IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

Supreme Court Case No. 78092

Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC, *Appellant*

Electronically Filed Oct 03 2019 04:25 p.m. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

v.

Brahma Group, Inc., *Respondent*

Appeal
Fifth Judicial District Court
The Honorable Steven P. Elliott
Case No. CV 39348

APPELLANT'S APPENDIX VOLUME 14

D. LEE ROBERTS, JR., ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 8877
COLBY L. BALKENBUSH, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 13066
RYAN T. GORMLEY, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 13494
WEINBERG, WHEELER, HUDGINS,
GUNN & DIAL, LLC
6385 South Rainbow Blvd., Suite 400
Las Vegas, Nevada 89118
(702) 938-3838
lroberts@wwhgd.com
cbalkenbush@wwhgd.com
rgormley@wwhgd.com

Attorneys for Appellant Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC

Date Filed	Description	Bates Number	Volume(s)
06/11/2018	TSE's Motion to Expunge	AA0001-0013	1
	Exhibit 1 – Services Agreement	AA0014-0035	1
	Exhibit 2 – Notice of Lien	AA0036-0043	1
	Exhibit 3 – Notice of First Amended and Restated Lien	AA0044-0047	1
	Exhibit 4 – Notice of First Amended and Restated Lien	AA0048-0057	1
	Exhibit 5 – Notice of Second Amended and Restated Lien	AA0058-0067	1
	Exhibit 6 – Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice	AA0068-0078	1
	Exhibit 7 – Affidavit of Justin Pugh	AA0079-0083	1
07/24/2018	Brahma Group, Inc.'s Opposition to TSE's Motion to Expunge Brahma Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's Lien	AA0084-0104	1
	Exhibit 1 – Grant, Bargain and Sale Deed	AA0105-0110	2
	Exhibit 2 – Nye County Parcel Detail	AA0111-0112	2
	Exhibit 3 – Right-Of-Way Grant	AA0113-0136	2
	Exhibit 4 – Deed of Trust	AA0137-0167	2
	Exhibit 5 – Services Agreement	AA0168-0189	2
	Exhibit 6 – Original Lien	AA0190-00197	2
	Exhibit 7 – First Amended Lien	AA0198-0201	2
	Exhibit 8 – Re-recorded First Amended Lien	AA0202-0211	2

	Exhibit 9 – Second Amended Lien	AA0212-0221	2
	Exhibit 10 – Third Amended Lien	AA0222-0230	2
	Exhibit 11 – Parcel Detail printouts from Nye County Assessor's website	AA0231-0235	2
07/31/2018	TSE's Reply to Brahma Group, Inc.'s Opposition to TSE's Motion to Expunge Brahma Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's Lien	AA0236-00249	3
	Exhibit A – Nye County Parcel Detail for parcels 012-141-01 & 012-151-01	AA0250-00252	3
	Exhibit B – Nye County Parcel Detail for parcels 012-31-04, 012-131-03, 012-131-04	AA0253-0256	3
	Exhibit C – Nye County Parcel Detail for parcels 612-141-01, 012-141-01	AA0257-0259	3
	Exhibit D – Nye County Real Property Inquiry	AA0260-0262	3
	Exhibit E – Nye County Parcel Detail for parcel 012-431-06	AA0263-0264	3
	Exhibit F – Article from Department of Energy dated 09/28/2011	AA0265-0267	3
	Exhibit G – Affidavit of Justin Pugh	AA0268-0271	3
08/03/2018	Brahma Group, Inc.'s Supplement to its Opposition to TSE's Motion to Expunge Brahma Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's Lien	AA0272-0274	3
	Exhibit A – Notice of Right to Lien	AA0275-0276	3
	Exhibit B – USPS Tracking	AA0277-0279	3

08/15/2018	Brahma Group, Inc.'s Statement of Supplemental Authorities in Support of its Opposition to TSE's Motion to Expunge Brahma Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's Lien	AA0280-0284	4
	Appendix A – Basic Refractories, Inc. v. Bright, 72 Nev 183 (1956)	AA0285-0294	4
	Appendix B – Schultz v. King, 68 Nev 207 (1951)	AA0295-0300	4
	Appendix C – Byrd Underground, LLC v. Angaur, LLC, 332 P.3d 273 (2014)	AA0301-0309	4
	Appendix D – <i>Crutcher v. Block</i> , 19 Okla. 246 (1907)	AA0310-0314	4
	Appendix E – <i>Tropic Builders, Ltd., v. US,</i> 52 Haw. 298 (1970)	AA0315-0321	4
	Appendix F – Dow Chemical Co. v. Bruce-Rogers Co., 255 Ark 448 (1973)	AA0322-0328	4
08/15/2018	TSE's Errata to its Reply to Brahma Group, Inc.'s Opposition to TSE's Motion to Expunge Brahma Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's Lien	AA0329-0331	4
09/07/2018	TSE's Response to Brahma Group, Inc.'s Statement of Supplemental Authorities in Support of its Opposition to TSE's Motion to Expunge Brahma Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's Lien	AA0332-0339	4
	Exhibit 1 – Loan Guarantee Agreement	AA0340-0344	4

09/12/2018	Hearing Transcript	AA0345-0471	5, 6
11/01/2018	Notice of Entry of Order Denying TSE's Motion to Expunge	AA0472-0481	6
11/01/2018	Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS 108.2275(6)(C)	AA0482-0495	7
	Exhibit 1 – Declaration of R. Peel	AA0496-0502	7
	Exhibit 2 – Order	AA0503-0509	7
	Exhibit 3 – Peel Brimley's invoices	AA0510-0525	7
11/26/2018	TSE's Opposition to Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS 108.2275(6)(C)	AA0526-0541	8
	Exhibit 1 – Peel Brimley Invoice	AA0542-0557	8
	Exhibit 2 – Declaration of R. Gormley	AA0558-0562	8
	Exhibit 3 – TSE Motion to Expunge Brahma Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's lien	AA0563-0576	8
	Exhibit 4 – Brahma Group, Inc.'s Opposition to TSE's Motion to Expunge Mechanic's Lien	AA0577-0598	8
	Exhibit 5 – Helix Electric of Nevada, LLC's Motion for Attorney's Fees, Interest and Costs	AA0599-0663	9
	Exhibit 6 – Complaint	AA0664-0669	9
	Exhibit 7 – Notice of Removal to Federal Court	AA0670-0673	9
	Exhibit 8 – Fourth Amended and/or Restated Notice of Lien	AA0674-0684	9

12/11/2018	Hearing Transcript	AA0823-1005	12, 13, 14
12/04/2018	Brahma Group, Inc.'s Reply to TSE's Opposition to Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS 108.2275(6)(C)	AA0808-0822	11
	Exhibit 16 – Peel Brimley firm information	AA0804-0807	11
	Exhibit 15 – TSE Motion to Strike Brahma Group, Inc.'s First Amended Counter-Complaint, or in the Alternative, Motion to Dismiss Counter-Complaint, or in the Alternative, Motion to Stay this Action Until the Conclusion of the Proceedings in Federal Court	AA0763-0803	11
	Exhibit 14 – Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion for Stay, or in the Alternative, Motion to Amend Complaint	AA0743-0762	10
	Exhibit 13 – Brahma Group, Inc.'s Answer to TSE Counterclaim	AA0734-0742	10
	Exhibit 12 – Brahma Group, Inc.'s First Amended Counter-Complaint; and Third-Party Complaint	AA719-0733	10
	Exhibit 11 – First Amended Complaint	AA0714-0718	10
	Exhibit 10 – Braham Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's Lien Foreclosure Complaint	AA0705-0713	10
	Exhibit 9 – TSE Answer to Brahma Group, Inc.'s Complaint and Counterclaim against Brahma	AA0685-0704	10

01/09/2019	Notice of Entry of Order Granting Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS 108.2275(6)(C)	AA1006-1018	14
02/15/2019	Notice of Appeal	AA1019-1022	14
	Exhibit 1 – Notice of Entry of Order	AA1023-1033	14
	Exhibit 2 – Notice of Entry of Order	AA1034-1047	14

Date Filed	Description	Bates Number	Volume(s)
11/01/2018	Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS 108.2275(6)(C)	AA0482-0495	7
	Exhibit 1 – Declaration of R. Peel	AA0496-0502	7
	Exhibit 2 – Order	AA0503-0509	7
	Exhibit 3 – Peel Brimley's invoices	AA0510-0525	7
07/24/2018	Brahma Group, Inc.'s Opposition to TSE's Motion to Expunge Brahma Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's Lien	AA0084-0104	1
	Exhibit 1 – Grant, Bargain and Sale Deed	AA0105-0110	2
	Exhibit 2 – Nye County Parcel Detail	AA0111-0112	2
	Exhibit 3 – Right-Of-Way Grant	AA0113-0136	2
	Exhibit 4 – Deed of Trust	AA0137-0167	2
	Exhibit 5 – Services Agreement	AA0168-0189	2
	Exhibit 6 – Original Lien	AA0190-00197	2
	Exhibit 7 – First Amended Lien	AA0198-0201	2
	Exhibit 8 – Re-recorded First Amended Lien	AA0202-0211	2
	Exhibit 9 – Second Amended Lien	AA0212-0221	2
	Exhibit 10 – Third Amended Lien	AA0222-0230	2
	Exhibit 11 – Parcel Detail printouts from Nye County Assessor's website	AA0231-0235	2
12/04/2018	Brahma Group, Inc.'s Reply to TSE's Opposition to Brahma	AA0808-0822	11

	Group, Inc.'s Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS 108.2275(6)(C)		
08/15/2018	Brahma Group, Inc.'s Statement of Supplemental Authorities in Support of its Opposition to TSE's Motion to Expunge Brahma Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's Lien	AA0280-0284	4
	Appendix A – Basic Refractories, Inc. v. Bright, 72 Nev 183 (1956)	AA0285-0294	4
	Appendix B – Schultz v. King, 68 Nev 207 (1951)	AA0295-0300	4
	Appendix C – Byrd Underground, LLC v. Angaur, LLC, 332 P.3d 273 (2014)	AA0301-0309	4
	Appendix D – Crutcher v. Block, 19 Okla. 246 (1907)	AA0310-0314	4
	Appendix E – <i>Tropic Builders, Ltd., v. US</i> , 52 Haw. 298 (1970)	AA0315-0321	4
	Appendix F – Dow Chemical Co. v. Bruce-Rogers Co., 255 Ark 448 (1973)	AA0322-0328	4
08/03/2018	Brahma Group, Inc.'s Supplement to its Opposition to TSE's Motion to Expunge Brahma Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's Lien	AA0272-0274	3
	Exhibit A – Notice of Right to Lien	AA0275-0276	3
	Exhibit B – USPS Tracking	AA0277-0279	3
09/12/2018	Hearing Transcript	AA0345-0471	5, 6
12/11/2018	Hearing Transcript	AA0823-1005	12, 13, 14

02/15/2019	Notice of Appeal	AA1019-1022	14
	Exhibit 1 – Notice of Entry of Order	AA1023-1033	14
	Exhibit 2 – Notice of Entry of Order	AA1034-1047	14
11/01/2018	Notice of Entry of Order Denying TSE's Motion to Expunge	AA0472-0481	6
01/09/2019	Notice of Entry of Order Granting Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS 108.2275(6)(C)	AA1006-1018	14
08/15/2018	TSE's Errata to its Reply to Brahma Group, Inc.'s Opposition to TSE's Motion to Expunge Brahma Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's Lien	AA0329-0331	4
06/11/2018	TSE's Motion to Expunge	AA0001-0013	1
	Exhibit 1 – Services Agreement	AA0014-0035	1
	Exhibit 2 – Notice of Lien	AA0036-0043	1
	Exhibit 3 – Notice of First Amended and Restated Lien	AA0044-0047	1
	Exhibit 4 – Notice of First Amended and Restated Lien	AA0048-0057	1
	Exhibit 5 – Notice of Second Amended and Restated Lien	AA0058-0067	1
	Exhibit 6 – Notice of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice	AA0068-0078	1
	Exhibit 7 – Affidavit of Justin Pugh	AA0079-0083	1
11/26/2018	TSE's Opposition to Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS	AA0526-0541	8

108.2275(6)(C)		
Exhibit 1 – Peel Brimley Invoice	AA0542-0557	8
Exhibit 2 – Declaration of R. Gormley	AA0558-0562	8
Exhibit 3 – TSE Motion to Expunge Brahma Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's lien	AA0563-0576	8
Exhibit 4 – Brahma Group, Inc.'s Opposition to TSE's Motion to Expunge Mechanic's Lien	AA0577-0598	8
Exhibit 5 – Helix Electric of Nevada, LLC's Motion for Attorney's Fees, Interest and Costs	AA0599-0663	9
Exhibit 6 – Complaint	AA0664-0669	9
Exhibit 7 – Notice of Removal to Federal Court	AA0670-0673	9
Exhibit 8 – Fourth Amended and/or Restated Notice of Lien	AA0674-0684	9
Exhibit 9 – TSE Answer to Brahma Group, Inc.'s Complaint and Counterclaim against Brahma	AA0685-0704	10
Exhibit 10 – Braham Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's Lien Foreclosure Complaint	AA0705-0713	10
Exhibit 11 – First Amended Complaint	AA0714-0718	10
Exhibit 12 – Brahma Group, Inc.'s First Amended Counter-Complaint; and Third-Party Complaint	AA719-0733	10
Exhibit 13 – Brahma Group, Inc.'s Answer to TSE Counterclaim	AA0734-0742	10

	Exhibit 14 – Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion for Stay, or in the Alternative, Motion to Amend Complaint	AA0743-0762	10
	Exhibit 15 – TSE Motion to Strike Brahma Group, Inc.'s First Amended Counter-Complaint, or in the Alternative, Motion to Dismiss Counter-Complaint, or in the Alternative, Motion to Stay this Action Until the Conclusion of the Proceedings in Federal Court	AA0763-0803	11
	Exhibit 16 – Peel Brimley firm information	AA0804-0807	11
07/31/2018	TSE's Reply to Brahma Group, Inc.'s Opposition to TSE's Motion to Expunge Brahma Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's Lien	AA0236-00249	3
	Exhibit A – Nye County Parcel Detail for parcels 012-141-01 & 012-151-01	AA0250-00252	3
	Exhibit B – Nye County Parcel Detail for parcels 012-31-04, 012-131-03, 012-131-04	AA0253-0256	3
	Exhibit C – Nye County Parcel Detail for parcels 612-141-01, 012-141-01	AA0257-0259	3
	Exhibit D – Nye County Real Property Inquiry	AA0260-0262	3
	Exhibit E – Nye County Parcel Detail for parcel 012-431-06	AA0263-0264	3
	Exhibit F – Article from Department of Energy dated 09/28/2011	AA0265-0267	3
	Exhibit G – Affidavit of Justin Pugh	AA0268-0271	3

09/07/2018	TSE's Response to Brahma Group, Inc.'s Statement of Supplemental Authorities in Support of its Opposition to TSE's Motion to Expunge Brahma Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's Lien	AA0332-0339	4
	Exhibit 1 – Loan Guarantee Agreement	AA0340-0344	4

Index: rule..seem

rule 43:21,24	S	81:16,20 83:7	85:14 86:9	scheduling
44:11 69:3		84:21 85:11	89:15 90:2	48:13,16
73:5,14,18,24		89:8,9 90:18	91:17,22 92:9	70:17 109:7,
76:3 78:5	Sacramento	92:25 93:2	94:2,4 97:2	15
86:15 87:3	119:13	96:25 113:5	100:4,12	
88:8,13,14,	110110	117:6,15	102:6,10	scheme 51:4
20,21,23	Acres de la constante de la co		103:4 111:1	113:13
90:13 99:7	sacrosanct	sanctions	117:22	110.15
112:9 122:24,	101:21	119:16	122:18	2.20
25 128:6		110.10	124:21 129:7	scholar 83:19
	said 12:24	43.53.67		4-00
ruled 41:19	14:14 29:18	sat 106:7	saying 15:19,	seated 3:4
69:17 106:10	30:6 43:9		20 17:13 23:9	40:5 104:24
126:11	45:10,18	satisfaction	25:2,4 27:11,	40.5 104.24
(23.1)	49:22 50:3	124:10	23 28:20	A Parente
V- 42/72	60:2 62:16,21	1211.0	31:11 49:14	second 11:8
rules 41:22	65:19 70:11.	- 1.3.44 X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	51:23 75:4	46:7 80:4
43:2,13 44:24	25 78:5 79:21	satisfied 48:3	76:22 79:2	7-7-2
45:3,15 46:1	81:13,15	98:22	85:13 92:2	section 65:11
88:9 102:14	85:11 86:5		94:20 100:16	95:6
115:2,7	87:11 93:6,20	satisfies 99:6	109:22	00.0
128:10,11	105:7 108:21	Cationica 50.5	120:12	O.N.
	109:4 110:19		120.12	secure 68:8,
ruling 3:19	111:21 114:7	saved 55:4	27 / 20 / 20 / 20 / 20 / 20 / 20 / 20 /	13
4:9 39:7,8	124:1 126:24		says 6:10	
54:23 71:10,	127:5	saw 13:18	20:1 24:5	security 5:21
11 106:23	1,41.42	16:5 108:12	30:24 33:20	9:8 11:9 35:4
126:5,23		10.0 100.12	40:23 41:13	110:1
129:1	same 7:24	- Treakles	44:3 47:7	110.7
120.1	16:10 17:14,	say 7:11 17:2,	60:11 77:14	100
	16,19 24:22	19 19:14	78:10 79:8	seek 128:8,23
run 39:3 71:9	25:11,23	26:15 39:19	82:7,12 84:8,	
88:22 94:11	26:12,14	45:21,22 49:3	13 85:20	seeking
	34:16 45:9	52:6,15	86:7,11 88:8	27:21 30:4
running	47:13 55:9	55:13,15 56:7	93:15,16 95:2	54:4 64:14
32:25 38:2	61:18 68:8	58:22 59:8	96:13 97:10,	109:13 120:9
02.20 00.2	69:14 72:17	68:6 71:7	21 98:14,19	129:4
	73:10 74:6,9	73:22 76:4	99:13,14	140.0
RYAN 2:4	75:18,20	77:6,8 80:12	103:21 111:8	C 24 45 2
	76:21 77:2	81:3 82:9,11,	114:22	seem 5:18
	79:7,11,20	13,14 83:13	116:22	16:9 34:23
	80:3,24	84:1,11,16	120:21	90:24

Index: seems..single

seems 4:22 124:8,11	26:10 64:7,8 65:6 66:1,15, 22 67:19 69:9	severe 89:4 90:1	107:17 115:9, 18 123:6 129:9	Silver 35:19 similar 16:9
seen 13:1 81:24 105:13	110:12,13,20 113:1	shift 23:19 28:5	shouldn't 21:20 26:18	61:6 80:16 93:22 98:17
selection 65:23 94:16,	Serene 2:12	shifted 24:19	32:15 55:11 81:16 85:3	similarly 20:12
17 97:3	serve 70:11, 13 87:10,22	shifting 23:19	show 93:8	simple 10:2
send 58:9	served 43:22 72:25 74:10	shoes 11:8	showed 9:4, 18 28:23	29:6 72:15 115:4
Senet 2:17	81:13,18 82:4 87:24 88:2	shoots 76:12	shown 88:16	simplest 42:23
senior 29:11 33:19,22 60:17 64:21	114:11	shopping 71:8 110:8,24	94:2	simplify
	service 74:11	115:10	sic 48:22	40:12
sense 19:5 52:9 89:10 102:4 111:23 113:14,15	services 3:9 14:15	short 10:2 11:11 31:18 67:15 72:2	side 10:10 27:22 41:15 59:19 81:19	simply 5:5 27:3 43:1 46:5,14 48:7
120:25 121:2 124:2	set 24:5,15 47:11,19 70:5 71:23 79:7	shortly 25:13, 15 66:1	108:4 109:20 129:15	51:1,21 52:8 53:4 72:21 73:10 84:7
sensitive 5:24	119:22 sets 46:12	should 3:6 18:14,21	side's 6:12	88:23 89:4 90:2 99:18 102:14
sent 62:13 74:18	setting 23:20	19:18 25:18 31:12 39:9	signature 126:1	109:22 111:17 112:2
separate	54:18 56:11 70:18 100:3	43:10 45:2 47:24 48:4 50:4 55:10	signed 3:10 21:2 48:15	121:3,8,22 122:9
46:10,19,22, 23 53:13 75:4	101:5,12	56:20 57:13 58:22 59:5	130:8	since 104:8 122:4 124:2
81:6 82:7 129:9	several 42:20 65:1 67:14 70:6 85:1	61:19 68:5 74:5 81:5 87:3,4 89:2	significant 5:19 6:3	single 30:18
September	87:9	102:21	signing 41:23	33:2 55:10

Index: sir..stand

67:5 76:5	22 87:23 115:1 118:7	56:22 59:23 123:13	50:23	4,11,16 113:8 114:15 118:8
sir 4:17	128:7	someone	sophisticated 8:3 10:8	122:22
sit 127:6	SNMARK 85:6	13:8 24:16 82:17 118:3	Sorry 119:21	specific 55:21 60:24 81:9 88:11,13
site 86:17	snow 38:3	something 12:25 21:19	sort 21:22	94:13 95:3 101:24
sitting 51:12 64:4 105:13	snowplow 38:2	25:19 27:1,13 29:4 32:8 34:24,25	26:25 31:21, 22 34:9 49:25 124:15	specifically 60:18 85:8
situation 62:1 82:3,5 109:21	solar 1:7 3:4, 16 5:4 10:7,8	38:17,23 39:12,19 42:18 45:13,	sound 89:20 126:2,3	106:8 112:4 spend 25:1
sketchy 81:1	23:7 34:22 35:7 40:7 49:18 57:19	14 60:1 73:3, 8,25 74:3 75:9,12 81:22	sounds 27:11	57:3,7 82:25
skill 7:23 8:11 11:25 36:13 37:10	59:4,9 108:6, 13 109:24 111:6 113:1 115:11	82:22,23 85:16 89:14, 20 101:16,18 102:8,23	126:7 southern 48:24	spending 6:25 89:23
skilled 14:4, 10	Solar's 4:1 7:25 89:25	103:2 107:21 123:14 126:16 129:20	sovereign 9:7,13 10:11 20:19	spent 5:18 9:25 12:2 18:5 19:22 20:8,12,22,23 21:4 22:23
skillful 23:11 24:7,11	sole 71:2	something's 94:11	speak 4:13	26:3,7,8 27:5 28:18
slop 8:4	solely 66:9		10:17 84:25	spoke 17:13
slow 54:25 55:2	solution 103:12 126:7	sometimes 16:8 18:13 31:4 38:5	speaking 17:25	staffing 12:6
small 33:12	somebody 10:17 12:12 13:6 16:21	somewhat 30:18 33:2	special 11:3 41:14,20,25 42:1,17 44:14	stake 35:15 36:24
Smith 43:6 44:22 45:10	somehow	59:2 soon 41:22	45:19,22 88:9 110:24 111:15 112:1,	stakes 7:5
52:25 86:21,	Somenow	S00ff 41;22	1 [1, 10 [12, 1,	stand 40:2

MOTION HEARING

- 12/11/2018

Index:	standalone.	.stuck

84:6 104:21	68:14 74:15	82;7,8,15	130:2,6	strategic 71:1
127:24 131:14	76:16 77:17, 21 78:6,8 82:24 89:19 91:14 92:22,	86:7 88:13 90:16 96:2,4, 24 97:8,9,12, 21 98:4,5	step 124:14	streamline 83:4
standalone 72:22 73:9 74:17 82:5 87:13 88:3	24 93:1,3,11, 18 98:16,24 102:16	101:11 111:22 112:3 117:1,21	Steven 1:15 33:23	street 11:10
07.13 00.3	103:24 115:14,21,23	119:9 123:16	sticking 28:4	stricken 48:4
standard 24:6 33:4 34:9,12, 14 45:12	118:24 119:9, 10,16,19,25 120:13,22,24	statutes 13:16 97:5	still 33:2 38:6 46:18 51:20	strict 45:8
standing 7:22	121:23	statutory	66:8 107:7 117:4 122:17	strictly 17:24
36:13 73:11	stated 66:17	41:10 55:22 95:25 124:5	123:3,4	strike 3:17
stands 74:2	statement 9:17 21:21	stay 3:18 40:8 47:22 48:7,8	stipulate 65:15	4:2 40:7 45:1 2 72:7,9,12 87:19 88:6
start 23:9 25:13 111:19 118:12	statements 16:9 22:1,7	49:25 51:10, 16 54;9 56:8 60:6 61:19 69:11 70:10	stipulated 3:8 75:1	89:23 91:3 111:18 118:12 124:23
started 71:3 95:24	states 10:13 33:18 43:16 77:7 98:15	71:5,18,22 72:11 76:14 78:25 99:18,	stipulation 3:10 39:8 130:8	strip 89:6
starving 53:21	119:14 statewide	21 100:25 101:6,7,17 106:21 109:16 122:9,	stop 13:7 91:25	strong 46:8, 25 52:5,21 61:7 76:4
state 1:5 12:17 13:10 35:10 36:16 45:8 47:7,16	35:21 status 26:13,	16 124:24 128:9,11,15 129:2	stopped 108:13	strongly 20:8 21:16 52:15
48:22,25 50:5,11,12	-17	stayed 50:1 56:16 78:23	stops 6:23	struck 44:9
52:5,9,16,17, 18 53:5 55:13	statute 6:6,9 8:22 13:8,9 23:20,21	88:11 125:9	story 10:2	struggling 89:16
59:6 60:8,17 61:10 66:19	40:23 41:12, 13 62:20 81:9	staying 61:9 100:25 101:9	straight 32:2	stuck 23:24

Index: stuff..taken

51:25	substantial 7:16,17 36:8	113:5	7:18 17:22 83:9	survived 15:8
stuff 20:20	109:1	sult 114:23	supported	suspect 27:12 108:15
styled 72:14 80:11	substantially 25:5,6,22 47:13	Suite 2:5,13, 18	7:15	sympathetic 56:20 58:23
sub 18:2 116:19	subversion	suits 84:9	80:7	synthesize
277.12	110:4	sum 26:23	suppose 4:13 37:3 50:15	9:23
subcontractor s 54:6	subvert 115:24	summary 6:18	supposed	T
subject 7:14 37:4 57:20 91:11 106:5 119:3 129:6	subverted 47:24 115:18	summoned 43:20	22:20 40:20 113:4 supreme 15:5	table 14:9 32:6 108:4 109:21
submit 21:20 22:15 23:1 38:23 95:1 108:2	such 12:19 30:1 43:18 44:5,20 66:20 97:13 107:5	summons 72:25 81:14, 18 82:4	43:7,10,15,23 80:15 81:8 85:2,7,8 86:5 94:25 101:18 114:6,17	take 26:22 39:11 49:20, 23 50:6 53:20 54:8,18,19
submitted	sued 120:4	sums 39:21	128:7 129:11	59:10 68:13 78:1 84:24
12:24 14:20 15:11 18:1	sufficiency 68:10	super 78:19	sur-reply 21:23	86:12 89:17 90:17 91:22 98:11 102:14
21:1 39:1,21 48:12 108:15 109:9	sufficient 68:2 114:2	superiors 37:14 92:10	surety 78:21 96:14,21 106:20 125:7,	104:12,13 105:14 108:8 111:1 113:11
subsection 5:1 66:23 79:8,14 96:3, 10 97:14	suggest 11:15 13:10 24:17	supplemental 9:17 20:19 21:21 39:2 116:7,9	15,16 surprise 21:20	122:5,14,18 123:16 126:23 128:19
substance 73:15	suggested 127:19	suppliers 54:6 63:14	surprised 5:7	taken 40:4 48:5 75:12 97:25 104:22
	suggests	support 4:23	survive 123:9	121:21

Index: takes..through

takes 69:9 88:23	126:10	28:11 35:11 38:18 46:3	13:25 64:19	thinking 11:9, 10 23:23
4-14 404.0	technically	61:5 70:21 74:12 75:12	theory 121:24	30:25 31:6,21 57:12 95:12
taking 101:3 102:7 105:10	20:5 60:4	102:16 112:20	therefore	100 mg 100 mg
4-U- 40-0 4E	teed 94;10	113:22 118:1,	19:14 75:6	thinks 84:16
talk 12:3,15 14:18 24:9,13 80:6 86:21 91:7 105:1	telephone 17:13	7 119:3 122:6 125:14 129:5	82:12 87:19 88:18 97:23 98:6 124:5	third-party 43:19,21,22 44:1
31.7 103.1		their 5:13 7:2	the second	44.1
6 00 D 000	telling 32:19	8:17 9:14,16	thereupon	
talked 9:9	91:23	11:1,2 12:1,	131:18	thought
128:25	7.72.0	15,21 14:3	Acres 1	29:12 30:25
	tempered	18:23 19:4,	thing 10:22	119:22
talking 5:19	7:14	18,23 21:1, 11,22 24:24	12:20 16:10,	
9:19 14:19	7.19	26:2,18,19	11 19:25	thought-
18:10 24:10		27:15,24	24:22 34:16	about 22:6
30:15 38:13	ten 110:21	28:16 30:1,5,	44:25 51:8	
84:3 87:14	113:2	9 43:1 44:17	59:13,14	three 35:24
95:6 105:17		47:6,24 52:25	74:25 83:8	52:5,14 53:13
106:11	term 24:2	54:18 55:6	84:23 90:5,21	66:11 68:22
		59:19 63:10,	92:25 100:12	69:6,25 75:16
task 26:3	terminated	11,17,18,20,	104:8,18	76:4 77:10
	41:25 61:16	24 65:3 71:7	107:20 116:1 123:23 128:3	85:22,25
tasks 26:5	41.25 01.10	72:7 73:1,9,	129:17,19	86:19 90:9
LUGNG ZO.D	V. 27047 3775	13,21 74:8	129.17,19	91:7,12,25
	terminates	76:13 77:8	Company of the last	94:9 96:25
teach 45:18	41:21	79:18 83:9	things 3:13	100:13 102:9
	Charles and Aller	84:4,5 85:5,	13:1 17:20	103:14
team 14:9	terms 123:21	19 91:9,20	19:21 20:3,21	105:17,20,25
23:10		94:6 101:9,19	26:13,18 29:8	106:10,15,22,
	terrific 8:1	102:25	31:24 37:7 50:2 55:1	23 107:6 118:17
teamwork	terrine s. i	110:18,21	82:16 83:3	120:19
16:7		115:17,22 116:14 117:2,	99:5 103:19	124:24 125:8
18.00	than 12:12,18	14 120:1	108:8 112:3	124.24 120.0
	13:10 15:15	124:22,23	121:21	Was all and
technical	16:13,14	127.22,20	123:16	through
89:11,12	19:25 20:10 23:17 24:19		125:19	13:19 30:5
	23,17 24,19	themselves		31:16 36:9
technicality	4			

Index: throw..trying

38:25 39:1 44:16 47:25	67:6,12,25 69:3 72:3	115:9	town 2:18 129:20	tricked 108:24
54:8 57:4,5,7 71:19 73:16 111:10 115:18	75:8,22 76:11 84:5 85:16 86:14 87:17 88:1 89:23	together 11:5 16:7 32:23 82:16 88:18	traffic 23:24	trickery 120:21
throw 85:13 122:7	94:6 100:17 107:13 108:6, 7 116:8 118:16	90:24 123:17 token 7:24	trained 14:4, 10	tried 31:17 76:20 80:23 94:3
throws 51:18	129:14,22 130:22 131:10,16	told 117:22	training 7:21 36:12	tries 123:10,
thwart 101:17	timeframe	Tonopah 1:7 3:4,16 4:1 5:4	transaction 55:10 69:14	16
tie 72:1	54:18 68:24 70:18 101:15	7:24 10:7 23:7 34:22 35:7 40:7	transfer 29:2	true 20:6 29:9 40:22,23 60:4 62:24
tied 28:8 tiered 54:6	timely 38:8 88:2	49:18 57:19 59:4,9 89:25 108:6,13	transferred 28:21,25	truly 89:1 123:12
time 4:20 6:3	times 31:14 67:12,15,16	109:24 111:6 113:1 115:11	travel 26:11	truncate
8:10 9:10,22, 25 11:25 12:2 13:14 15:14	68:18 124:3	took 72:16 73:16 80:16	treat 93:7	54:19 trust 22:17
17:23 18:4,5, 7,17,18,23	title 43:9 111:5,13	93:1 Tooley 80:14	treatise 83:12 85:3	119:5
19:5 20:9,14, 18,23 21:4 25:5,22 26:3, 5,6,8,15 27:2, 5,16,17,23	titled 67:3 today 3:11,14	topnotch 35:7,17 36:18	treatises 83:23	try 6:23 18:25 19:18 40:12 46:2,3 59:22 78:7 83:23
28:1,5,18 29:4,20 31:18,23	5:14,17 22:17,25 29:21 38:15	total 5:18 109:6	trial 6:19 15:6,9 21:13 34:24 43:11	104:19 110:23
34:13 37:10, 11,22 38:10, 11 39:23 41:5	39:8 42:21 45:6 57:14 59:23 63:15, 16 86:9 91:16	totality 30:17	44:22 54:17 56:11 100:3 101:5,12,14	trying 23:15 28:5 38:4 46:6 56:17
57:7,10 61:15 62:14 63:9	109:19 110:7	toward 32:16	tribal 76:8	64:5 71:2,9 77:18 78:12

Index: TSE..urge

81:3 83:22 87:12 91:25	two 15:15 17:9 33:12	38:9 41:8,15	75:11,23	unheard 13:3
97:4 103:10	62:17 64:2	43:2,13,20 44:10,18,22	83:21 90:4, 14,25 91:4	
108:1 109:13,	68:4 70:2,7	45:11,16	102:20	Union 94:24
17 110:4,6	71:13,14	46:25 47:22	107:24	
116:2 120:11	77:11 92:19	48:13,15	111:19	United 10:13
	94:13 110:13	49:16 52:25	125:20	119:14
TSE 22:11	112:3 120:15	53:2,4 56:14	127:12	
26:11 57:25	121:18 123:16	60:24 62:20 73:5,14,18		unius 45:17
58:16 62:1,24	123.10	79:7 85:14	understandin	
63:7,22 64:2,		87:3 88:7,16	g 32:18 65:10,	unjust 36:6
4,14 65:12,	two-year	95:13 96:1,9	21 98:7	42:16
14,18 66:1,5,	54:18 101:10	97:9,12,14	100:22	
15,25 67:6,7, 10,22,24		99:7 101:4,5,	102:12	unless 74:20
68:15 69:19,	type 24:16	10 102:13,18		77:15 98:21
21 70:10	28:11 32:24	108:21	understands	77.10 30.21
72:25 79:25	45:9,25	111:21 117:1,	36:15 80:9	
82:4 84:22	117:11 121:2	18,21 118:2,7		unlike 87:23
86:22 94:18		121:10 123:6	Understood	
96:11,23	types 44:7		59:21 121:15	unreasonable
97:16	73:17 115:19	under-billing		6:25 23:13
		13:22	undertake	33:3,7
TSE's 54:2	typical 35:12		77:25	
65:7 66:4	37:5	under-		unreasonably
		collateralized	undoubtedly	6:24
TUESDAY	U	68:3	36:17	
1:19 3:1			323.17	until 25:13
100		underlying	unenforceabl	40:25 50:24
turn 96:2	U.S. 19:9 61:5	4:22 29:17	e 97:22,23	72:18 98:21
105:3 106:14,	0.0. 10.0 01.0	105:24	e 31.22,23	110:21
21 107:13	C.106-3-23-68-7	106:14 107:7	1 -212 - 22 22 .	128:10,16
119:23	ultimately 30:3 31:16,25	125:17	unfair 22:16	131:6
	32:9,22 37:13			
turned 109:2	50:3 65:1,19	understand	unfolded	upwards
turned 105.2	00.0 00.1110	17:11 27:9	105:14	36:21
	under E.4	32:2,14 33:5	1.0	
Turner 2:17	under 5:1 6:16 23:19	35:1 40:6	unfortunately	urge 111:17
	28:6 30:11	49:14,15	59:12	118:6
TV 58:25	20.0 00.11	56:18,22		

Index: use..whether

use 80:3	violate 34:12	Wanker 64:1	wasting 75:7	Wells 19:7
used 45:18 55:1 105:6, 21,22 113:16	violates 97:4, 9	want 3:15 23:9 27:16 30:23 32:1,11	watching 105:13	went 15:1,5,6 9 20:17 31:3 32:16 37:21
uses 24:2	violation 97:20 105:19	34:21 35:2 38:22 42:21 47:6 54:3,9, 12,21,22,24	way 4:8 8:16 16:19 21:22 26:9 27:9,24	49:12 63:11 68:22 71:19 86:4 93:1
usually 35:12	virtually 17:2	55:14 56:7 57:15 60:15	40:11 42:8,23 47:15 50:10, 12 52:23 56:5	whack 19:15
V	vitally 6:4	62:17 65:20 71:7,13,18 76:2,10 78:19	58:17,19 59:1,8,17	what-have- you 61:17
valid 78:14	vitiate 121:24	79:11 92:9 102:4 105:16	60:2 63:11 65:3,14 70:16 74:13 75:3	whatever
80;8	void 4:7 8:20 30:15 97:22,	121;4 122;5,7 123;9 124;15,	82:10 83:24 89:10,13	5:10 30:24 50:1 71:1
value 22:22, 25 100:21	23 98:2	19,20 126:19, 20 131:12	90:20 91:1 98:22,23	115:13 117:19
vastly 7:4,5	voluntarily 47:5 62:23 63:5 113:23	wanted 26:20 74:15 79:3 91:4 92:8	100:22 105:11,23 106:12,20 112:12 113:3,	131:10 whatsoever
Vegas 2:6,19	vulnerable	wanting 63:2	9,15 115:8 117:6 123:18	7:4
venue 46:12, 21	6:1,2	14.0	124:8 127:16	Wheeler 2:4
versus 3:5	W	wants 13:24 27:15 48:6 82:16 122:13	weeds 16:1	whereas 101:10
14:17 19:7 52:25 113:1	wait 78:3	123:22	week 34:24 62:8 128:14	wherein
viable 91:5	87:11 107:5 122:16	war 31:8,14, 17	weekend	80:19
view 13:18	waited 87:9	waste 76:10	49:12	wherever 65:17
18:9,20 22:23	waive 97:11	wasted	Weil 2:23	whether
Village 2:23	waived 98:6	100:17	Weinberg 2:4	12:12 18:11,

Index: while..Zimbelman

25 29:25 46:14 48:24	wind 105:9	121:14 123:20	working 17:17,22 20:2	114:20
63:3 64:22	withdraw			
70:23 99:11	63:10	wording	works 16:24	Y
100:10 116:9	307.0	124:15	116:18	1 7 7
while 37:21	withdrew			year 25:10
49:24 50:15	64:2 69:6	words 19:13,	World 31:14	62:5
51:21 52:21	80:2	24 97:6		
59:5 114:16	The second		worried 18:21	years 13:23,
117:4	within 41:1	work 8:9 9:1	53:19	24 15:16 36:3
	59:10 68:24	11:13 12:1,22		49:6 54:8
whim 82:22	72:17 79:19	13:7 14:1	wrapped	58:5 64:10
	80:1,24	16:7,8,19,23	32:23	76:8 87:9
	82:10,18	18:11 24:17	8-02	116:16
whole 3:12 9:2 50:21	89:7,21 90:5,	26:19 27:17		
78:4 95:22	18 92:7 96:17 98:3,15	31:19 32:9, 16,17,22,25	writ 128:8,10, 13,16	yet 18:16
113:13	101:13,15	33:1 34:13,16	13,10	38:22 48:4
121:20,24	108:22	35:11,14	State Street	70:5 106:10
10.114141	128:14	36:19 37:5,9,	writable	119:8
		11,12,21 51:3	115:5	have been all
widely 13:6		57:18 59:2		yourself 11:7
	without 30:25 35:10 42:12,	62:2 68:5	write 114:18,	53:24
will 12:21	14 63:5 69:1	75:21 78:21	19	
18:1 40:2	99:12 129:14	84:21 96:18		z
41:24,25 48:6	00.12 120.14	105:8 108:21	writing 38:18,	
53:11,21 57:2	MEAN II	130:24	23	
58:17,18	Wittbrodt 2:17			Zimbelman
60:21 61:1,17 64:10 70:23	2.17	workable	written 123:2	2:9 3:20,24
71:14,25	Water of the	126:7	129:9	4:15,18,19
76:14 77:19,	won 12:9,10		120.0	5:11 14:16,
20 91:1,20		worked 8:25	22.42	19,24 15:1
94:5,7 95:4	wondering	17:8,18 36:3	wrong 22:16	17:7,12 23:3,
98:20 99:3,15	38:13 118:15	61:14,15 80:5	49:10,15 81:5	14 33:11,12,
100:5 101:13	Age of the Control	6360-7075-27-15	85:1,16,17	15 38:20,24
104:21 117:9,	word 62:24	worked-on		39:13,18,25
11,20 122:15	88:25 102:4	22:5	wrongfully	49:8 125:10,
125:1,9,17	105:22	22.0	108:16	13,22 127:15
128:12	113:16			130:16,20
131:14	Vising.	workers 6:4	wrote 13:7	

28

BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation,

Third-Party Plaintiff,

vs.

COBRA THERMOSOLAR PLANTS, INC., a Nevada corporation; AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE COMPANY, a surety; BOE BONDING COMPANIES I through X; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X, inclusive,

Third-Party Defendants.

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that an Order Granting Brahma's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS 108.2275(6)(C) was filed on January 8, 2019, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit1.

AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NRS 239B.030

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

Dated this ____ day of January, 2019.

PEEL BRIMLEY LLP

RICHARD L. PEEL, ESQ. (4359) ERIC ZIMBELMAN, ESQ. (9863) CARY B. DOMINA, ESQ. (10567) RONALD J. COX, ESQ. (12723) 3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200 Henderson, Nevada 89074-6571 Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc.

PEEL BRIMLEY LLP 3333 E. SERENE AVENUE, STE. 200 HENDERSON, NEVADA 89074 (702) 990-7272 * FAX (702) 990-7273

below:

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursu	ant to Nev. R. Civ. P. 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of PEEL BRIMLEY LLP
and that on th	is May of December 2018, I caused the above and foregoing document entitled
NOTICE OF	ENTRY OF ORDER to be served as follows:
	by placing same to be deposited for mailing in the United States Mail, in a sealed envelope upon which first class postage was prepaid in Las Vegas, Nevada; and/or
	Wiznet, the Court's electronic filing system;
	pursuant to EDCR 7.26, to be sent via facsimile;
	to be hand-delivered; and/or
	other – electronic mail
to the party(ie	es) and/or attorney(s) listed below at the address and/or facsimile number indicated

D. Lee Roberts, Jr., Esq.
Colby L. Balkenbush, Esq.
WEINBERG, WHEELER, HUDGINS
GUNN & DIAL, LLC
6385 S. Rainbow Blvd., Suite 400
Las Vegas, NV 89118
lroberts@wwhgd.com
cbalkenbush@wwhgd.com
Attorneys for Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC

Geoffrey Crisp, Esq.
WEIL & DRAGE
2500 Anthem Village Drive
Henderson, NV 89052
gcrisp@weildrage.com
Attorneys for Cobra Thermosolar Plants,
Inc.

An Employee of Peel Brimley LLP

EXHIBIT 1

ORIGINAL

FILED 1 ORDR FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT RICHARD L. PEEL, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 4359 ERIC B. ZIMBELMAN, ESQ. JAN 08 2019 Nevada Bar No. 9407 RONALD J. COX, ESQ. Mye County Clerk 4 Nevada Bar No. 12723 PEEL BRIMLEY LLP Deputy 5 3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200 lenderson, Nevada 89074-6571 Telephone: (702) 990-7272 Facsimile: (702) 990-7273 rpeel@peelbrimley.com zimbelman@peelbrimley.com 8 cox@peelbrimley.com Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc. 10 FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT NYE COUNTY, NEVADA 11 PEEL BRIMLEY LLP 3333 E. SERENE AVENUE, STE. 200 HENDERSON, NEVADA 89074 (702) 990-7272 4 FAX (702) 990-7273 TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY, LLC, a Delaware CASE NO. : CV 39348 12 limited liability company, DEPT. NO.: 2 13 Plaintiff. ORDER GRANTING BRAHMA'S 14 MOTION FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS PURSUANT TO NRS 15 BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation, 108.2275(6)(C) 16 Defendant. 17 This matter came on for hearing December 11, 2018 (the "Hearing") before the Honorable Senior Judge Steven Elliott on the Motion For Attorney's Fees And Costs Pursuant To 18 NRS 108.2275(6)(c) ("Fee Motion") filed by BRAHMA GROUP, INC. ("Brahma"). Eric B. 19 Zimbelman, Esq. of PEEL BRIMLEY LLP appeared on behalf of Brahma. D. Lee Roberts, 20 Esq. of WEINBERG, WHEELER, HUDGINS, GUNN & DIAL, LLC appeared on behalf of 21 Plaintiff TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY, LLC ("TSE"). 22 The Court having considered all the pleadings and papers on file, and having heard 23 argument of counsel, hereby ORDERS as follows, having rendered its oral decision from the 24 25 bench on December 11, 2018: I. STATUTORY BASIS FOR AWARD OF FEES AND COSTS. 26 On October 17, 2018, this Court signed an Order Denying TSE's Motion to Expunge 27 28 ¹ The Order Denying the Underlying Motion was entered by the Clerk on October 29, 2018.

Page 1 of 5

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Brahma's mechanic's lien pursuant to NRS 108.2275 ("Underlying Motion"). As part of the Order Denying the Underlying Motion, the Court concluded that Brahma's Notice of Lien is not frivolous nor was it made without reasonable cause. NRS 108.2275(6)(c) states in relevant part:

- If, after a hearing on the matter, the court determines that: (6)
- The notice of lien is not frivolous and was made with reasonable (c) cause...the court shall make an order awarding costs and reasonable attorney's fees to the lien claimant for defending the motion.

Accordingly, once the Court determines that a lien is not frivolous or excessive and made with reasonable cause, an award of attorneys' fees is mandatory. In Nevada, the method upon which a reasonable fee is determined is subject to the discretion of the court, which is tempered only by reason and fairness. Shuette v. Beazer Homes Holdings Corp., 121 Nev. 837, 864-65, 124 P.3d 530, 548-49 (2005).

BRAHMA'S APPLICATION FOR AWARD OF FEES AND COSTS.

Pursuant to NRS 108.2275(6)(c), Brahma applied to the Court by way of the Fee Motion for an award of \$77,937.50 in attorney's fees and \$479.84 in costs plus additional sums, discussed below, for work performed on the Reply, at oral argument on the Fee Motion and in preparation of this Order. In support of its Fee Motion, Brahma submitted the Declaration of Richard L. Peel, Esq. and supporting documentation including invoicing and time records relating to Peel Brimley LLP's work performed on Brahma's behalf in defending the Underlying Motion. Brahma's motion addressed the factors identified in Brunzell v. Golden Gate Nat'l Bank, 85 Nev. 345, 349, 455 P.2d 31 (1969) that the District Court is required to consider in reviewing any application for reasonable attorney's fees ("the Brunzell Factors"). See Barney v. Mt. Rose Heating & Air Conditioning, 124 Nev. 821, 829, 192 P.3d 730, 736 (2008).2

² The Brunzell factors are:

¹⁾ The advocate's qualities, including ability, training, education, experience, professional standing, and

The character of the work, including its difficulty, intricacy, importance, as well as the time and skill required, the responsibility imposed, and the prominence and character of the parties when affecting the importance of the litigation;

³⁾ The work performed, including the skill, time, and attention given to the work; and

3333 E. SERENE AVENUE, STE. 200 HENDERSON, NEVADA 89074 702) 990-7272 + FAX (702) 990-7273 7 8

TSE opposed the Fee Motion on multiple grounds and asserted that the fees requested were excessive for work performed in response to a "single motion." [TSE Opposition p. 2]. Among other things, TSE contends that (i) PB's rates are higher than the "prevailing rate," (ii) PB engaged in "block billing," and (iii) PB "overstaffed" the work on the Underlying Motion and its invoices contain duplicative work or billings. On Reply, Brahma argued, among other things, that (i) the Underlying Motion was an existential threat to Brahma's lien rights – its sole source of security³ for the \$12,859,577.74 Brahma claims to be owed for its work on TSE's Crescent Dunes Solar Energy Project (the "Project"),⁴ (ii) involved multiple complex issues, and (iii) the work successfully performed by Brahma's attorneys was reasonable and necessary under the circumstances.

Having received and reviewed the Fee Motion, TSE's Opposition, Brahma's Reply, having heard and considered oral argument counsel at hearing on December 11, 2018, and having considered the *Brunzell* Factors, the Court makes the following findings and conclusions:

III. FINDINGS.

In general, and while the attorney hours expended and resulting amount sought by way of the Fee Motion are substantial, the hour and amounts are reasonable and not excessive in light of (i) the size and importance of Brahma's lien, (ii) the complex and varied issues presented to the Court, (iii) the high quality counsel on both sides of the case, (iv) higher quality work product than seen in ordinary cases and (v) the clients' reasonable expectations for superior intellectual ability and work product on both sides. In addition, the Court is satisfied that the rates charged by Brahma's counsel, including associate and partner rates, are reasonable and justified.

⁴⁾ The result—whether the attorney was successful and what benefits were derived. See Brunzell, 85 Nev. at 349; Barney v Mt. Rose Heating & Air Conditioning, 124 Nev. at 829.

³ A mechanic's lien is a statutory creature established to help ensure payment of work, materials and/or equipment provided for the construction or improvements on real property (In re Fontainebleau Las Vegas Holdings, 289 p.3D 1199, 1210 (Nev. 2012).

⁴ Underlying Nevada's public policy of securing payment to contractors by way of mechanics' items is that "contractors are generally in a vulnerable position because they extend large blocks of credit; invest significant time, labor, and materials into a project; and have any number of workers vitally depend upon them for eventual payment." Id.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

As to the Brunzell Factors, the Court finds, without limitation, as follows:

- Advocate's Qualities: Brahma's counsel are highly experienced, knowledgeable and competent, especially relating to the Nevada Mechanics' Lien Statute and construction law;
- 2. Character of the Work: Brahma's lien claim of nearly \$13 million is substantial and the Underlying Motion presented big stakes. In addition, the Court enjoyed the benefit of high-quality briefing and argument on atypical, challenging and varied subject matter;
- 3. The Work Performed: The Underlying Motion presented the Court with a lot to consider; and
- 4. The Result: The arguments presented by Brahma's attorneys were persuasive to the Court and the Court ruled in favor of Brahma on the Underlying Motion.

III. CONCLUSION.

Based on the foregoing, and having considered the Brunzell Factors, the Court concludes that the time expended and amounts incurred by Brahma's counsel in defending the Underlying Motion were reasonable and appropriate and, pursuant to NRS 108.2275(6)(c), Brahma is awarded reasonable attorneys fees and costs as follows:

- As presented by way of the Declaration of Richard L. Peel, Esq., for fees and costs incurred in defending the Underlying Motion and submitting the Fee Motion the sum of \$78,417.34; and
- 2. As agreed by the parties by a separate Stipulation attached hereto as Exhibit A, for fees incurred in preparing Brahma's Reply to TSE's Opposition to the Fee Motion, for appearance of counsel at oral argument and preparation of this Order, the additional sum of \$10,000.00.

111

111

111

111

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Brahma's Motion For Attorney's Fees And Costs Pursuant To NRS 108.2275(6)(c) is GRANTED and Brahma is awarded the sum of \$88,417.34 which shall be due and payable by TSE within ten (10) days of a notice of entry of this order being filed.

Dated this _____ day December 2018.

Senior Judge Steven Elliott

Submitted by:

PEEL BRIMLEY LLP

RICHARD L. PEEL, ESQ. (NV Bar No. 4359) ERIC B. ZIMBELMAN, ESQ. (NV Bar No. 9407) RONALD J. COX, ESQ. (NV Bar No. 12723)

3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200

Henderson, Nevada 89074-6571

Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc.

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Brahma's Motion For Attorney's Fees And Costs Pursuant To NRS 108.2275(6)(c) is GRANTED and Brahma is awarded the sum of \$88,417.34 which shall be due and payable by TSE within ten (10) days of a notice of entry of this order being filed.

Dated this _____ day December 2018.

Senior Judge Steven Elliott

Submitted by:

PEEL BRIMLEY LLP

RICHARD I PEEL, ESQ. (NV Bar No. 4359) ERIC B. ZIMBELMAN, ESQ. (NV Bar No. 9407) RONALD J. COX, ESQ. (NV Bar No. 12723) 3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200

Henderson, Nevada 89074-6571 Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc.

EXHIBIT A

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1	ORDR
2	RICHARD L. PEEL, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 4359
3	ERIC B. ZIMBELMAN, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 9407
	RONALD J. COX, ESQ.
4	Nevada Bar No. 12723 PEEL BRIMLEY LLP
5	3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 20
6	Henderson, Nevada 89074-6571 Felephone: (702) 990-7272
7	Facsimile: (702) 990-7273
	peel@peelbrimley.com ezimbelman@peelbrimley.com
8	rcox@peelbrimley.com
9	Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc.
0	FIF
1	
2	TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY, I imited liability company,

TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT NYE COUNTY, NEVADA

LLC, a Delaware

CASE NO. : CV 39348 DEPT. NO. : 2

Plaintiff,

STIPULATION REGARDING AMOUNT OF ADDITIONAL FEES WARDED TO BRAHMA

BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation,

Defendant.

Defendant BRAHMA GROUP, INC. ("Brahma") and Plaintiff TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY, LLC ("TSE") by and through their respective counsel stipulate and agree as follows:

WHEREAS, on October 29, 2018, the Court entered an Order Denying Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's Motion to Expunge Brahma Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's Lien ("Underlying Order");

WHEREAS, Brahma thereafter filed a Motion for Order Granting Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS 108.2275(6)(c) ("Fee Motion");

WHEREAS, at a hearing on December 11, 2018 the Court orally ruled that Brahma was entitled to an award of fees and costs of \$78,417.34 plus additional fees incurred for appearance of counsel at oral argument and preparation of the Order ("Additional Fees") and directed counsel for Brahma to submit a declaration in support of such Additional Fees; and

WHEREAS, the Parties have stipulated and agreed that the amount of the Additional

Fees shall be \$10,000.00 (Ten Thousand U.S. Dollars);

Now therefore,

IT IS STIPULATED AND AGREED that Brahma shall be awarded additional fees incurred for appearance of counsel at oral argument and preparation of the Order Granting Motion for Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS 108.2275(6)(c) in the amount of \$10,000.00 (Ten Thousand U.S. Dollars) such that the total amount of fees and costs awarded to Brahma is and shall be a total of \$88,417.34 (Eighty Eight Thousand Four Hundred Seventeen U.S. Dollars and Thirty-Four Cents).

This stipulation is to the amount of additional fees in light of the court's ruling on entitlement. TSE reserves its right to appeal the decision on expungment and entitlement to fees.

IT IS SO STIPULATED this 27 day of December, 2018.

PEEL BRUMLEY LLP

Richard L. Peel, Esq. (4359)
Eric B. Zimbelman, Esq. (9407)
Cary B. Domina, Esq. (10567)
3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200
Henderson, NV 89074-6571
Telephone: (702) 990-7272
rpcel@peelbrimley.com
ezimbelman@peelbrimley.com
edomina@peelbrimley.com
Attorneys for Defendant Brahma Group,

WEINBERG, WHEELER, HUDGINS, GUNN & DIATE-LISC

D. Lee Roberts, Jr., Esq. (8877)
Colby L. Balkenbush, Esq. (13066)
Ryan T. Gormley, Esq. (13494)
6385 S. Rainbow Blvd., Suite 400
Las Vegas, NV 89118
Telephone: (702) 938-3838
lroberts@wwhgd.com
cbalkenbush@wwhgd.com
rgormley@wwhgd.com
Attorneys for Plaintiff Tonopah Solar Energy,
LLC

1	D. Lee Roberts, Jr., Esq.
2	Nevada Bar No. 8877
	lroberts@wwhgd.com
3	Colby L. Balkenbush, Esq.
	Nevada Bar No. 13066
4	cbalkenbush@wwhgd.com
	Ryan T. Gormley, Esq.
5	Nevada Bar No. 13494
	rgormley@wwhgd.com
6	WEINBERG, WHEELER, HUDGINS,
	Gunn & Dial, LLC
7	6385 South Rainbow Blvd., Suite 400
	Las Vegas, Nevada 89118
8	Telephone: (702) 938-3838
	Facsimile: (702) 938-3864
0	Attorneys for Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC
71	i ·

IN THE FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF NYE

¥ ¥ ,				
Movant,				
vs.				
BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation,				
Respondent.				
BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation,				
Counterclaimant,				
vs.				
TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY LLC, a Delaware limited liability company; BOE BONDING COMPANIES I through X; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X; and TOE TENANTS I through X, inclusive,				
Counterdefendant.				
BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation,				
Third-Party Plaintiff,				

TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY, LLC, a Delaware | Case No. CV 39348 limited liability company, | Consolidated with Consolidated with Case No. CV 39799 Dept. No. 2

TSE'S NOTICE OF APPEAL

Page 1 of 4

27

28

1 COBRA THERMOSOLAR PLANTS, INC., a Nevada corporation; AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE COMPANY, a surety; BOE 3 BONDING COMPANIES I through X; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X, inclusive. 5 Third-Party Defendants. 6 H&E EQUIPMENT SERVICES, INC., a Delaware corporation, 7 Plaintiff-In-Intervention, 8 VS. 9 BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation, 10 TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, COBRA THERMOSOLAR PLANTS, INC., a Nevada 11 corporation; AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE 12 COMPANY, a surety; BOE BONDING COMPANIES I through X; DOES I through X; 13 ROE CORPORATIONS I through X, and TOE TENANTS I through X, inclusive, 14 Defendants-In-Intervention. 15 16 BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation, 17 Plaintiff, 18 vs. 19 COBRA THERMOSOLAR PLANTS, INC., a Nevada corporation; AMERICAN HOME 20 ASSURANCE COMPANY, a surety; BOE BONDING COMPANIES I through X; DOES I 21 through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X, inclusive, 22 Defendants. 23 24 25

Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC ("TSE"), by and through its undersigned counsel, hereby files this Notice of Appeal. TSE appeals to the Supreme Court of Nevada the following orders entered by this Court in Case No. CV 39348:

Page 2 of 4

•	Order Denying Tonopal	n Solar Energy,	LLC's Motion to	Expunge Brahma Grou	up,
Inc.'s Mechan	nic's Lien, Notice of Entr	y served Noven	nber 1, 2018, attac	hed hereto as Exhibit	1.

Order Granting Brahma's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS 108.2275(6)(C), Notice of Entry served January 9, 2019, attached hereto as Exhibit 2.

DATED this 51 day of February 2019.

D. Lee Roberts, Jr., Esq. Colby L. Balkenbush, Esq. Ryan T. Gormley, Esq. WEINBERG, WHELER, HUDGINS,

GUNN & DIAL, LLC

6385 S. Rainbow Blvd., Suite 400

Las Vegas, NV 89118 Attorneys for Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC

WEINBERG WHEELER HUDGINS GUNN & DIAL

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 4th day of February 2019, a true and correct copy of the foregoing TSE'S NOTICE OF APPEAL was served by mailing a copy of the foregoing document via US Mail, to the following:

Richard L. Peel. Esq. Eric B. Zimbelman, Esq. Cary B. Domina, Esq. Ronald J. Cox, Esq. Peel Brimley, LLP 3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200 Henderson, Nevada 89074 Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc.

Richard E. Haskin, Esq.
Daniel M. Hansen, Esq.
Gibbs Giden Locher Turner
Senet & Wittbrodt LLP
1140 N. Town Center Drive, Suite 300
Las Vegas, Nevada 89144
Attorneys for H&E Equipment Services, Inc.

Geoffrey Crisp, Esq. Weil & Drage 2500 Anthem Village Drive Henderson, NV 89052 Attorneys for Cobra Thermosolar Plants, Inc.

An employee of Weinberg, Wheeler, Hudgins Gunn & Dial, LLC

Page 4 of 4

EXHIBIT 1

EXHIBIT 1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation, 2 Third-Party Plaintiff, 3 VS. 4 COBRA THERMOSOLAR PLANTS, 5 Nevada corporation; **AMERICAN** COMPANY, a surety; BOE ASSURANCE 6 BONDING COMPANIES I through X; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X, 7 inclusive, 8 Third-Party Defendants. 9 10 NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER 11 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that an Order Denying Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's Motion to 12 13 Expunge Brahma Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's Lien was filed on October 29, 2018 a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A. 14 **AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NRS 239B.030** 15 The undersigned does hereby affirm that the proceeding document does not contain the 16 social security number of any persons. 17 Dated this 2018. 18 19 20

PEEL BRIMLEY LLP

RICHARD L. PEEL, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 4359 ERIC ZIMBELMAN, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 9407 RONALD J. COX, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 12723

3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200 Henderson, Nevada 89074-6571

Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc.

Page 2 of 3

below:

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

and that on this /st day of October, 2018, I caused the above and foregoing document entitled

Pursuant to Nev. R. Civ. P. 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of PEEL BRIMLEY LLP

D. Lee Roberts, Jr., Esq.
Colby L. Balkenbush, Esq.
WEINBERG, WHEELER, HUDGINS
GUNN & DIAL, LLC
6385 S. Rainbow Blvd., Suite 400
Las Vegas, NV 89118
Iroberts@wwhgd.com
cbalkenbush@wwhgd.com
Attorneys for Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC

Geoffrey Crisp, Esq.
WEIL & DRAGE
2500 Anthem Village Drive
Henderson, NV 89052
gcrisp@weildrage.com
Attorneys for Cobra Thermosolar
Plants, Inc.

An Employee of Peel Brimley LLP

EXHIBIT A

Q. ESQ.
ESQ.
Suite 200
14-6571
72
73
y.com
roup, Inc.
- 19 · 5 · 17 ·

FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

OCT 29 2018

AMY DOWERS Deputy

FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

NYE COUNTY, NEVADA

TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

Plaintiff,

VS.

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation,

Defendant.

CASE NO. : CV 39348 DEPT. NO. : 2

ORDER DENYING TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY, LLC'S MOTION TO EXPUNGE BRAHMA GROUP, INC.'S MECHANIC'S LIEN

This matter came on for hearing September 12, 2018 (the "Hearing") before the Honorable Senior Judge Steven Elliott on the Motion to Expunge ("Motion") filed by Plaintiff TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY, LLC ("TSE"). D. Lee Roberts, Esq., and Colby L. Balkenbush, Esq. of WEINBERG, WHEELER, HUDGINS, GUNN & DIAL, LLC appeared on behalf of TSE. Eric B. Zimbelman, Esq., Richard Peel, Esq. and Ronnie Cox, Esq. of PEEL BRIMLEY LLP appeared on behalf of BRAHMA GROUP, INC. ("Brahma").

The Court having considered all the pleadings and papers on file, and having heard argument of counsel, hereby ORDERS as follows, having rendered its oral decision from the bench on September 12, 2018:

111

27 ///

28 ///

Page 1 of 6

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

SUMMARY OF STANDARD OF PROOF. I.

TSE commenced this proceeding by filing the present motion pursuant to NRS 108.2275 seeking an order to expunge Brahma's original notice of lien and the several amendments thereto (collectively, the "Notice of Lien"), recorded by Brahma against the Crescent Dunes Solar Energy Facility in Tonopah, Nevada (the "Work of Improvement"). NRS 108.2275(6) requires the Court to "make an order releasing the lien" if the Court determines "the notice of lien is frivolous and was made without reasonable cause." Because the Court finds the Notice of Lien (i) was not frivolous, and (ii) was made with reasonable cause, the Court denies the Motion.

II. THE COURT'S DECISION.

In its moving papers and at the Hearing, TSE made the following arguments in support of its Motion, each of which the Court rejects for the following reasons:

A. Brahma's Notice of Right to Lien was Properly Given.

- 1. NRS 108.245 generally requires a lien claimant who claims the benefit of NRS 108.221 to 108.246, inclusive (hereinafter, the "Lien Statute" or the "Statute") to deliver in person or by certified mail to the owner of the property a notice of right to lien in the form prescribed by the Statute.
 - 2. In its briefing and at the Hearing TSE argued that:
- . Brahma failed to give a Notice of Right to Lien to the Bureau of Land Management ("BLM"); and
- Brahma's Notice of Right to Lien is void because Brahma identified Solar Reserve as the party with whom it contracted, rather than TSE.
- 3. In its Supplement to it Opposition, Brahma provided copies of and demonstrated that it timely gave its Notice of Right to Lien (by certified mail, return receipt requested) to: (i) the BLM, the fee simple interest owner of certain parcels of land on which the Work of Improvement was constructed, and (ii) TSE, the fee simple interest owner of certain other parcels of land that comprise the Work of Improvement, as well as owner of the Work of Improvement.

28 111

4. At the Hearing, (i) TSE's counsel admitted that Solar Reserve (identified on the Notice of Right to Lien as the "person who contracted such labor, services, equipment or material") has an indirect ownership interest in TSE and shared the same address as TSE in Santa Monica, California to which the Notice of Right to Lien was mailed by certified mail, return receipt requested, and (ii) the Court confirmed that the Notice of Right to Lien identifies the "Project Owner" of the Work of Improvement as "Tonopah Solar Energy c/o Solar Reserve" at that same address.

5. Based on the foregoing, Brahma demonstrated that it timely and properly caused it's Notice of Right to Lien to be given as required by the Statute.

B. Brahma's Notice of Lien is not Barred by the Statute.

- 1. NRS 108.22188 identifies a "work of improvement" as: "[T]he entire structure or scheme of improvement as a whole, including, without limitation, all work, materials and equipment to be used in or for the construction, alteration or repair of the property or any improvement thereon, whether under multiple prime contracts or a single prime contract."
- 2. NRS 108.229(1) permits a lien claimant to "record an amended notice of lien to correct or clarify the lien claimant's notice of lien" "at any time before or during the trial of any action to foreclose a lien." The Statute further provides that a "variance between a notice of lien and an amended notice of lien does not defeat the lien and shall not be deemed material unless the variance: (a) Results from fraud or is made intentionally; or (b) Misleads an adverse party to the party's prejudice, but then only with respect to the adverse party who was prejudiced." NRS 108.229(1).
- 3. In its Motion, TSE initially argued that "[t]he Property on which the [Work of Improvement] is located consists of the following parcels: 012-031-04, 012-131-03, 012-131-04, 012-140-01, 012-141-01, 012-150-01, 012-151-01, 012-431-06, 612-141-01." In its supplemental briefing and at the Hearing, TSE then argued that the Property on which the Work of Improvement is located consists of the following two BLM owned parcels: 012-141-01, 012-151-01, and without providing any proof (ii), that the remaining Assessor's Parcel Numbers

¹ The address to which notice was sent is the address identified in the TSE/BGI Services Agreement to which BGI was to send notices.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

("APNs") against which Brahma's Lien were recorded were a) parcels owned by TSE purely for water rights on which Brahma never performed any work, and/or b) not parcels of land on which the Work of Improvement was constructed, but rather APNs associated with rights of way/easements, and/or c) parcels of land on which Brahma never performed any work that were owned by third parties.

- In its Motion and at the Hearing, TSE also argued that:
- · Brahma's Notice of Lien was "void" and cannot be amended because it attempted to illegally lien federally owned land (specifically land owned by the BLM), on which some of the improvements that are the subject of the Work of Improvement were constructed:
- · Because Brahma "intentionally" liened BLM land, its Notice of Lien could not be amended. Specifically, TSE relies on the fact that the original Notice of Lien, identifies one of the "owners of the property" to be liened as "Bureau of Land Management and Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC" and Exhibit A to the Notice of Lien, identifies the Land to be encumbered as including APNs 012-141-01, 012-015-01, which belong to the BLM; and
- Brahma had no right to lien three parcels owned by TSE to which, TSE contends, Brahma furnished no work, materials, or equipment.
 - 5. In response, Brahma:
- Disputed that its original Notice of Lien was intended to attach to BLM land and that it simply completed the statutory form required in NRS 108.226;
- Argued that its Notice of Lien (i) also attached to land owned by TSE, and (ii) to the Work of Improvement, including improvements constructed on land owned by the BLM;
- The Notice of Lien also identifies the "property to be charged with the lien" as "Crescent Dunes Solar Energy Project more fully described in Exhibit A." Further, as Brahma argued at Hearing, the Exhibit A more specifically identifies the improvements as follows: "The Crescent Dunes Solar Energy Project is a 110 MW plant constructed on the Land in Tonopah, Nevada." By necessity, the "Land" on which the Project was constructed is then

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

identified by parcel number and legal description; and

- Demonstrated that it caused its original Notice of Lien to be amended several times to, among other things, clarify that Brahma's lien did not attach BLM land.
 - 6. The Court concludes as follows:
- · Brahma did not "intentionally" attach BLM land such that it is precluded from amending its Notice of Lien;
- TSE is estopped from arguing that the Notice of Lien is void simply because the BLM's land was allegedly implicated in the Notice of Lien; and
- · Whether or not Brahma worked on the TSE-owned parcels is irrelevant because the Statute permits a lien claimant to record a notice of lien against the Work of Improvement as a whole.
 - C. Brahma's Notice of Lien is not Barred by Sovereign Immunity.
 - 1. At the Hearing, TSE contended that:
- Brahma's Notice of Lien is barred by the doctrine of sovereign immunity because the United States Department of Energy ("DOE") provided a \$737 Million loan guarantee, and is, through PNC Bank as its collateral agent, the beneficiary of a Construction Deed of Trust pledging all of TSE's right, title, and interest in the Project, and therefore, the DOE has a financial stake in the Project's continued successful operation by TSE;
- "[A] proceeding against property in which the United States has an interest is a suit against the United States." United States v. Alabama, 313 U.S. 274,282, 61 S.Ct. 1011 (1941).
 - 2. In response, Brahma demonstrated that:
- "[N]ot every lien or action will be void/barred just because it tangentially affects a federal government security interest." United States v. Rural Elec. Convenience Co-op. Co., 922 F.2d 429, 436 (7th Cir. 1991); and
- Nevada law (among other states) recognizes that governmental immunity does not preclude a mechanic's lien against a leasehold interest on land owned by the federal government. Basic Refractories, Inc. v. Bright, 72 Nev. 183, 298 P.2d 810, 59 A.L.R.2d

	6
	7
	8
	9
	10
ß	11
974 98-72	11 12
04 89 702) 9	13
NEVA FAX	14
2772	15
HENDE 2) 990-7	16
H(20/)	17
	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
	25
	26

28

1

2

3 4

5

457 (1956). See also Crutcher v. Block, 19 Okl. 246, 91 P. 895, 14 Ann. Cas. 1029 ("it is immaterial that the legal title to the land in question is in the United States").

- The Court concludes that:
- No-one is suing the United States in this action and neither the BLM's fee simple interest in certain parcels that comprise the Work of Improvement, nor is the DOE's security interest impaired by Brahma asserting a Notice of Lien; especially if (as TSE contends) the DOE has first priority over Brahma's Notice of Lien;
- Even if Brahma were to eventually foreclose on its Notice of Lien, the Work of Improvement could still be operated as a solar electric facility; and
- The doctrine of sovereign immunity does not bar Brahma's Notice of Lien.

III. CONCLUSION.

- 1. Based on the foregoing, the Court concludes that Brahma's Notice of Lien is not frivolous nor was it made without reasonable cause and therefore denies TSE's Motion.
- Nothing in this Order shall prevent or preclude Brahma from applying for an award of attorney's fees and costs pursuant to NRS 108.2275(6)(c).

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that TSE's Motion to Expunge Brahma's Notice of Lien is DENIED.

Dated this // day of October, 2018.

Respectfully submitted by:

PEEL BRIMLEY LLP

RICHARD L. PEEL, ESQ. (NV Bar No. 4359) ERIC B. ZIMBELMAN, ESQ. (NV Bar No. 9407) RONALD J. COX, ESQ. (NV Bar No. 12723)

3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200 Henderson, Nevada 89074-6571 Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc.

EXHIBIT 2

EXHIBIT 2

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation, 1 2 Third-Party Plaintiff, 3 VS. 4 COBRA THERMOSOLAR PLANTS, INC., a Nevada corporation; AMERICAN ASSURANCE COMPANY, a surety; BOE 5 BONDING COMPANIES I through X; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X, 6 inclusive, 7 Third-Party Defendants. 8 9 10

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that an Order Granting Brahma's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS 108.2275(6)(C) was filed on January 8, 2019, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit1.

AFFIRMATION PURSUANT TO NRS 239B.030

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

Dated this ____ day of January, 2019.

PEEL BRIMLEY LLP

RICHARD L. PEEL, ESQ. (4359) ERIC ZIMBELMAN, ESQ. (9863) CARY B. DOMINA, ESQ. (10567) RONALD J. COX, ESQ. (12723) 3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200 Henderson, Nevada 89074-6571 Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 1 Pursuant to Nev. R. Civ. P. 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of PEEL BRIMLEY LLP 2 and that on this _____day of December 2018, I caused the above and foregoing document entitled 3 NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER to be served as follows: 4 5 X by placing same to be deposited for mailing in the United States Mail, in a sealed envelope upon which first class postage was prepaid in Las Vegas, Nevada; 6 and/or 7 Wiznet, the Court's electronic filing system; 8 pursuant to EDCR 7.26, to be sent via facsimile; 9 to be hand-delivered; and/or 10 other - electronic mail 11 PEEL BRIMLEY LLP 3333 E. SERENE AVENUE, STE. 200 HENDERSON, NEVADA 89074 (702) 990-7272 + FAX (702) 990-727 to the party(ies) and/or attorney(s) listed below at the address and/or facsimile number indicated 12 below: 13 14 D. Lee Roberts, Jr., Esq. Geoffrey Crisp, Esq. 15 **WEIL & DRAGE** Colby L. Balkenbush, Esq. WEINBERG, WHEELER, HUDGINS 2500 Anthem Village Drive 16 GUNN & DIAL, LLC Henderson, NV 89052 6385 S. Rainbow Blvd., Suite 400 gcrisp@weildrage.com 17 Las Vegas, NV 89118 Attorneys for Cobra Thermosolar Plants, lroberts@wwhgd.com Înc. 18 cbalkenbush@wwhgd.com Attorneys for Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC 19 20 21 An Employee of Peel Brimley LLP 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

EXHIBIT 1

ORIGINAL

FILED 1 ORDR FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT RICHARD L. PEEL, ESO. Nevada Bar No. 4359 JAN 08 2019 ERIC B. ZIMBELMAN, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 9407 RONALD J. COX, ESQ. Aye County Clerk Nevada Bar No. 12723 Deputy PEEL BRIMLEY LLP 3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200 Henderson, Nevada 89074-6571 l'elephone: (702) 990-7272 Facsimile: (702) 990-7273 peel@peelbrimley.com ezimbelman@peelbrimley.com rcox@peelbrimley.com Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc. FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT 10 NYE COUNTY, NEVADA 11 PEEL BRIMLEY LLP 3333 E. SERENE AVENUE, STE. 200 HENDERSON, NEVADA 89074 (702) 990-7272 + FAX (702) 990-7273 I'ONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY, LLC, a Delaware CASE NO. : CV 39348 12 imited liability company, DEPT. NO.: 2 13 Plaintiff, ORDER GRANTING BRAHMA'S 14 MOTION FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS PURSUANT TO NRS 15 BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation, 108.2275(6)(C) 16 Defendant. 17 This matter came on for hearing December 11, 2018 (the "Hearing") before the Honorable Senior Judge Steven Elliott on the Motion For Attorney's Fees And Costs Pursuant To 18 NRS 108.2275(6)(c) ("Fee Motion") filed by BRAHMA GROUP, INC. ("Brahma"). Eric B. 19 Zimbelman, Esq. of PEEL BRIMLEY LLP appeared on behalf of Brahma. D. Lee Roberts, 20 Esq. of WEINBERG, WHEELER, HUDGINS, GUNN & DIAL, LLC appeared on behalf of 21 22 Plaintiff TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY, LLC ("TSE"). The Court having considered all the pleadings and papers on file, and having heard 23 argument of counsel, hereby ORDERS as follows, having rendered its oral decision from the 24 bench on December 11, 2018: 25 STATUTORY BASIS FOR AWARD OF FEES AND COSTS. 26 I. On October 17, 2018, this Court signed an Order Denying TSE's Motion to Expunge 27

1 The Order Denying the Underlying Motion was entered by the Clerk on October 29, 2018.

28

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Brahma's mechanic's lien pursuant to NRS 108.2275 ("Underlying Motion"). As part of the Order Denying the Underlying Motion, the Court concluded that Brahma's Notice of Lien is not frivolous nor was it made without reasonable cause. NRS 108.2275(6)(c) states in relevant

- (6) If, after a hearing on the matter, the court determines that:
- (c) The notice of lien is not frivolous and was made with reasonable cause...the court shall make an order awarding costs and reasonable attorney's fees to the lien claimant for defending the motion.

Accordingly, once the Court determines that a lien is not frivolous or excessive and made with reasonable cause, an award of attorneys' fees is mandatory. In Nevada, the method upon which a reasonable fee is determined is subject to the discretion of the court, which is tempered only by reason and fairness. Shuette v. Beazer Homes Holdings Corp., 121 Nev. 837, 864-65, 124 P.3d 530, 548-49 (2005).

BRAHMA'S APPLICATION FOR AWARD OF FEES AND COSTS. II.

Pursuant to NRS 108.2275(6)(c), Brahma applied to the Court by way of the Fee Motion for an award of \$77,937.50 in attorney's fees and \$479.84 in costs plus additional sums, discussed below, for work performed on the Reply, at oral argument on the Fee Motion and in preparation of this Order. In support of its Fee Motion, Brahma submitted the Declaration of Richard L. Peel, Esq. and supporting documentation including invoicing and time records relating to Peel Brimley LLP's work performed on Brahma's behalf in defending the Underlying Motion. Brahma's motion addressed the factors identified in Brunzell v. Golden Gate Nat'l Bank, 85 Nev. 345, 349, 455 P.2d 31 (1969) that the District Court is required to consider in reviewing any application for reasonable attorney's fees ("the Brunzell Factors"). See Barney v. Mt. Rose Heating & Air Conditioning, 124 Nev. 821, 829, 192 P.3d 730, 736 (2008).²

² The Brunzell factors are:

¹⁾ The advocate's qualities, including ability, training, education, experience, professional standing, and

The character of the work, including its difficulty, intricacy, importance, as well as the time and skill required, the responsibility imposed, and the prominence and character of the parties when affecting the importance of the litigation;

The work performed, including the skill, time, and attention given to the work; and

2

3

4 5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

TSE opposed the Fee Motion on multiple grounds and asserted that the fees requested were excessive for work performed in response to a "single motion." [TSE Opposition p. 2]. Among other things, TSE contends that (i) PB's rates are higher than the "prevailing rate," (ii) PB engaged in "block billing," and (iii) PB "overstaffed" the work on the Underlying Motion and its invoices contain duplicative work or billings. On Reply, Brahma argued, among other things, that (i) the Underlying Motion was an existential threat to Brahma's lien rights - its sole source of security³ for the \$12,859,577.74 Brahma claims to be owed for its work on TSE's Crescent Dunes Solar Energy Project (the "Project"),4 (ii) involved multiple complex issues. and (iii) the work successfully performed by Brahma's attorneys was reasonable and necessary under the circumstances.

Having received and reviewed the Fee Motion, TSE's Opposition, Brahma's Reply, having heard and considered oral argument counsel at hearing on December 11, 2018, and having considered the Brunzell Factors, the Court makes the following findings and conclusions:

III. FINDINGS.

In general, and while the attorney hours expended and resulting amount sought by way of the Fee Motion are substantial, the hour and amounts are reasonable and not excessive in light of (i) the size and importance of Brahma's lien, (ii) the complex and varied issues presented to the Court, (iii) the high quality counsel on both sides of the case, (iv) higher quality work product than seen in ordinary cases and (v) the clients' reasonable expectations for superior intellectual ability and work product on both sides. In addition, the Court is satisfied that the rates charged by Brahma's counsel, including associate and partner rates, are reasonable and justified.

⁴⁾ The result—whether the attorney was successful and what benefits were derived. See Brunzell, 85 Nev. at 349; Barney v Mt. Rose Heating & Air Conditioning, 124 Nev. at 829,

A mechanic's lien is a statutory creature established to help ensure payment of work, materials and/or equipment provided for the construction or improvements on real property (In re Fontainebleau Las Vegas Holdings, 289 p.3D 1199, 1210 (Nev. 2012).

Underlying Nevada's public policy of securing payment to contractors by way of mechanics' liens is that "contractors are generally in a vulnerable position because they extend large blocks of credit; invest significant time, labor, and materials into a project; and have any number of workers vitally depend upon them for eventual payment."

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

As to the Brunzell Factors, the Court finds, without limitation, as follows:

- 1. Advocate's Qualities: Brahma's counsel are highly experienced, knowledgeable and competent, especially relating to the Nevada Mechanics' Lien Statute and construction law;
- 2. Character of the Work: Brahma's lien claim of nearly \$13 million is substantial and the Underlying Motion presented big stakes. In addition, the Court enjoyed the benefit of high-quality briefing and argument on atypical, challenging and varied subject matter;
- 3. The Work Performed: The Underlying Motion presented the Court with a lot to consider; and
- 4. The Result: The arguments presented by Brahma's attorneys were persuasive to the Court and the Court ruled in favor of Brahma on the Underlying Motion.

III. CONCLUSION.

Based on the foregoing, and having considered the Brunzell Factors, the Court concludes that the time expended and amounts incurred by Brahma's counsel in defending the Underlying Motion were reasonable and appropriate and, pursuant to NRS 108.2275(6)(c), Brahma is awarded reasonable attorneys fees and costs as follows:

- As presented by way of the Declaration of Richard L. Peel, Esq., for fees and costs incurred in defending the Underlying Motion and submitting the Fee Motion the sum of \$78,417.34; and
- 2. As agreed by the parties by a separate Stipulation attached hereto as Exhibit A, for fees incurred in preparing Brahma's Reply to TSE's Opposition to the Fee Motion, for appearance of counsel at oral argument and preparation of this Order, the additional sum of \$10,000.00.

///

III

///

///

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Brahma's Motion For Attorney's Fees And Costs Pursuant To NRS 108.2275(6)(c) is GRANTED and Brahma is awarded the sum of \$88,417.34 which shall be due and payable by TSE within ten (10) days of a notice of entry of this order being filed.

Dated this 3 day December 2018.

Senior Judge Steven Effici

Submitted by:
PEEL BRIMLEY LLP

RICHARD L. PEEL, ESQ. (NV Bar No. 4359) ERIC B. ZIMBELMAN, ESQ. (NV Bar No. 9407) RONALD J. COX, ESQ. (NV Bar No. 12723) 3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200 Henderson, Nevada 89074-6571

Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc.

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Brahma's Motion For Attorney's Fees And Costs Pursuant To NRS 108.2275(6)(c) is GRANTED and Brahma is awarded the sum of \$88,417.34 which shall be due and payable by TSE within ten (10) days of a notice of entry of this order being filed.

Dated this _____ day December 2018.

Senior Judge Steven Elliott

Submitted by:

PEEL BRIMLEY LLP

RICHARD I, PEEL, ESQ. (NV Bar No. 4359) ERIC B. ZIMBELMAN, ESQ. (NV Bar No. 9407) RONALD J. COX, ESQ. (NV Bar No. 12723) 3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200

3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200 Henderson, Nevada 89074-6571 Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc.

EXHIBIT A

26

27

28

1	ORDR				
_	RICHARD L. PEEL, ESQ.				
2	Nevada Bar No. 4359				
3	ERIC B. ZIMBELMAN, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 9407				
,	RONALD J. COX, ESQ.				
4	Nevada Bar No. 12723				
	PEEL BRIMLEY LLP				
5	3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200				
_	Henderson, Nevada 89074-6571				
6	Felephone: (702) 990-7272 Facsimile: (702) 990-7273				
7	rpeel@peelbrimley.com				
	ezimbelman@peelbrimley.com				
8	rcox@peelbrimley.com				
^	Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc.				
9					
10					
11	NYE COUNTY, NEVADA				
10	TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY, LLC, a Delaware	CASE NO. : CV 39348			
12	limited liability company,	DEPT. NO. : 2			
13	Plaintiff,				
•	,	STIPULATION REGARDING			
14	vs.	AMOUNT OF ADDITIONAL FEES			
15	BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation,	AWARDED TO BRAHMA			
10	Did think Groot, live., a nevada corporation,				
16	Defendant.				
17	Defendant BRAHMA GROUP INC. ("F	Brahma") and Plaintiff TONOPAH SOLAR			
• ′					
18	ENERGY, LLC ("TSE") by and through their respective counsel stipulate and agree as follows:				
19	WHEREAS, on October 29, 2018, the Court entered an Order Denying Tonopah Sola				
17	WHEREMS, OH COLOUGE 27, 2010, the Co	art emered an order Benying Tonopan Bolar			
20	Energy, LLC's Motion to Expunge Brahma Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's Lien ("Underlying				
٠. ا	Condonin				
21	Order");				
22	WHEREAS, Brahma thereafter filed a Motion for Order Granting Fees and Cost				
	D 44 NDG 100 0005 (C) (A) (WD-, M-42-, W)				
23	Pursuant to NRS 108.2275(6)(c) ("Fee Motion");				
24	WHEREAS, at a hearing on December 11, 2018 the Court orally ruled that Brahma was				
- '					

WHEREAS, the Parties have stipulated and agreed that the amount of the Additional

entitled to an award of fees and costs of \$78,417.34 plus additional fees incurred for appearance

of counsel at oral argument and preparation of the Order ("Additional Fees") and directed

counsel for Brahma to submit a declaration in support of such Additional Fees; and

Fees shall be \$10,000.00 (Ten Thousand U.S. Dollars);

Now therefore,

IT IS STIPULATED AND AGREED that Brahma shall be awarded additional fees incurred for appearance of counsel at oral argument and preparation of the Order Granting Motion for Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS 108.2275(6)(c) in the amount of \$10,000.00 (Ten Thousand U.S. Dollars) such that the total amount of fees and costs awarded to Brahma is and shall be a total of \$88,417.34 (Eighty Eight Thousand Four Hundred Seventeen U.S. Dollars and Thirty-Four Cents).

This stipulation is to the amount of additional fees in light of the court's ruling on entitlement. TSE reserves its right to appeal the decision on expungment and entitlement to fees.

IT IS SO STIPULATED this 27 day of December, 2018.

PEEL BRIMLEY LLP

Richard L. Peel, Esq. (4359)
Eric B. Zimbelman, Esq. (9407)
Cary B. Domina, Esq. (10567)
3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200
Henderson, NV 89074-6571
Telephone: (702) 990-7272
rpeel@peelbrimley.com
ezimbelman@peelbrimley.com
cdomina@peelbrimley.com
Attorneys for Defendant Brahma Group,
Inc.

WEINBERG, WHEELER, HUDGINS, GUNN & DIAPALLOC

D. Lee Roberts, Jr., Esq. (8877)
Colby L. Balkenbush, Esq. (13066)
Ryan T. Gormley, Esq. (13494)
6385 S. Rainbow Blvd., Suite 400
Las Vegas, NV 89118
Telephone: (702) 938-3838
lroberts@wwhgd.com
cbalkenbush@wwhgd.com
rgormley@wwhgd.com
Attorneys for Plaintiff Tonopah Solar Energy,
LLC