22,37: 21, \\ 37: 24,38: 13,38: 18, \\ 39: 21,40: 13,42: 12, \\ 42: 16,43: 5,57: 5 \\ 57: 6,57: 15,57: 23 \\ 58: 12,58: 15,58: 18, \\ 59: 2,59: 4,70: 3 \end{gathered}$ |
| $6$ | relates [1] - 64:14 | requesting [2] - 9:4, |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { relating [2] - 16:6, } \\ & 52: 8 \end{aligned}$ | required [13] - 6:1, |  |  |
|  | relative [1]- 8:22 | $6: 2,14: 1,16: 1,30: 1,$ |  |  |
|  | release [5] - 16:5, | $33: 8,39: 16,43: 14$ |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 12,56: 24,59: 8, \\ & 60: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $43: 22,44: 16,55: 21$ |  |  |
|  | Release [5] - 13:12, | Required [2] - 33:1, |  |  |
|  | 13:16, 15:19, 16:4, |  |  |  |


| 70:15, 71:13, 71:14, | signing ${ }_{[2]}-7: 1,21: 8$ | SRPD ${ }_{[2]}-59: 17,68: 4$ | suburban [3]-28:10, | testimony [10] - 32:24, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Septic [1] - 57:9 | 30:14 | stand [11]-26:11 | successfully ${ }_{[1]}$ | :1, 40:3, 46:10, |
| served [1] - 9:4 | simplistic [1] - 6:6 | 7:16, 27:22, 31:1 | 20:17 | 9, 51:13, 66:8 |
| Service [5] - 19:5, | simply [3] - 8:21, 31:2, | 32:18, 34:13, 34:16, | sue [1]-35:17 | tests [1] - 19:20 |
| 19:6, 57:10, 58:10 | 56:18 | 5:3, 37:19, 38:11, | sued [6]-30:11, | THE ${ }_{[165]}-1: 6,1: 7$, |
| service [2]-53:11, | single [2]-29:6, 38:20 | 69:5 | 30:12, 65:22, 66:13, | 1:8, 4:3, 5:15, 7:4, |
| 53:16 | sit [1] - 48:23 | stars [1] - 40:20 | 66:19, 66:22 | 7:8, 7:12, 7:21, 7:24, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { set }[3]-8: 12,32: 14, \\ & 58: 15 \end{aligned}$ | situation [1]-66:21 <br> situations [1]-48:1 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { start }[7]-6: 7,6: 20, \\ 17: 18,23: 22,24: 5 \end{array}$ | suffered [2] - 40:14, $47: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 11,9: 1,9: 9,10: 11, \\ & 10: 14,10: 16,10: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| sets [2]-61:11, 62:23 | siz | 32:23, 52:21 | summer [2] - 45:6 | 11:1, 11:14, 11:19, |
| settled [2]-35:19, | 18, 42:21, 52:17, | started [2] - 46:16 | 45:7 | 12:12, 12:17, 12:18, |
| 48:7 | 57:5, 57:8, 57:15, | 53:8 | sun [1] - 40:20 | 12:21, 12:24, 13:7 |
| settlement[3]-45:5, | 57:23, 61:7, 61:9, | State [1]-73:6 | supply [1]-13:17 | 14:5, 14:9, 14:16, |
| 48:7 | 71:18 | STATE [2] - 1:7, 73:1 | supplying ${ }_{[1]}-69: 20$ | 15:1, 15:4, 15:6 |
| settlements [2]- | sizes [1] - 61:12 | state [2]-4:15, 5:22 | support ${ }_{[1]}$ - 25:2 | 15:9, 16:8, 16:10, |
| 46:17 | skip [3] - 52:15, 58:5, | statement [7] - 10:1, | supported [2] - 45:21, | 16:16, 16:18, 16:19, |
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THE COURT: Good morning. Be seated please. This is CV15-00281, Lindberg versus Reynolds and Johnson. Okay. This was set because of the order I made on December the 5th granting an amendment to the filings. And the question before the court at this time is what was the amounts of the settlement of the other defendants so that we can deduct from the damages that were awarded.

So, counsel, what do we have?
MR. MOORE: Your Honor, John Moore on behalf of the plaintiffs. Was the court going to entertain any argument?

THE COURT: Just the figures and subtraction basically.

MR. MOORE: Okay. The amount of settlement was a settlement of $\$ 50,000$ with Harry Reynolds and Deann Reynolds.

THE COURT: They are the --
MR. MOORE: Seller.
THE COURT: Sellers. Now, they had a
nondisclosure bases, right?
MR. MOORE: Yes, for the -- the settlement was confidential, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. MOORE: And I don't believe that the other settlement was. I'm not certain.

THE COURT: And what was that?
MR. MOORE: $\$ 7,500$ with the other broker, your
Honor: Ken Amundson and Brian Kincannon.
THE COURT: Now, the $\$ 50,000$, that
contemplated the treble damages for the nondisclosure, right?

MR. MOORE: Certainly, your Honor.
THE COURT: So that $\$ 15,000$ would be the base on that, right?

MR. MOORE: So $\$ 15,000$-- for the treble damages, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes. One-third of 50.
MR. MOORE: It is a little more than that. If
I may, your Honor, may I just outline?
THE COURT: Sure.
MR. MOORE: What we had is the -- the claims we would have proceeded with against -- may I, your Honor?

THE COURT: Sure.
MR. MOORE: And I did want to clarify the amount of the judgment. I believe that the court was
using a $\$ 75,000$ amount. But the court did award interest, pre-judgment interest, as well. So I just wanted to put those numbers up, if I could.

THE COURT: That will confuse it. Let's stick with the -- I guess that has to work into it at this point in time. Go ahead.

MR. MOORE: The amount of judgment for costs to repair the septic and to obtain a variance to have a larger septic is $\$ 27,663.95$. And the amount of attorney's fees awarded as damages by statute is $\$ 48,116.75$.

And the judgment then -- when the judgment was entered by the court, the court awarded prejudgment interest in the amount of $\$ 19,121.48$, for a total of $\$ 94,902.18$.

That's the total amount of the judgment entered by the court. And it does carry post-judgment interest at a specified rate. And I imagine, if the court does reduce the amount, that we would probably have a reduced amount of post-judgment interest. And so we'll deal with that, if we need to.

But against the seller, your Honor, and -here in this case we did bring a claim against multiple defendants and against the seller. The claim against the
seller was based in statute NRS 113.150 which allows for -- if the seller does not disclose damages, does not disclose a known defect in the seller disclosure form, the seller potentially could be responsible for triple damages.

So in this case we proceeded against the seller on the same facts here. And there had been an award of $\$ 27,663.95$ for the fix. By statute that would be tripled to an amount of $\$ 82,991.85$.

The statute also permits for reasonable
attorney's fees and costs. So it would include \$48,116.75, the amount awarded by the court. And interest in that situation would have been significantly higher against the seller for an amount of 33,000 -using the same formula we used in the judgment that the court had entered -- $\$ 33,084.24$, for a total judgment against the seller of $\$ 164,192.84$.

And the significant issue with this statute is that this is only something that the seller would have had to have responded to, the tripling of the damages, which is why we -- respectfully disagree with the court that this is the same injury.

When it comes to --
THE COURT: Well, the trebles are based on the
amount of injury and the amount of injury is the $\$ 27,663$.
But that's the finding of this court after trial.

Now, you settled with them so they -- that took away their advantage under the statute. I'm not concerned with that. But I'm concerned with the $\$ 27,000$ as part of the contribution.

MR. MOORE: Okay. And from that perspective, your Honor, if we are going from with respect to this statute, the trebling of damages for the $\$ 50,000--\quad$ I think you were getting to this earlier -- that full $\$ 50,000$ shouldn't be credited towards this -- these remaining defendants.

THE COURT: No, it doesn't.
MR. MOORE: If anything, it should be --
THE COURT: $\$ 16,000$.
MR. MOORE: A third of that.
THE COURT: 16 -- $\$ 16,650$.
MR. MOORE: Okay. So, your Honor, under the scenario with the judgment in the amount of $\$ 94,902.18$, you subtract from that the $\$ 7,500$ paid by the other realtor, and $I$ tend to agree, your Honor; the other realtor the liability is based on the same statute. So I would tend to agree that this should be reduced. And
then you take the $\$ 16,000--$ how much was that, your Honor?

THE COURT: $\$ 16,650$.

MR. MOORE: $\$ 16,650$, $I$ don't have my calculator - -

THE COURT: We have $\$ 16,650$, plus $\$ 7,500$.

Plus --

MR. MOORE: It is a minus.

THE COURT: And the $\$ 94,000$ is what?

MR. MOORE: \$94,902.18.

THE COURT: \$33, 640 .

MR. MOORE: Well --

THE COURT: That can't be right.

MR. MOORE: Yes. $\$ 94,902.18$ minus about
\$24, 150 .

THE COURT: But again the $\$ 94,000$ is coming from what?

MR. MOORE: The judgment. The court entered a judgment in this case against the remaining defendants for 94,000 --

THE COURT: That's including the pre-interest.

MR. MOORE: Yes. That's prejudgment interest, attorney's fees, awarded as damages and damages associated with the septic tank and the variance.

THE COURT: Finish that up. Finish -- here, use this.

MR. MOORE: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: Make sure you punch each one because they miss.

MR. MOORE: I will.
THE COURT: Wait a minute. That $\$ 94,000$ that is Plaintiff's damages. The attorney's fees proven at trial. And the prejudgment interest, right?

MR. MOORE: Correct.
THE COURT: Okay. But the attorney's fees are already established. The going to trial and the -- the testimony that came in established that amount. So that's sacrosanct, so to speak. We can't touch that.

The prejudgment interest we have to take into consideration. And the $\$ 27,000$ as the bases for the -damages were established at trial.

MR. MOORE: Correct.
THE COURT: Is the starting point. So you are looking at something like, what, \$3,000.

MR. MOORE: For what, your Honor?
THE COURT: Being the difference between the -- what the other parties contributed and what was remaining at the time of -- well, that the defendants
would have owed had they all gotten together and said hey here and contributed.

MR. MOORE: Our contention is that from the judgment -- at best -- we don't believe this is the same injury because of what's been outlined here. This $\$ 164,000$ would not have been owed by the remaining defendants. It would be a different amount.

And it is just -- from our perspective it is respectfully not the same injury by statute under the -statutes that govern for the realtor.

THE COURT: And $I$ agree with that. The $\$ 113,150$ is a nondisclosure aspect. But the starting point for the treble is the $\$ 27,000$.

So that's what will --
MR. MOORE: And that's what gets us to this $\$ 82,000$, if you treble that amount.

So from the judgment entered by the court, we would -- we would agree the $\$ 7,500$ settlement from the other realtor should be deducted. But we don't believe the $\$ 50,000$ with the other defendants should be deducted.

THE COURT: I agree with that.
MR. MOORE: If you deduct these two amounts you are looking at $\$ 70,752.18$.

THE COURT: Okay. But $I$ do disagree with
that.
MR. MOORE: Okay.
THE COURT: Okay. Because, again, when you net it out, the -- based on the settling amounts of the other two defendants, what was left of the damage that the plaintiff established was approximately $\$ 3,000$.

MR. MOORE: I don't -- oh, of the $\$ 27,000$ ?
THE COURT: Right. I have $\$ 27,000$.
MR. MOORE: Oh, oh, oh, okay. So you reduce that to three. But then you add the $\$ 48,000$ for the -THE COURT: No problem with that.

And then the -- the $\$ 48,000$, that's 51.
MR. MOORE: And then --
THE COURT: Pre-trial interest is reduced proportionately.

MR. MOORE: Okay.
THE COURT: Instead of the large amount. Now it is a smaller amount that's gathering the interest.

MR. MOORE: And then, your Honor, but what -where you are going with that is you add the -- you take this amount and you subtract it from the $\$ 27,000$.

THE COURT: Yes. Yes.
MR. MOORE: Which leaves -- correct, $\$ 3,000$ or $\$ 4,000$ and then you add the $\$ 48,000$ found to be damages
associated.
THE COURT: Because you had to get the attorney's fees to get where we are.

MR. MOORE: Right. And then the court would reduce the interest based on the $\$ 50,000$ total.

THE COURT: Based on the $\$ 50,000$ rather than the \$94,000.

MR. MOORE: I understand. I was confused with that until now, your Honor.

We do still contend though that this should be the amount of the judgment. If the court finds it should be something closer to $\$ 50,000$ plus interest, we understand that as well.

Under those circumstances the judgment far exceeds the $\$ 5,000$ offer of judgment made.

THE COURT: I'm not concerned with the offer argument. I discounted that.

MR. MOORE: So, your Honor, we would submit to the Court again -- we don't think this is the same injury. But we leave it to the Court's discretion to determine what the amount of the judgment should be.

THE COURT: All right. Just for arithmetical purposes, what interest rate were you using?

MR. MOORE: Seven percent.

THE COURT: Seven from the prejudgment. MR. MOORE: The legal rate.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. MOORE: Anything else, your Honor?
THE COURT: And did you calculate the post -MR. MOORE: We did on the original judgment, the $\$ 94,000$ judgment. We calculated that to be about $\$ 14$ a day.

THE COURT: And that's at, what, still at the seven percent?

MR. MOORE: Seven percent.
THE COURT: So seven percent will be the total
amount from the date of the judgment to today.
MR. MOORE: Okay.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Anything
else?
MR. MOORE: No, your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Hall, what do you have?
MR. HALL: Your Honor, I filed a prehearing statement last evening. Sorry I didn't get it sooner than that.

THE COURT: You filed that at six o'clock last night.

MR. HALL: Yes. And that summarizes $I$ think
most of our argument. But listening to the computations that were made this morning, it appears to me that what we are doing is we are awarding treble damages against these defendants, these remaining defendants; and I don't believe the statute provides for treble damages.

THE COURT: How do you arrive at that
conclusion?
MR. HALL: Just from my reading of the overall statutory authority, your Honor. I'm sorry I don't have it in front of me right now. But $I$ wanted to submit -I'm just hearing this for the first time the arguments that were presented.

THE COURT: Okay. But I found that the damages that were caused by the sellers and their agent and your client that impacted the plaintiff had to do with the septic system. And that totaled $\$ 27,000$. Yes, $\$ 27,663.95$.

They settled. What was left is what your client owed. Now, for some reason they were not considered in this case. They were not parties to the case because they dropped out. There was no motion for good-faith settlement as far as $I$ was able to discern from the record.

MR. HALL: The settlement was kept
confidential actually.
THE COURT: I know. But nothing was done to -- and I looked at the affirmative defenses. Nothing was mentioned in that about it.

When we had the trial, the attorney's fees that were presented -- there was no objection to that.

MR. HALL: No objection to the computation, your Honor.

THE COURT: No objection to the fact of whether or not they were reasonable, were they necessary and things like that. So that went to judgment. And the judgment is what it is.
$\$ 48,000$ in attorney's fees.
MR. HALL: I understand. But I have made a motion to amend and so $I$ just want to briefly make my arguments on that.

THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR. HALL: And I think, simply stated, your Honor, it is that what has been sought here by the plaintiff is attorney's fees as damages.

THE COURT: Right. That's how they were alleged.

MR. HALL: We would measure damages by how much the plaintiff was injured, not some construct of
fees by the other side. Because as a matter of law -THE COURT: That's what we are doing. But to arrive at the final total, sum total, you caused them to go through the process. And that's the way I see it.

MR. HALL: But here is what happened. When the offer of judgment was made in November of 2017 , the fee bases between the plaintiff and his attorney changed to a contingent fee. And so the contingent fee -- that's what I thought we were going to hear this morning. The contingent fee would be, I'm assuming, one-third of $\$ 27,000$. That's what the plaintiff had -- that's the damages that were caused to the plaintiff. The hourly rate is not what the -- what the plaintiff has to pay. THE COURT: That is something that you should have argued when we were presenting that evidence at the trial. I mean, your client is damaged by what it cost to defend her. That's -- if they allege it as part of the cause of action rather than asking the court under statutory remedies for attorney's fees, they have to plead and prove. And they pled and proved without contradiction.

MR. HALL: But as matter of law is what I am arguing, your Honor, that that is incorrect.

THE COURT: Well, then that's --

MR. HALL: That's why I moved to amend --
THE COURT: That's the appeal.
MR. HALL: -- to correct that. And just so we are understood, my argument is that if the $\$ 27,000$ was the recovery of the defendant -- excuse me, the recovery of the plaintiff, his attorney, I assume, would get one-third of that amount because it was on a contingency fee bases.

And so that was the actual damages suffered by the plaintiff as attorney's fees damages. And that's what they pled for in the case.

And, in addition, $I$ would just like to point out for the court, the defendant -- the plaintiffs in this case were made whole when they got the $\$ 57,000$.

What was the bases -- what was the reason for continuing the lawsuit in any event?

THE COURT: Well, they were entitled to -- had we gone through to trial against the former owners, just their apportionment of their damages was in the treble amount. So we would have to find out how much they were initially damaged times three for the realtor -- I mean for the owners.

Okay. And then that's strictly to the owners. And then the other two would be dividing up if
there is anything left.
MR. HALL: All right. I have made my
arguments. Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: In any event, that's what we'll
do.
I'll go ahead and amend the judgment and conclude this.

MR. MOORE: Thank you, your Honor.
MR. HALL: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: And thank you, counsel. Why don't we do this, so we don't have to do it around and around and around. You make the calculations, submit it to Mr. Hall. And, once it is agreed upon, submit it to me and I'll sign it.

MR. MOORE: I'll do that, your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.
(At this time the foregoing proceedings concluded.)
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