### IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

### Supreme Court Case No. 78092

Electronically Filed
Mar 03 2020 10:27 p.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

## TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY, LLC,

Appellant,

v.

## BRAHMA GROUP, INC.,

Respondent.

Appeal from Judgment
Fifth Judicial District Court
The Honorable Steven Elliott, District Court Judge
District Court Case No. CV 39348

### **RESPONDENT'S APPENDIX VOLUME 6**

RICHARD L. PEEL, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 4359 ERIC B. ZIMBELMAN, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 9407

PEEL BRIMLEY LLP

3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200

Henderson, NV 89074-6571 Telephone: (702) 990-7272 Facsimile: (702) 990-7273

azimbalman@paalbrimlay.co

ezimbelman@peelbrimley.com

rpeel@peelbrimley.com Attorneys for Respondent Brahma Group, Inc.

# **CHRONOLOGICAL APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS**

<u>Date</u>	<u>Description</u>	Bates Range	<u>Volume</u>
10/18/2018	Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's Motion to Strike Brahma Group, Inc.'s First Amended Counter-Complaint, or, in the Alternative, Motion to Stay this Action Until the Conclusion of the Proceedings in Federal Court	RA000001 – RA000025	1
	Exhibit 1 – Brahma Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's Lien Foreclosure Complaint	RA000026 – RA000032	1
	Exhibit 2 - Brahma Group, Inc.'s (i) First Amended Counter Complaint; and (ii) Third-Party Complaint	RA000033- RA000047	1
	Exhibit 3 – Complaint	RA000048- RA000053	1
	Exhibit 4 – Services Agreement between Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC and Brahma Group, Inc.	RA000054 - RA000075	1
	Exhibit 5 – Notice of Removal to Federal Court	RA000076- RA000085	1
	Exhibit 6 – Defendant Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's Answer to Brahma Group, Inc.'s Complaint and Counterclaim against Brahma	RA000086- RA000105	1
	Exhibit 7 – First Amended Complaint	RA000106- RA000110	1
	Exhibit 8 – Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion for Stay, or in the Alternative, Motion to Amend Complaint	RA000111- RA000130	1
	Exhibit 9 – Fourth Amended and/or Restated Notice of Lien recorded 9/14/18	RA000131- RA000141	1
	Exhibit 10 – Certificate of Service of Surety Rider Bond 854481 and Surety Bond 85441	RA000142- RA000153	1
11/05/18	Brahma Group, Inc.'s Opposition to Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's Motion to Strike, Motion to Dismiss or Motion to Stay	RA000154- RA000186	1
	Exhibit 1 - Services Agreement between Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC and Brahma Group, Inc.	RA000187– RA000208	2

Exhibit 2 – Notice of Lien recorded 4/9/18  Exhibit 3 – Complaint  Exhibit 4 – Notice of Foreclosure of RA000223  Exhibit 4 – Notice of Foreclosure of RA000231  Exhibit 5 – Notice of Lis Pendens  Exhibit 5 – Notice of Lis Pendens  Exhibit 6 – Correspondence from Lee RA000239  Exhibit 7 – Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's Motion to Expunge Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion to Expunge Brahma Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's Liens and Lis Pendens  Exhibit 8 – Notice of Voluntary Dismissal RA000256  Exhibit 9 – Notice of First Amended and RA000259  Exhibit 10 – Notice of First Amended and RA000272  Exhibit 10 – Notice of Second Amended RA000273 – 2 RA000282  Exhibit 11 – Third Amended and/or RA000273 – 2 RA000291  Exhibit 12 – Fourth Amended and/or RA000282 – 2 RA000300  Exhibit 13 – NRS 108.2415 Surety Bond RA000300  Exhibit 14 - Certificate of Service of Surety Rider Bond 854481 Posted to Release Lien with Power of Attorney  Exhibit 15 – Notice of Lien recorded S/15/2018  Exhibit 15 – Notice of Lien recorded S/15/2018  Exhibit 16 - NRS 108.2415 Surety Bond RA000310  Exhibit 17 – Order of Reassignment  Exhibit 18 – Notice of Lien recorded S/15/2018  Exhibit 19 – Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion for Stay, or in the Alternative, Motion to Amend Complaint			
Exhibit 4 — Notice of Foreclosure of Mechanic's Lien RA000221 Exhibit 5 — Notice of Lis Pendens RA000232 Exhibit 6 — Correspondence from Lee RA000239 Exhibit 7 — Tonopal Solar Energy, LLC's Machanic's Liens and Lis Pendens Exhibit 7 — Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's Motion to Expunge Brahma Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's Liens and Lis Pendens Exhibit 8 — Notice of Voluntary Dismissal without Prejudice Exhibit 9 — Notice of First Amended and RA000259 Exhibit 10 — Notice of Second Amended RA000272 Exhibit 11 — Third Amended and/or RA000282 Exhibit 12 — Fourth Amended and/or RA000281 Exhibit 13 — NRS 108.2415 Surety Bond RA000300 Exhibit 13 — NRS 108.2415 Surety Bond RA000301— RA000305 Exhibit 14 — Certificate of Service of Surety Rider Bond 854481 and Surety RA000319 Exhibit 15 — Notice of Lien recorded RA000319 Exhibit 15 — Notice of Lien recorded RA000319 Exhibit 16 — NRS 108.2415 Surety Bond RA000310 Exhibit 17 — Notice of Lien recorded RA000310 Exhibit 17 — Notice of Lien recorded RA000310 Exhibit 18 — NRS 108.2415 Surety Bond RA000300 Exhibit 19 — RA000310 Exhibit 19 — Notice of Lien recorded RA000310 Exhibit 19 — Notice of Lien recorded RA000320— RA000310 Exhibit 19 — Notice of Lien recorded RA000320— RA0003320— RA0003320— RA000333— RA000333— RA000333 Exhibit 19 — Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion RA000333 Exhibit 19 — Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion RA000333	Exhibit 2 – Notice of Lien recorded 4/9/18		2
Mechanic's Lien   RA000231	Exhibit 3 – Complaint		2
Exhibit 6 - Correspondence from Lee Roberts to Justin Jones re Crescent Dunes Solar Energy Project Exhibit 7 - Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's Motion to Expunge Brahma Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's Liens and Lis Pendens Exhibit 8 - Notice of Voluntary Dismissal without Prejudice Exhibit 9 - Notice of First Amended and Restated Lien Exhibit 10 - Notice of Second Amended and Restated Lien Exhibit 11 - Third Amended and/or RA000282 Exhibit 12 - Fourth Amended and/or Restated Notice of Lien Exhibit 13 - NRS 108.2415 Surety Bond 854481 Posted to Release Lien with Power of Attorney Exhibit 14 - Certificate of Service of Surety Rider Bond 854481 and Surety Bond 854482 Posted to Release Lien with Power of Attorney Exhibit 15 - Notice of Lien recorded S/15/2018 Exhibit 16 - NRS 108.2415 Surety Bond 854482 Posted to Release Lien with Power of Attorney Exhibit 17 - Order of Resisignment Exhibit 18 - Complaint Exhibit 19 - Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion for Stay, or in the Alternative, Motion to			2
Roberts to Justin Jones re Crescent Dunes Solar Energy Project  Exhibit 7 - Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's Motion to Expunge Brahma Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's Liens and Lis Pendens  Exhibit 8 - Notice of Voluntary Dismissal without Prejudice  Exhibit 9 - Notice of First Amended and Restated Lien  Exhibit 10 - Notice of Second Amended and Restated Lien  Exhibit 11 - Third Amended and/or Restated Lien  Exhibit 12 - Fourth Amended and/or Restated Notice of Lien  Exhibit 13 - NRS 108.2415 Surety Bond 854481 Posted to Release Lien with Power of Attorney  Exhibit 14 - Certificate of Service of Surety Rider Bond 854481 and Surety Bond 85441  Exhibit 15 - Notice of Lien recorded 5/15/2018  Exhibit 16 - NRS 108.2415 Surety Bond 854482 Posted to Release Lien with Power of Attorney  Exhibit 17 - Order of Reassignment  Exhibit 18 - Complaint  RA000325  RA000325  RA000327  RA000317  RA000317  RA000317  RA000317  RA000320  RA000320  RA000320  RA000320  RA000325  RA000328  RA000328  RA000333  Exhibit 19 - Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion for Stay, or in the Alternative, Motion to	Exhibit 5 – Notice of Lis Pendens		2
Motion to Expunge Brahma Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's Liens and Lis Pendens  Exhibit 8 – Notice of Voluntary Dismissal without Prejudice  Exhibit 9 – Notice of First Amended and RA000259  Exhibit 10 – Notice of Second Amended RA000272  Exhibit 11 – Notice of Second Amended RA000282  Exhibit 11 – Third Amended and/or RA000282  Exhibit 12 – Fourth Amended and/or RA000291  Exhibit 13 – NRS 108.2415 Surety Bond RA000300  Exhibit 14 - Certificate of Service of Attorney  Exhibit 14 - Certificate of Service of Surety Rider Bond 854481 and Surety Bond 854481  Exhibit 15 – Notice of Lien recorded Shadous 15 – NRS 108.2415 Surety Bond RA000316  Exhibit 15 – Notice of Lien recorded RA000316  Exhibit 16 - NRS 108.2415 Surety Bond RA000317 – RA000319  Exhibit 17 – Order of Reassignment RA000324  Exhibit 18 – Complaint RA000327  Exhibit 19 – Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion for Stay, or in the Alternative, Motion to RA000353	Roberts to Justin Jones re Crescent Dunes		2
Without Prejudice	Motion to Expunge Brahma Group, Inc.'s	RA000256	2
Restated Lien	without Prejudice		2
Exhibit 11 - Third Amended and/or RA000282   Exhibit 11 - Third Amended and/or RA000283 - RA000291   Exhibit 12 - Fourth Amended and/or RA0002292 - Restated Notice of Lien RA000300   Exhibit 13 - NRS 108.2415 Surety Bond RA000301 - RA000305   RA000306   RA000306   RA000316   RA000316   RA000316   RA000316   RA000317   RA000319   RA000319   RA000319   RA000319   RA000320   RA000320   RA000320   RA000320   RA000320   RA000320   RA000320   RA000327   RA000327   RA000327   Exhibit 17 - Order of Reassignment   RA000328 - RA000333   RA000333   RA000333   Exhibit 19 - Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion for Stay, or in the Alternative, Motion to RA000353   RA000353			2
Restated Lien			2
Restated Notice of Lien			2
854481 Posted to Release Lien with Power of Attorney  Exhibit 14 - Certificate of Service of Surety Rider Bond 854481 and Surety RA000316  Bond 85441  Exhibit 15 - Notice of Lien recorded RA000317- RA000319  Exhibit 16 - NRS 108.2415 Surety Bond RA000320- RA000324 of Attorney  Exhibit 17 - Order of Reassignment RA000325- RA000327  Exhibit 18 - Complaint RA000328- RA000333  Exhibit 19 - Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion for Stay, or in the Alternative, Motion to RA000353			2
Surety Rider Bond 854481 and Surety Bond 85441  Exhibit 15 - Notice of Lien recorded 5/15/2018  Exhibit 16 - NRS 108.2415 Surety Bond 854482 Posted to Release Lien with Power of Attorney Exhibit 17 - Order of Reassignment  Exhibit 18 - Complaint  RA000325- RA000327  Exhibit 19 - Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion for Stay, or in the Alternative, Motion to  RA000353  RA000353  RA000353	854481 Posted to Release Lien with Power		2
5/15/2018       RA000319         Exhibit 16 - NRS 108.2415 Surety Bond 854482 Posted to Release Lien with Power of Attorney       RA000320— RA000324         Exhibit 17 - Order of Reassignment       RA000325— RA000327         Exhibit 18 - Complaint       RA000328— RA000333         Exhibit 19 - Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion for Stay, or in the Alternative, Motion to       RA000334— RA000353	Surety Rider Bond 854481 and Surety		2
854482 Posted to Release Lien with Power of Attorney  Exhibit 17 – Order of Reassignment  Exhibit 18 – Complaint  Exhibit 19 – Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion for Stay, or in the Alternative, Motion to  RA000324  RA000325 – 2  RA000328 – 2  RA000333 – 2  RA0003334 – 2  RA000353			2
Exhibit 18 – Complaint  Exhibit 18 – Complaint  RA000328– RA000333  Exhibit 19 – Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion RA000334– for Stay, or in the Alternative, Motion to RA000353	854482 Posted to Release Lien with Power		2
Exhibit 19 – Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion for Stay, or in the Alternative, Motion to RA000353	-		2
for Stay, or in the Alternative, Motion to RA000353	Exhibit 18 – Complaint		2
	for Stay, or in the Alternative, Motion to		2

	Exhibit 20 – Mechanic's Lien Foreclosure Complaint	RA000354- RA000364	2
11/30/18	Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's Reply to Brahma Group, Inc.'s Opposition to Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's Motion to Strike Brahma Group, Inc.'s First Amended Counter-Complaint, or, in the Alternative, Motion to Stay this Action Until the Conclusion of the Proceedings in Federal Court	RA000365- RA000379	2
	Exhibit 1 – Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's First Set of Interrogatories to Brahma Group, Inc. and Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's First Set of Requests for Production to Brahma Group, Inc.	RA000380- RA000394	2
	Exhibit 2 – Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion to Stay Discovery Pending Determination of Dispositive Motion	RA000395 - RA000410	3
	Exhibit 3 – Plaintiff's Responses to Defendant Tonopah Energy, LLC's First Request for Production of Documents and Responses to First Set of Interrogatories	RA000411- RA000426	3
	Exhibit 4 – Pages 283 – 286 from Nevada Construction Law (2016 Edition)	RA000427 – RA000437	3
	Exhibit 5 – Order re Discovery Plan [ECF No. 26]	RA000438- RA000440	3
	Exhibit 6 – Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's Response to Brahma's Motion for Stay, or in the Alternative, Motion to Amend Complaint	RA000441 – RA000464	3
	Exhibit 7 – Brahma Group, Inc.'s Reply in Support of Motion for Stay, or in the Alternative, Motion to Amend Complaint	RA000465- RA000478	3
	Exhibit 8 – Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's Motion for an Injunction and to Strike	RA000479- RA000494	3
	Exhibit 9 — Brahma Group, Inc.'s Response to Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's Motion for Preliminary Injunction and Motion to Strike [ECF No.16]	RA000495- RA000520	4
	Exhibit 10 – Reply in Support of Tonopah Energy, LLC's Motion for an Injunction and to Strike	RA000521 - RA000536	4
12/17/18	Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion to Consolidate Case No. CV 39799 with Case No., CV 39348	RA000537 - RA000541	4

01/04/19	TSE's Opposition to Brahma's Motion to Consolidate Case No. 39799 with Case No. CV 39348	RA000542- RA000550	4
01/14/19	Brahma Group, Inc.'s Reply to Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's Motion to Consolidate Case No. CV 39799 with Case No., CV 39348	RA000551- RA000561	4
	Exhibit A - Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's Reply to Brahma Group, Inc.'s Opposition to Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's Motion to Strike Brahma Group, Inc.'s First Amended Counter-Complaint, or, in the Alternative, Motion to Stay this Action Until the Conclusion of the Proceedings in Federal Court	RA000562- RA000577	4
	Exhibit B – Page 286 from Nevada Construction Law (2016 Edition)	RA000578– RA000579	4
	Exhibit C – Brahma Group, Inc.'s Mechanic's Lien Foreclosure Complaint Against Surety Bond	RA000580- RA000586	4
	Exhibit D – Notice of Entry of Order – Order Granting Brahma's Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS (108.2275(6)(C)	RA000587- RA000600	4
	Exhibit E - Brahma Group, Inc.'s First Amended Complaint for (Among Other Things): (i) Foreclosure of Notice of Lien Against Surety Bond; and (ii) Breach of Settlement Agreement	RA000601- RA000610	4
01/28/19	Notice of Entry of Order (i) Denying Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's Motion to Strike and Dismiss; and (ii) Granting in Part Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's Motion for Stay (iii) Granting Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion to Amend	RA000611- RA000618	4
02/21/19	Defendants Cobra Thermosolar Plants, Inc.'s and American Home Assurance Company's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff Brahma Group, Inc.'s First Amended Complaint in Case No. CV 39799	RA000619- RA000628	4
	Exhibit 1 – Brahma Group, Inc.'s (i) First Amended Counter Complaint; and (ii) Third-Party Complaint	RA000629- RA000643	4
	Exhibit 2 – Brahma Group, Inc.'s First Amended Complaint for (Among Other Things): (i) Foreclosure of Notice of Lien	RA000644- RA000654	4

	Against Surety Bond; and (ii) Breach of Settlement Agreement		
	Exhibit 3 – Email Correspondence from Richard Peel to Geoffrey Crisp	RA000655 - RA000657	4
03/15/19	Notice of Entry of Order – Order Granting Brahma's Motion to Consolidate Case No.CV 39799 with Case No. 39348	RA000658- RA000665	4
03/25/19	Brahma Group, Inc.'s Opposition to Cobra Thermosolar Plants, Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss and Countermotion for Leave to File a Single Consolidated Amended Complaint	RA000666 – RA000680	4
	Exhibit 1 – Order Granting Brahma's Motion to Consolidate Case No. CV39799 with Case No. CV39348	RA000681– RA000684	4
	Exhibit 2 – Order (i) Denying Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's Motion to Strike and Dismiss, and (ii) Granting in Part Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's Motion for Stay (iii) Granting Brahma Group, Inc.'s Motion to Amend	RA000685 – RA000689	4
	Exhibit 3 – Petition for Writ of Prohibition, or, Alternatively, Mandamus	RA000690– RA000749	4
	Exhibit 4 – Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's Reply to Brahma Group, Inc.'s Opposition to Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's Motion to Strike Brahma Group, Inc.'s First Amended Counter-Complaint, or, in the Alternative, Motion to Stay this Action Until the Conclusion of the Proceedings in Federal Court	RA000750 – RA000765	5
	Exhibit 5 - Page 286 from Nevada Construction Law (2016 Edition)	RA000766– RA000767	5
	Exhibit 6 – Email Correspondence from Eric Zimbelman to Lee Roberts	RA000768- RA000770	5
	Exhibit 7 - Email Correspondence from Colby Balkenbush to Richard Peel	RA000771- RA000774	5
	Exhibit 8 – Defendant Tonopah Solar Energy, LLCs Answer to Brahma Group, Inc.'s Complaint and Counterclaim Against Brahma	RA000775– RA000794	5

	Exhibit 9 – TSE's Opposition to Brahma's	RA000795-	5
	Motion to Consolidate Case No. CV 39799 with Case No. 39348	RA000804	
	Exhibit 10 – Brahma Group, Inc.'s Reply	RA000805-	5
	to Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC's	RA000865	
	Opposition to Motion to Consolidate Case		
	No. CV 39799 with Case No. 39348		_
	Exhibit 11 - Brahma Group, Inc.'s First	RA000866-	5
	Amended Complaint for (Among Other	RA000875	
	Things): (i) Foreclosure of Notice of Lien		
	Against Surety Bond; and (ii) Breach of		
	Settlement Agreement	D + 0000=6	_
	Exhibit 12 – Brahma Group, Inc.'s (i)	RA000876-	5
	Second Amended Complaint; and (ii) First	RA000891	
	Amended Third-Party Complaint		_
04/10/19	TSE's Opposition to Brahma's	RA000892-	5
	Countermotion for Leave to File a Single	RA000900	
	Consolidated Complaint		_
04/22/19	Order Granting Brahma's	RA000901-	5
	Countermotion for Leave to File a Single	RA000918	
	Consolidated Amended Complaint		_
04/22/19	Brahma Group, Inc.'s (i) Second	RA000919-	5
	Amended Complaint; and (ii) First	RA000931	
	Amended Third-Party Complaint		

es--affidavits are sufficient to er a District Court's refusal to parties was a denial of difference.

ocess to determine if an order purt is free to hold and weight excessive. In sum, the motion tened time, and the court has and made without reasonable the lien is not frivolous and is from that matter. 773 Once that orney's fees and costs to the de based on the lien being allenging party if the lien is sexcessive. 776

ase. In its holding, the Court rest in property, but are a lificant property interest that is not necessarily in keeping viewed,<sup>778</sup> and is difficult to claims as any other property

any party with an interest in t to show cause why the lien or made upon affidavits and

v. Adv. Op. No. 36 (Nev. 2010).

widence to support the petitioner's claim. If the court agrees that a hearing should be field, it must give 15 to 30 days notice of the hearing. An Many times the courts will not aware of this strict mandate and will issue the order to show cause on a shorter time finals, often because the moving party has provided a request for a shortened time final courts are often accommodating to that request, there is no basis under the final courts are often accommodating to that request, there is no basis under the finechanics lien statute for the expedited hearing. Moreover, since the motion is effectively a challenge to the validity of the lien with limited due process, the Courts should be slow to shorten the time for a motion to less than the statutory minimum of 15 days. It should be noted that while the hearing must commence within 15 to 30 days, it need not be completed in that time, so long as the owner's rights to a speeding resolution of the validity or excessiveness of the lien is made expeditiously.

A ruling on a motion under NRS 108.2275 is a final order and is immediately appealable, however, a ruling that the lien claim is not frivolous or excessive does not allow a stay to be entered during the time of the appeal's pendency. As such, the fact that a ruling is being appealed should not be taken by the lien claimant as tolling any statute of limitations on the claim of lien itself. The lien claimant still must file suit to foreclose the mechanics lien timely under NRS 108.233 and NRS 108.239. A foreclosure suit cannot be filed as a counter-claim to a petition to expunge or reduce under NRS 108.2275, however. Since a petition is not a "complaint," it cannot commence an action under Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure (NRCP) Rule 4. Likewise, a "petition" is not a proper spleading" under NRCP Rule 7(a), to which a counter-claim may be filed. Rather, it is a motion" under NRCP Rule 7(b). As such, it is improper legal practice to file a counterclaim to a petition under NRS 108.2275. The proper procedure is to file a complaint for foreclosure and to move the petitioning court to consolidate the two matters.

If the lien is ordered expunged or reduced under NRS 108.2275, the party removing the lien needs merely to record a copy of the certified order reducing or expunging the lien claim to release the property from the lien or reducing the same for all purposes.<sup>784</sup>

<sup>700</sup> NRS 100.2275(3).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>781</sup> J.D. Const., Inc. v. IBEX Intern. Group, LLC, 240 P.3d 1033, 126 Nev. Adv. Op. No. 36 (Nev. 2010).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>722</sup> NRS 108.2275(8).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>733</sup> See Section 8:22, Foreclosing the claim of lien.

P NRS 108.2275(9).

# PEEL BRIMLEY LLP 3333 E. SERENE AVENUE, STE. 200 11ENDERSON, NEVADA 89074 (702) 990-7272 + FAX (702) 990-7273

///

		FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
1	RICHARD L. PEEL, Esq.	DEC 1 4 2018
2	Nevada Bar No. 4359 ERIC B. ZIMBELMAN, ESQ.	NYE COUNTY DEPUTY OLERK
	Nevada Bar No. 9407	
3	CARY B. DOMINA, ESQ.	Marianne Yoffee
4	Nevada Bar No. 10567 RONALD J. COX, ESQ.	
5	Nevada Bar No. 12723	
6	PEEL BRIMLEY LLP	
	3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200 Henderson, Nevada 89074-6571	
7	Telephone: (702) 990-7272	·
8	Facsimile: (702) 990-7273	
9	rpeel@peelbrimley.com ezimbelman@peelbrimley.com	
10	cdomina@peelbrimley.com	
	rcox@peelbrimley.com Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc.	
11	Augrieys for Branna Group, me.	
12		
13	FIFTH JUDICIAL DIS	STRICT COURT
14	nye county,	NEVADA
15	BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation,	CASE NO. : C V 39 799
16	Lien/Bond Claimant,	DEPT. NO. :
17	Lieff Bond Claimant,	
18	vs.	
19	COBRA THERMOSOLAR PLANTS, INC., a	BRAHMA GROUP, INC.'S
	CODICA INDICINOSOBILITY	
20	Nevada corporation; AMERICAN HOME	MECHANIC'S LIEN
	Nevada corporation; AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE COMPANY, a surety; BOE	FORECLOSURE COMPLAINT
21	Nevada corporation; AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE COMPANY, a surety; BOE BONDING COMPANIES I through X; DOES I	
	Nevada corporation; AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE COMPANY, a surety; BOE	FORECLOSURE COMPLAINT AGAINST SURETY BOND
22	Nevada corporation; AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE COMPANY, a surety; BOE BONDING COMPANIES I through X; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X,	FORECLOSURE COMPLAINT
22 23	Nevada corporation; AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE COMPANY, a surety; BOE BONDING COMPANIES I through X; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X, inclusive,  Defendants,	FORECLOSURE COMPLAINT AGAINST SURETY BOND  [Arbitration Exemption: Amount in Controversy in Excess of \$50,000]
22	Nevada corporation; AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE COMPANY, a surety; BOE BONDING COMPANIES I through X; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X, inclusive,	FORECLOSURE COMPLAINT AGAINST SURETY BOND  [Arbitration Exemption: Amount in Controversy in Excess of \$50,000]
22 23	Nevada corporation; AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE COMPANY, a surety; BOE BONDING COMPANIES I through X; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X, inclusive,  Defendants,  Lien/Bond Claimant, BRAHMA GROUP, I	FORECLOSURE COMPLAINT AGAINST SURETY BOND  [Arbitration Exemption: Amount in Controversy in Excess of \$50,000]  NC. ("Brahma"), by and through its
22 23 24	Nevada corporation; AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE COMPANY, a surety; BOE BONDING COMPANIES I through X; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X, inclusive,  Defendants,  Lien/Bond Claimant, BRAHMA GROUP, I attorneys of record, the law firm of PEEL BRIMI	FORECLOSURE COMPLAINT AGAINST SURETY BOND  [Arbitration Exemption: Amount in Controversy in Excess of \$50,000]  NC. ("Brahma"), by and through its LEY LLP, as and for its Complaint in this
22 23 24 25 26	Nevada corporation; AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE COMPANY, a surety; BOE BONDING COMPANIES I through X; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X, inclusive,  Defendants,  Lien/Bond Claimant, BRAHMA GROUP, I	FORECLOSURE COMPLAINT AGAINST SURETY BOND  [Arbitration Exemption: Amount in Controversy in Excess of \$50,000]  NC. ("Brahma"), by and through its LEY LLP, as and for its Complaint in this
22 23 24 25	Nevada corporation; AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE COMPANY, a surety; BOE BONDING COMPANIES I through X; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X, inclusive,  Defendants,  Lien/Bond Claimant, BRAHMA GROUP, I attorneys of record, the law firm of PEEL BRIMI	FORECLOSURE COMPLAINT AGAINST SURETY BOND  [Arbitration Exemption: Amount in Controversy in Excess of \$50,000]  NC. ("Brahma"), by and through its LEY LLP, as and for its Complaint in this

# 3333 E. Serene A Vevue, ste. 200 Henderson, Nevada 89074 (702) 990-7272 + Fax (702) 990-7273

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

27

28

### THE PARTIES

- 1. Brahma is and was at all times relevant to this Action:
- a. A Nevada corporation, duly authorized and qualified to do business in the State of Nevada; and
- b. A duly licensed contractor holding a Nevada State Contractor's License, which license is in good standing.
- 2. Brahma is informed and believes and therefore alleges that the U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ("BLM"), is and was at all times relevant to this Action, an owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portions of real property located in Nye County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nye County Parcel Numbers 012-141-01 and 012-151-01 (the "BLM Parcels").
- Brahma is informed and believes and therefore alleges that LIBERTY MOLY, 3. LLC, a Delaware limited liability company ("Liberty"), is and was at all times relevant to this Action, an owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portions of real property located in Nye County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nye County Parcel Number 012-431-06 (the "Liberty Parcel").2
- 4. TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY, LLC ("TSE")3 is and was at all times relevant to this Action:
- A Delaware limited liability company authorized to do business in Nye County, Nevada;
- An owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portions of real property located in Nye County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nye County Parcel Numbers 012-031-04, 012-131-03, 012-131-04, 012-140-01, 012-150-01 and 612-141-01 (collectively, the "TSE Parcels");

<sup>26</sup> 1 The BLM is not a party to this Action and Brahma is not making a claim against the BLM or the fee simple title of the BLM Parcels by way of this Action.

<sup>2</sup> Liberty is not a party to this Action and Brahma is not making a claim against Liberty or the fee simple title of the Liberty Parcel by way of this Action.

While TSE is not a party to this Case, it is a party to Case No. CV 39348 in the Fifth Judicial District Court of Nye County, which Case Brahma will seek to consolidate this Action into.

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

c.	The lessee, tenant or the person, individual and/or entity who claims	; a
license or leasehold e	ate with respect to the BLM Parcels and the Liberty Parcels; and	

- d. The owner of those certain improvements and/or leasehold estate (the "Project"):
  - i. Commonly known as the Crescent Dunes Solar Energy Project; and
  - ii. Constructed on the BLM Parcels, the TSE Parcels, and the Liberty Parcels.4
- 5. The TSE Parcels, along with the Project, are collectively referred to herein as the "Work of Improvement," and include all leasehold estates, easements, rights-of-way, common areas and appurtenances related thereto, and the surrounding space as may be required for the convenient use and occupation of the Work of Improvement.
- 6. Brahma is informed, believes and therefore alleges that Defendant AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE COMPANY ("AHAC"):
- Is and was at all times relevant to this Action a bonding company duly a. licensed and qualified to do business as a surety in Nevada;
- Issued Bond No. 854481 ("Surety Bond") pursuant to NRS 108.2415 as b. discussed more fully below; and
  - Issued a Surety Rider to the Surety Bond as discussed more fully below.
- 7. Brahma is informed, believes and therefore alleges that Defendant COBRA THERMOSOLAR PLANTS, INC. ("Cobra"):
  - Is and was at all times relevant to this Action a Nevada corporation; and a.
  - b. Is the principal on the Surety Bond and the Rider.
- 8. Brahma does not know the true names of the individuals, corporations, partnerships and entities identified and named as Defendants by the fictitious names of (collectively, the "Doe Defendants"), (i) BOE BONDING COMPANIES I through X, (ii) DOES I through X, and (iii) ROE CORPORATIONS I through X. Brahma alleges that such Doe Defendants may be liable to Brahma for damages arising from the construction of the Work of Improvement, as more fully

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The term "Project" as used herein, does not include, and expressly excludes, the fee simple title of the BLM Parcels and the Liberty Parcels.

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

discussed under the claims for relief set forth below. Brahma will request leave of this Honorable Court to amend this Complaint to show the true names and capacities of each such fictitious Doe Defendants when Brahma discovers such information.

Cobra, AHAC and the Doe Defendants are collectively referred to in the Complaint as the "Defendants."

# FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Claim Against Surety, Surety Bond and Principal thereon)

- 10. Brahma repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint, incorporates them by reference, and further alleges as follows:
- On or about February 1, 2017, Brahma entered a Services Agreement (the 11. "Agreement") with TSE wherein Brahma agreed to provide certain construction related work, materials and/or equipment (the "Work") for the Work of Improvement.
- As provided in NRS 108.245, Brahma gave or served a copy of its Notice of Right 12. to Lien on:
  - a. The BLM; and
  - Ь. TSE, even though it had no statutory duty to do so.
- 13. The Work was provided for the whole of the Work of Improvement, at the special instance and/or request of TSE.
- On or about April 09, 2018, Brahma timely recorded a Notice of Lien in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada, as Document No. 890822 ("Original Lien"), in the amount of \$6,982,186.24.
- 15. On or about April 16, 2018 and as allowed by NRS 108.229(1), Brahma recorded a Notice of First Amended and Restated Lien in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada, as Document 891073 and re-recorded the same document on April 18, 2018 as Document No. 891507, in the amount of \$7,178,376.94 (the "First Amended Lien").
- On or about April 24, 2018 and allowed by NRS 108.229(1), Brahma recorded a 16. Notice of Second Amended and Restated Lien in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada, as Document 891766, in the amount of \$7,178,376.94 (the "Second Amended Lien").

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

	17.	On or about July 19, 2018 and as allowed by NRS 108.229(1), Brahma recorded a
Third	Amende	d and/or Restated Notice of Licn in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada
as Do	cument 8	196269, in the amount of \$11,902,474.75 (the "Third Amended Lien").

- 18. On or about September 14, 2018, Brahma recorded a Fourth Amended and/or Restated Notice of Lien in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada, as Document 899351 in the amount of \$12,859,577.74 (the "Fourth Amended Lien").
- The (i) Original Lien, (ii) First Amended Lien, (iii) Second Amended Lien, (iv) Third Amended Lien, and (iv) Fourth Amended Lien, collectively, the "Lien," were:
  - in writing; a.
  - b. recorded against the Work of Improvement; and
- c. given or served on the authorized agents of the BLM and TSE, or the BLM and/or TSE knew of the existence of the Lien.
- 20. The Lien is in the amount Twelve Million Eight Hundred and Fifty-Nine Thousand, Five Hundred and Seventy-Seven Dollars and Seventy-Four Cents. (\$12,859,577,74), which is the amount due and owing Brahma as of the date of this Complaint (the "Lienable Amount").
- On or about September 6, 2018, pursuant to NRS 108.2413, Cobra (as principal) and AHAC (as surety) caused the Surety Bond to be recorded in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada as Document No. 898975.
- 22. On or about October 9, 2018, Cobra (as principal) and AHAC (as surety) caused a Surety Rider ("Rider") to be recorded in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada as Document No. 900303.
  - 23, The Rider increased the penal sum of the Surety Bond to \$19,289,300.61.
- 24. NRS 108.2421(1) authorizes Brahma, as lien claimant, to bring an action against the principal (Cobra) and the surety (AHAC) on the Surety Bond and Rider within this Court.
- Brahma makes claim against Cobra and AHAC, and Cobra and AHAC are 25. obligated to Brahma for the Lienable Amount plus interest, costs and attorney's fees up to the penal sum of the Surety Bond and Rider as provided in Chapter 108 of the Nevada Revised Statutes.

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

# WHEREFORE, Brahma prays that this Honorable Court:

- Enters judgment against the Defendants, and each of them, jointly and severally in ١. the amount of the Lienable Amount;
- Enters a judgment against the Defendants and each of them, jointly and severally, 2. for Brahma's reasonable costs and attorney's fees incurred in the collection of the Lienable Amount, as well as an award of interest thereon;
- Enters judgment against AHAC up to the penal sum of the Surety Bond and Rider; 3. and
- For such other and further relief as this Honorable Court deems just and proper in 4. the premises.

### **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 December 2018.

PEEL BRIMLEY LLP

RICHARD L. PEEL, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 4359 ERIC ZIMBELMAN, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 9407

CARY B. DOMINA, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 10567

RONALD J. COX, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 12723

3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200

Henderson, Nevada 89074-6571

Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc.

RICHARD L. PEEL, Esq. 1 Nevada Bar No. 4359 ERIC B. ZIMBELMAN, ESQ. 2 2010 JAN -9 A 11:55 Nevada Bar No. 9407 CARY B. DOMINA, ESQ. 3 MYE COUNT Nevada Bar No. 10567 RONALD J. COX, ESQ. 4 Nevada Bar No. 12723 5 PEEL BRIMLEY LLP 3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200 Henderson, Nevada 89074-6571 6 Telephone: (702) 990-7272 Facsimile: (702) 990-7273 rpeel@peelbrimlev.com 7 ezimbelman@peelbrimlev.com 8 rcox@peelbrimlev.com 9 Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc. 10 FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT 11 PEEL BRIMLEY LLP 3333 E. SERENE AVENUE, STE. 200 HENDERSON, NEVADA 89074 (702) 990-7272 & FAX (702) 990-7273 NYE COUNTY, NEVADA 12 CASE NO. : CV 39348 TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY, LLC, a Delaware DEPT. NO. : 2 limited liability company, 13 Plaintiff, 14 NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER VS. 15 BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation, 16 Defendant. 17 BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation, 18 Counterclaimant/Lien Claimant, 19 vs. 20 TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY LLC, a Delaware 21 limited liability company; BOE BONDING COMPANIES I through X; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X; and TOE 22 TENANTS I through X, inclusive, 23 Counter-Defendant. 24 25 111 26 111 27 111

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.

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 1 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 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 to the party(ies) and/or attorney(s) listed below at the address and/or facsimile number indicated 12 below: 13 14 Geoffrey Crisp, Esq. D. Lee Roberts, Jr., Esq. 15 Colby L. Balkenbush, Esq. WEINBERG, WHEELER, HUDGINS 16 GUNN & DIAL, LLC 6385 S. Rainbow Blvd., Suite 400 Las Vegas, NV 89118 17 troberts@wwhgd.com 18 cbalkenbush@wwhgd.com Attorneys for Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

28

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

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

An Employee of Peel Brimley LLP

# EXHIBIT 1

**ORDR** 

26

27

28

CASE NO. : CV 39348

ORDER GRANTING BRAHMA'S MOTION FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS PURSUANT TO NRS

This matter came on for hearing December 11, 2018 (the "Hearing") before the Honorable Scnior Judge Steven Elliott on the Motion For Attorney's Fees And Costs Pursuant To NRS 108.2275(6)(c) ("Fee Motion") filed by BRAHMA GROUP, INC. ("Brahma"), Eric B. Zimbelman, Esq. of PEEL BRIMLEY LLP appeared on behalf of Brahma. D. Lee Roberts. Esq. of WEINBERG, WHEELER, HUDGINS, GUNN & DIAL, LLC appeared on behalf of

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 December 11, 2018:

### I. STATUTORY BASIS FOR AWARD OF FEES AND COSTS.

On October 17, 2018, this Court signed an Order Denying TSE's Motion to Expunge

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Order Denying the Underlying Motion was entered by the Clerk on October 29, 2018.

3333 E. Serene Avenue, ste. 200 Henderson, Nevada 89074 (702) 990-7272 + Fax (702) 999-727

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

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:
- (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. TT.

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).<sup>2</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The Brunzell factors are:

<sup>1)</sup> 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

ı

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 security<sup>3</sup> 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 then 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.

<sup>4)</sup> 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).

<sup>4</sup> 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."

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:

- 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:

- I. 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
- As agreed by the parties by a separate Stipulation attached hereto as Exhibit A. 2. 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

///

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 \( \frac{1}{2} \) day December 2018.

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.

Scnior 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

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1	ORDR	
	RICHARD L. PEEL, ESQ.	
2	11	
	ERIC B. ZIMBELMAN, ESQ.	
3	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	
0	Telephone: (702) 990-7272	
7	Facsimile: (702) 990-7273	
,	<u> </u>	
8	rcox@peelbrimley.com	
U	Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc.	
9	Milorneys for Brainna Group, Inc.	
	Ğ	
10	FIFTH JUDICIAL D	ISTRICT COURT
	NYE COUNTY	NEVADA
11	MIE COOM!	· MEAWAY
		CASE NO. ; CV 39348
12	limited liability company,	DEPT. NO. : 2
	n	
13	Plaintiff,	CONTRACT ACTION OF THE CAMPAGE
14		STIPULATION REGARDING
14	vs.	AMOUNT OF ADDITIONAL FEES AWARDED TO BRAHMA
15	BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation,	AWAKDED IO BRAHMA
15	BRAITIVIA GROUP, INC., a Nevaua corporation,	
16	Defendant.	
1		
17	Defendant BRAHMA GROUP, INC. ("E	Brahma") and Plaintiff TONOPAH SO
10	ENERGY IIC (STSEP) by and through their recog	ortivo agranda stinulata and agranda ortivo
* X 1		

LAR

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

FEEL BRIMLEY LLP 3333 E. Serene Avenue, ste. 200 Henderson, nevada 89074 (702) 990-7273 + Rax (702) 990-7273 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 21 day of December, 2018.

### PEEK 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
ppeel@peelbrimley.com
ezimbelman@peelbrimley.com
cdomina@peelbrimley.com
Attorneys for Defendant Brahma Group,
Inc.

WEINBERG, WHEELER, HUDGINS, GUNN & DIAP, LLC

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
Iroberts@wwhgd.com
cbalkenbush@wwhgd.com
rgormley@wwhgd.com
Attorneys for Plaintiff Tonopah Solar Energy,

Attorneys for Plaintiff Tonopah Solar Energy
LLC

	1	RICHARD L. PEEL, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 4359	
	2	ERIC B. ZIMBELMAN, ESQ.	pare with the CO In Iti.
	3	Nevada Bar No. 9407 CARY B. DOMINA, ESQ.	7019 JAN 11 P 1: 14:
	4	Nevada Bar No. 10567	NYE COUNT / CLEMA
	5	RONALD J. COX, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 12723	BYDEPUTY
	_	PEEL BRIMLEY LLP	
	6	3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200 Henderson, Nevada 89074-6571	
	7	Telephone: (702) 990-7272	
	8	Facsimile: (702) 990-7273 rpeel@peelbrimley.com	
	9	ezimbelman@peelbrimley.com	
	10	cdomina@peelbrimley.com rcox@peelbrimley.com	
m	11	Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc.	
E. 200 74 0-727	12		
LLP JE, STI A 890 02) 99	13	FIFTH JUDICIAL DIS	
Peel Brimley Lli Serene Avenue, Berson, Nevada 8 1-7272 + Fax (702)	14	NYE COUNTY, NEVADA	
L BRI VENE A SON, 1	15	The state of the tale of Newsda corporation	CASE NO. : CV39799
PEB E. SEI ENDER	16	BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation,	DEPT. NO. : 1
Peel I 3333 E. Serer Henderso (702) 990-7272	17	Plaintiff,	
6 6	1,8	vs.	
	19	COBRA THERMOSOLAR PLANTS, INC., a	BRAHMA GROUP, INC.'S FIRST
		Nevada corporation; AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE COMPANY, a surety; BOE	AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR (AMONG OTHER THINGS):
	20	BONDING COMPANIES I through X; DOES I	•
	21	through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X,	(I) FORECLOSURE OF NOTICE OF LIEN AGAINST SURETY BOND;
	22	inclusive,	AND
	<u>2</u> 3	Defendants,	(II) BREACH OF SETTLEMENT
	24		AGREEMENT.
	25		ra 1 ta dia Manadiana la andim
	26		[Arbitration Exemption: Amount in Controversy in Excess of \$50,000]
	27		

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

This First Amended Complaint for (Among Other Things) (i) Foreclosure of Notice of Lien Against Surety Bond, and (ii) Breach of Settlement Agreement ("Amended Complaint"), amends that certain Mechanic's Lien Foreclosure Complaint Against Surety Bond ("Original Complaint") filed with the Court on December 14, 2018 in this action (the "Action"), by Plaintiff, BRAHMA GROUP, INC. ("Brahma").

By way of this Amended Complaint against the above-named Defendants, Brahma, by and through its attorneys of record, the law firm of PEEL BRIMLEY LLP, complains, avers, and alleges as follows:

### THE PARTIES

- 1. Brahma is and was at all times relevant to this Action:
- A Nevada corporation, duly authorized and qualified to do business in the State of Nevada; and
- b. A duly licensed contractor holding a Nevada State Contractor's License, which license is in good standing.
- 2. Brahma is informed and believes and therefore alleges that the U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ("BLM"), is and was at all times relevant to this Action, an owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portions of real property located in Nye County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nye County Parcel Numbers 012-141-01 and 012-151-01 (the "BLM Parcels").
- Brahma is informed and believes and therefore alleges that LIBERTY MOLY, 3. LLC, a Delaware limited liability company ("Liberty"), is and was at all times relevant to this Action, an owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portions of real property located in Nye County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nye County Parcel Number 012-431-06 (the "Liberty Parcel").2

<sup>1</sup> The BLM is not a party to this Action and Brahma is not making a claim against the BLM or the fee simple title of the BLM Parcels by way of this Action.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Liberty is not a party to this Action and Brahma is not making a claim against Liberty or the fee simple title of the Liberty Parcel by way of this Action.

4.	TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY, LLC ("TSE")3 is and was at all times relevant to
this Action:	

- A Delaware limited liability company authorized to do business in Nye a. County, Nevada;
- b. An owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portions of real property located in Nye County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nye County Parcel Numbers 012-031-04, 012-131-03, 012-131-04, 012-140-01, 012-150-01 and 612-141-01 (collectively, the "TSE Parcels");
- The lessee, tenant or the person, individual and/or entity who claims a license or leasehold estate with respect to the BLM Parcels and the Liberty Parcels; and
- The owner of those certain improvements and/or leasehold estate (the d. "Project"):
  - i. Commonly known as the Crescent Dunes Solar Energy Project; and
  - ii. Constructed on the BLM Parcels, the TSE Parcels, and the Liberty

### Parcels.4

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

- 5. The TSE Parcels, along with the Project, are collectively referred to herein as the "Work of Improvement," and include all leasehold estates, easements, rights-of-way, common areas and appurtenances related thereto, and the surrounding space as may be required for the convenient use and occupation of the Work of Improvement.
- 6. Brahma is informed, believes and therefore alleges that Defendant AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE COMPANY ("AHAC"):
- Is and was at all times relevant to this Action a company duly licensed and a. qualified to issue surety bonds and do business in Nevada;
- Issued Bond No. 854481 ("Surety Bond") pursuant to NRS 108.2413 as b. discussed more fully below; and
  - Issued a Surety Rider to the Surety Bond as discussed more fully below. c.

<sup>3</sup> While TSE is not a party to this Case, it is a party to Case No. CV 39348 in the Fifth Judicial District Court of Nye County, which Case Brahma will seek to consolidate this Action into.

<sup>4</sup> The term "Project" as used herein, does not include, and expressly excludes, the fee simple title of the BLM Parcels and the Liberty Parcels.

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

- 7. Brahma is informed, believes and therefore alleges that Defendant COBRA THERMOSOLAR PLANTS, INC. ("Cobra"):
  - Is and was at all times relevant to this Action a Nevada corporation;
  - b. Is the principal on the Surety Bond and the Rider; and
- Is a party to a negotiated settlement between Cobra and Brahma for the C. payment of monies owed to Brahma for work Brahma performed directly for Cobra ("Cobra Work") at the Project.
- 8. Brahma does not know the true names of the individuals, corporations, partnerships and entities identified and named as Defendants by the fictitious names of (collectively, the "Doe Defendants"), (i) BOE BONDING COMPANIES I through X, (ii) DOES I through X, and (iii) ROE CORPORATIONS I through X. Brahma alleges that such Doe Defendants may be liable to Brahma for damages arising from the construction of the Work of Improvement, as more fully discussed under the claims for relief set forth below. Brahma will request leave of this Honorable Court to amend this Amended Complaint to show the true names and capacities of each such fictitious Doe Defendants when Brahma discovers such information.
- 9. Cobra, AHAC and the Doe Defendants, are sometimes referred to in the First Cause of Action of this Amended Complaint (below), (i) individually, as a "Defendant," and (ii) collectively, as the "Defendants".
- Cobra and the Does Defendants, are sometimes referred to in the Second through 10. Fourth Causes of Action (below), (i) individually, as a "Defendant," and (ii) collectively, as the "Defendants".

# FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Claim Against Surety, Surety Bond and Principal thereon)

- Brahma repeats and realleges each allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs 11. of this Amended Complaint, incorporates them by reference, and further alleges as follows:
- 12. On or about February 1, 2017, Brahma entered a Services Agreement with TSE (the "TSE Agreement") wherein Brahma agreed to provide certain work, materials and/or equipment (the "TSE Work") for the Work of Improvement.

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

13.	As provided in NRS 108.245, Brahma gave or served a copy of its Notice of Right
to Lien on:	

- a. The BLM; and
- b. TSE, even though it had no statutory duty to do so.
- 14. The TSE Work was provided for the whole of the Work of Improvement, at the special instance and/or request of TSE.
- 15. On or about April 9, 2018, Brahma timely recorded a Notice of Lien in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada, as Document No. 890822 ("Original Lien"), in the amount of \$6,982,186.24.
- 16. On or about April 16, 2018 (as allowed by NRS 108.229(1)) Brahma recorded a Notice of First Amended and Restated Lien in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada, as Document 891073 and as re-recorded by Brahma in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada on April 18, 2018, as Document No. 891507, in the amount of \$7,178,376.94 (the "First Amended Lien").
- On or about April 24, 2018 (as allowed by NRS 108.229(1)) Brahma recorded a 17. Notice of Second Amended and Restated Lien in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada, as Document 891766, in the amount of \$7,178,376.94 (the "Second Amended Lien").
- On or about July 19, 2018 (as allowed by NRS 108.229(1)) Brahma recorded a 18. Third Amended and/or Restated Notice of Lien in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada, as Document 896269, in the amount of \$11,902,474.75 (the "Third Amended Lien").
- 19. On or about September 14, 2018 (as allowed by NRS 108.229(1)) Brahma recorded a Fourth Amended and/or Restated Notice of Lien in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada, as Document 899351 in the amount of \$12,859,577.74 (the "Fourth Amended Lien").
- The (i) Original Lien, (ii) First Amended Lien, (iii) Second Amended Lien, (iv) 20. Third Amended Lien, and (iv) Fourth Amended Lien, collectively, referred to herein as the "Lien," were:
  - in writing; a.
  - recorded against the Work of Improvement; and b.

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

c.	given or served on the authorized agents of the BLM and TSE, or the BLM
and/or TSE knew of	the existence of the Lien.

- 21. The Lien (as amended) is in the amount Twelve Million Eight Hundred and Fifty-Nine Thousand, Five Hundred and Seventy-Seven Dollars and Seventy-Four Cents. (\$12,859,577,74 — "Lienable Amount").
- 22. The Lienable Amount is due and owing Brahma as of the date of this Amended Complaint.
- 23. On or about September 6, 2018, pursuant to NRS 108.2413, Cobra (as principal) and AHAC (as surety) caused the Surety Bond to be recorded in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada as Document No. 898975.
- 24. On or about October 9, 2018, Cobra (as principal) and AHAC (as surety) caused a Surety Rider ("Rider") to be recorded in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada as Document No. 900303.
  - The Rider increased the penal sum of the Surety Bond to \$19,289,300.61. 25.
- 26. NRS 108.2421(1) authorizes Brahma, as lien claimant, to bring an action against the principal (Cobra) and the surety (AHAC) on the Surety Bond and Rider within this Court.
- Brahma makes claim against the Defendants and AHAC is obligated to Brahma for 27. the Lienable Amount plus interest, costs, and attorney's fees up to the penal sum of the Surety Bond and Rider as provided in Chapter 108 of the Nevada Revised Statutes.

## SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

#### (Breach of Settlement Agreement Against Cobra)

- 28. Brahma repeats and realleges each allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Amended Complaint, incorporates them by reference, and further alleges as follows:
- 29. Prior to the commencement of the Work of Improvement, Brahma previously contracted directly with Cobra to perform the Cobra Work at the Project.
- Brahma performed the Cobra Work and a dispute over payment arose between 30. Brahma and Cobra (the "Cobra Dispute").

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

- 31. Brahma and Cobra (i) negotiated a resolution of the Cobra Dispute, and (ii) agreed to certain terms, which terms were memorialized in writing ("Settlement Agreement").
- 32. Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, Cobra was to make (i) a first payment to Brahma in the amount of \$2,881,397.67 ("First Payment") upon Brahma providing certain documentation/information concerning the Cobra Work (the "Documentation"), and (ii) a second payment to Brahma in the amount of \$412,224.62 ("Second Payment") upon Brahma providing additional documentation/information ("Additional Documentation").
  - 33. Brahma provided the Documentation and Cobra paid Brahma the First Payment.
- 34. Brahma tendered and/or provided Cobra the Additional Documentation to receive the Second Payment, but Cobra has failed to pay Brahma the Second Payment.
- 35. Brahma has tendered and/or performed its duties and obligations as required by the Settlement Agreement.
- 36. The Defendants have breached the Settlement Agreement by failing to tender payment of the Second Payment to Brahma, which Second Payment is due and owing.
- 37. Brahma has been required to engage the services of an attorney to collect the Second Payment, and Brahma is entitled to recover its reasonable costs, attorney's fees, and interest therefore.

#### THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

#### (Breach of Implied Covenant of Good Faith & Fair Dealing Against Cobra)

- 38. Brahma repeats and realleges each allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Amended Complaint, incorporates them by reference, and further alleges as follows:
- There is a covenant of good faith and fair dealing implied in every agreement, 39. including the Settlement Agreement.
- The Defendants breached their duty to act in good faith by performing the 40. Settlement Agreement in a manner that was unfaithful to the purpose of the Settlement Agreement, thereby denying Brahma's justified expectations.

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

	41.	Due to the actions of the Defendants, Brahma suffered damages in an amount more
than th	e Secon	d Payment, for which Brahma is entitled to judgment in an amount to be determined
at trial.		

42. Brahma has been required to engage the services of an attorney to collect the Second Payment, and Brahma is entitled to recover its reasonable costs, attorney's fees, and interest therefore.

#### FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Unjust Enrichment Against Cobra)

- 43. Brahma repeats and realleges each allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Amended Complaint, incorporates them by reference, and further alleges as follows:
  - 44. This cause of action is being pled in the alternative.
- 45. Brahma tendered and/or provided the Additional Documentation for the benefit and/or at the specific instance and request of the Defendants.
- 46. The Defendants accepted, used, and enjoyed the benefit of the Additional Documentation.
  - 47. Brahma has demanded payment of the Second Payment.
- 48. To Date, the Defendants have failed, neglected, and/or refused to pay the Second Payment.
  - 49. The Defendants have been unjustly enriched, to the detriment of Brahma.
- 50. Brahma has been required to engage the services of an attorney to collect the Second Payment, and Brahma is entitled to recover its reasonable costs, attorney's fees, and interest therefore.

WHEREFORE, with respect to the First Cause of Action, Brahma prays that this Honorable Court:

1. Enters judgment against the Defendants, and each of them, jointly and severally in the Lienable Amount;

1	
2	for
3	Am
4	
5	and
6	
7	the
8	
9	pray
10	
11	the
12	in th
13	
14	the.
15	
16	
17	soci
18.	
19	
20	
21	
22 .	
<u>2</u> 3	
24	
25	
26-	
27	
1	1

Enters a judgment against the Defendants and each of them, jointly and severally,
 for Brahma's reasonable costs and attorney's fees incurred in the collection of the Lienable
 Amount, as well as an award of interest thereon;

- 3. Enters judgment against AHAC up to the penal sum of the Surety Bond and Rider;
- 4. For such other and further relief as this Honorable Court deems just and proper in the premises.

WHEREFORE, with respect to the Second through Fourth Causes of Action, Brahma prays that this Honorable Court:

- 1. Enters judgment against the Defendants and each of them, jointly and severally, in the amount of the Second Payment, plus Brahma's reasonable costs and attorney's fees incurred in the collection of the Second Payment; and
- 2. For such other and further relief as this Honorable Court deems just and proper in the premises.

#### 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 11th day of January 2019.

PEEL BRIMLEY LLP

RICHARÓ L. PEEL, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 4359

ERIC ZIMBELMAN, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 9407

CARY B. DOMINA, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 10567

RONALD J. COX, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 12723 3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200

Henderson, Nevada 89074-6571

Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc.

## EXHIBIT 11

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1	RICHARD L. PEEL, ESQ.
2	Nevada Bar No. 4359 ERIC B. ZIMBELMAN, ESQ.
3	Nevada Bar No. 9407 CARY B. DOMINA, ESQ.
4	Nevada Bar No. 10567 RONALD J. COX, ESQ.
5	Nevada Bar No. 12723 PEEL BRIMLEY LLP
6	3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200
7	Henderson, Nevada 89074-6571 Telephone: (702) 990-7272
8	Facsimile: (702) 990-7273
9	rpeel@peelbrimley.com ezimbelman@peelbrimley.com
10	cdomina@peelbrimley.com rcox@peelbrimley.com
11	Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc.
12	
13	FIFTH
14	I
15	BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Neva
16	
17	Plaintiff,
	<b>\</b>

2019 JAN | 1 P |: |4 HYE COURT : ULE .....

## TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

#### NYE COUNTY, NEVADA

evada corporation,

vs.

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

Defendants,

CASE NO. : CV39799 DEPT. NO.: 1

BRAHMA GROUP, INC.'S FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR (AMONG OTHER THINGS):

(I) FORECLOSURE OF NOTICE OF LIEN AGAINST SURETY BOND; AND

(II) BREACH OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.

[Arbitration Exemption: Amount in Controversy in Excess of \$50,000]

3333 E. Serene Avenue, ste. 200 Henderson, nevada 89074 (702) 990-7272 + Fax (702) 990-7273

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

28

This First Amended Complaint for (Among Other Things) (i) Foreclosure of Notice of Lien Against Surety Bond, and (ii) Breach of Settlement Agreement ("Amended Complaint"), amends that certain Mechanic's Lien Foreclosure Complaint Against Surety Bond ("Original Complaint") filed with the Court on December 14, 2018 in this action (the "Action"), by Plaintiff, BRAHMA GROUP, INC. ("Brahma").

By way of this Amended Complaint against the above-named Defendants, Brahma, by and through its attorneys of record, the law firm of PEEL BRIMLEY LLP, complains, avers, and alleges as follows:

#### THE PARTIES

- 1. Brahma is and was at all times relevant to this Action:
- A Nevada corporation, duly authorized and qualified to do business in the State of Nevada; and
- b. A duly licensed contractor holding a Nevada State Contractor's License, which license is in good standing.
- 2. Brahma is informed and believes and therefore alleges that the U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ("BLM"), is and was at all times relevant to this Action, an owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portions of real property located in Nye County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nye County Parcel Numbers 012-141-01 and 012-151-01 (the "BLM Parcels").1
- 3. Brahma is informed and believes and therefore alleges that LIBERTY MOLY, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company ("Liberty"), is and was at all times relevant to this Action, an owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portions of real property located in Nye County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nye County Parcel Number 012-431-06 (the "Liberty Parcel").2

<sup>27</sup> 1 The BLM is not a party to this Action and Brahma is not making a claim against the BLM or the fee simple title of the BLM Parcels by way of this Action.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Liberty is not a party to this Action and Brahma is not making a claim against Liberty or the fee simple title of the Liberty Parcel by way of this Action.

and the Liberty Parcels.

1	4. TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY, LLC ("TSE") <sup>3</sup> is and was at all times relevant to
2	this Action:
3	a. A Delaware limited liability company authorized to do business in Nye
4	County, Nevada;
5	b. An owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portions of real
6	property located in Nye County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nye County Parcel
7	Numbers 012-031-04, 012-131-03, 012-131-04, 012-140-01, 012-150-01 and 612-141-01
8	(collectively, the "TSE Parcels");
9	c. The lessee, tenant or the person, individual and/or entity who claims a
10	license or leasehold estate with respect to the BLM Parcels and the Liberty Parcels; and
11	d. The owner of those certain improvements and/or leasehold estate (the
12	"Project"):
13	i. Commonly known as the Crescent Dunes Solar Energy Project; and
14	ii. Constructed on the BLM Parcels, the TSE Parcels, and the Liberty
15	Parcels. <sup>4</sup>
16	5. The TSE Parcels, along with the Project, are collectively referred to herein as the
17	"Work of Improvement," and include all leasehold estates, easements, rights-of-way, common
18	areas and appurtenances related thereto, and the surrounding space as may be required for the
19	convenient use and occupation of the Work of Improvement.
20	6. Brahma is informed, believes and therefore alleges that Defendant AMERICAN
21	HOME ASSURANCE COMPANY ("AHAC"):
22	a. Is and was at all times relevant to this Action a company duly licensed and
23	qualified to issue surety bonds and do business in Nevada;
24	b. Issued Bond No. 854481 ("Surety Bond") pursuant to NRS 108.2413 as
25	discussed more fully below; and
26	c. Issued a Surety Rider to the Surety Bond as discussed more fully below.
27	<sup>3</sup> While TSE is not a party to this Case, it is a party to Case No. CV 39348 in the Fifth Judicial District Court of Nye County, which Case Brahma will seek to consolidate this Action into.
28	County, which Case Branma will seek to consolidate this restort mass.  4 The term "Project" as used herein, does not include, and expressly excludes, the fee simple title of the BLM Parcels.

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

- 7. Brahma is informed, believes and therefore alleges that Defendant COBRA THERMOSOLAR PLANTS, INC. ("Cobra"):
  - Is and was at all times relevant to this Action a Nevada corporation;
  - b. Is the principal on the Surety Bond and the Rider; and
- c. Is a party to a negotiated settlement between Cobra and Brahma for the payment of monies owed to Brahma for work Brahma performed directly for Cobra ("Cobra Work") at the Project.
- 8. Brahma does not know the true names of the individuals, corporations, partnerships and entities identified and named as Defendants by the fictitious names of (collectively, the "Doe Defendants"), (i) BOE BONDING COMPANIES I through X, (ii) DOES I through X, and (iii) ROE CORPORATIONS I through X. Brahma alleges that such Doe Defendants may be liable to Brahma for damages arising from the construction of the Work of Improvement, as more fully discussed under the claims for relief set forth below. Brahma will request leave of this Honorable Court to amend this Amended Complaint to show the true names and capacities of each such fictitious Doe Defendants when Brahma discovers such information.
- 9. Cobra, AHAC and the Doe Defendants, are sometimes referred to in the First Cause of Action of this Amended Complaint (below), (i) individually, as a "Defendant," and (ii) collectively, as the "Defendants".
- Cobra and the Does Defendants, are sometimes referred to in the Second through 10. Fourth Causes of Action (below), (i) individually, as a "Defendant," and (ii) collectively, as the "Defendants".

### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

#### (Claim Against Surety, Surety Bond and Principal thereon)

- 11. Brahma repeats and realleges each allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Amended Complaint, incorporates them by reference, and further alleges as follows:
- 12. On or about February 1, 2017, Brahma entered a Services Agreement with TSE (the "TSE Agreement") wherein Brahma agreed to provide certain work, materials and/or equipment (the "TSE Work") for the Work of Improvement.

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

- 13. As provided in NRS 108.245, Brahma gave or served a copy of its Notice of Right to Lien on: The BLM; and b. TSE, even though it had no statutory duty to do so. 14. The TSE Work was provided for the whole of the Work of Improvement, at the special instance and/or request of TSE.
- 15. On or about April 9, 2018, Brahma timely recorded a Notice of Lien in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada, as Document No. 890822 ("Original Lien"), in the amount of \$6,982,186.24.
- 16. On or about April 16, 2018 (as allowed by NRS 108.229(1)) Brahma recorded a Notice of First Amended and Restated Lien in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada, as Document 891073 and as re-recorded by Brahma in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada on April 18, 2018, as Document No. 891507, in the amount of \$7,178,376.94 (the "First Amended Lien").
- 17. On or about April 24, 2018 (as allowed by NRS 108.229(1)) Brahma recorded a Notice of Second Amended and Restated Lien in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada, as Document 891766, in the amount of \$7,178,376.94 (the "Second Amended Lien").
- 18. On or about July 19, 2018 (as allowed by NRS 108.229(1)) Brahma recorded a Third Amended and/or Restated Notice of Lien in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada, as Document 896269, in the amount of \$11,902,474.75 (the "Third Amended Lien").
- 19. On or about September 14, 2018 (as allowed by NRS 108.229(1)) Brahma recorded a Fourth Amended and/or Restated Notice of Lien in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada, as Document 899351 in the amount of \$12,859,577.74 (the "Fourth Amended Lien").
- 20. The (i) Original Lien, (ii) First Amended Lien, (iii) Second Amended Lien, (iv) Third Amended Lien, and (iv) Fourth Amended Lien, collectively, referred to herein as the "Lien," were:
  - in writing; a.
  - recorded against the Work of Improvement; and b.

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

- c. given or served on the authorized agents of the BLM and TSE, or the BLM and/or TSE knew of the existence of the Lien.
- 21. The Lien (as amended) is in the amount Twelve Million Eight Hundred and Fifty-Nine Thousand, Five Hundred and Seventy-Seven Dollars and Seventy-Four Cents. (\$12,859,577,74 — "Lienable Amount").
- 22. The Lienable Amount is due and owing Brahma as of the date of this Amended Complaint.
- 23. On or about September 6, 2018, pursuant to NRS 108.2413, Cobra (as principal) and AHAC (as surety) caused the Surety Bond to be recorded in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada as Document No. 898975.
- 24. On or about October 9, 2018, Cobra (as principal) and AHAC (as surety) caused a Surety Rider ("Rider") to be recorded in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada as Document No. 900303.
  - 25. The Rider increased the penal sum of the Surety Bond to \$19,289,300.61.
- 26. NRS 108.2421(1) authorizes Brahma, as lien claimant, to bring an action against the principal (Cobra) and the surety (AHAC) on the Surety Bond and Rider within this Court.
- Brahma makes claim against the Defendants and AHAC is obligated to Brahma for 27. the Lienable Amount plus interest, costs, and attorney's fees up to the penal sum of the Surety Bond and Rider as provided in Chapter 108 of the Nevada Revised Statutes.

#### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

#### (Breach of Settlement Agreement Against Cobra)

- Brahma repeats and realleges each allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs 28. of this Amended Complaint, incorporates them by reference, and further alleges as follows:
- 29. Prior to the commencement of the Work of Improvement, Brahma previously contracted directly with Cobra to perform the Cobra Work at the Project.
- 30. Brahma performed the Cobra Work and a dispute over payment arose between Brahma and Cobra (the "Cobra Dispute").

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

- 31. Brahma and Cobra (i) negotiated a resolution of the Cobra Dispute, and (ii) agreed to certain terms, which terms were memorialized in writing ("Settlement Agreement").
- 32. Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, Cobra was to make (i) a first payment to Brahma in the amount of \$2,881,397.67 ("First Payment") upon Brahma providing certain documentation/information concerning the Cobra Work (the "Documentation"), and (ii) a second payment to Brahma in the amount of \$412,224.62 ("Second Payment") upon Brahma providing additional documentation/information ("Additional Documentation").
  - 33. Brahma provided the Documentation and Cobra paid Brahma the First Payment.
- 34. Brahma tendered and/or provided Cobra the Additional Documentation to receive the Second Payment, but Cobra has failed to pay Brahma the Second Payment.
- 35. Brahma has tendered and/or performed its duties and obligations as required by the Settlement Agreement.
- 36. The Defendants have breached the Settlement Agreement by failing to tender payment of the Second Payment to Brahma, which Second Payment is due and owing.
- Brahma has been required to engage the services of an attorney to collect the 37. Second Payment, and Brahma is entitled to recover its reasonable costs, attorney's fees, and interest therefore.

#### THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Breach of Implied Covenant of Good Faith & Fair Dealing Against Cobra)

- 38. Brahma repeats and realleges each allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Amended Complaint, incorporates them by reference, and further alleges as follows:
- 39. There is a covenant of good faith and fair dealing implied in every agreement, including the Settlement Agreement.
- 40. The Defendants breached their duty to act in good faith by performing the Settlement Agreement in a manner that was unfaithful to the purpose of the Settlement Agreement, thereby denying Brahma's justified expectations.

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- Due to the actions of the Defendants, Brahma suffered damages in an amount more 41. than the Second Payment, for which Brahma is entitled to judgment in an amount to be determined at trial.
- Brahma has been required to engage the services of an attorney to collect the 42. Second Payment, and Brahma is entitled to recover its reasonable costs, attorney's fees, and interest therefore.

## FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Unjust Enrichment Against Cobra)

- Brahma repeats and realleges each allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs 43. of this Amended Complaint, incorporates them by reference, and further alleges as follows:
  - This cause of action is being pled in the alternative. 44.
- Brahma tendered and/or provided the Additional Documentation for the benefit 45. and/or at the specific instance and request of the Defendants.
- The Defendants accepted, used, and enjoyed the benefit of the Additional 46. Documentation.
  - Brahma has demanded payment of the Second Payment. 47.
- To Date, the Defendants have failed, neglected, and/or refused to pay the Second 48. Payment.
  - The Defendants have been unjustly enriched, to the detriment of Brahma. 49.
- Brahma has been required to engage the services of an attorney to collect the 50. Second Payment, and Brahma is entitled to recover its reasonable costs, attorney's fees, and interest therefore.

WHEREFORE, with respect to the First Cause of Action, Brahma prays that this Honorable Court:

Enters judgment against the Defendants, and each of them, jointly and severally in 1. the Lienable Amount;

2	
3	4
4	
5	á
6	
7	1
8	
9	1
10	
11	t
12	i
13	
14	t
15	
16	
17	S
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
<u>2</u> 3	
24	
25	
26	
27	

1

2. Enters a judgment against the Defendants and each of them, jointly and severally, for Brahma's reasonable costs and attorney's fees incurred in the collection of the Lienable Amount, as well as an award of interest thereon;

- 3. Enters judgment against AHAC up to the penal sum of the Surety Bond and Rider;
- 4. For such other and further relief as this Honorable Court deems just and proper in the premises.

WHEREFORE, with respect to the Second through Fourth Causes of Action, Brahma prays that this Honorable Court:

- 1. Enters judgment against the Defendants and each of them, jointly and severally, in the amount of the Second Payment, plus Brahma's reasonable costs and attorney's fees incurred in the collection of the Second Payment; and
- 2. For such other and further relief as this Honorable Court deems just and proper in the premises.

#### 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 11th day of January 2019.

PEEL BRIMLEY LLP

RICHARD L. PEEL, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 4359

ERIC ZIMBELMAN, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 9407

CARY B. DOMINA, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 10567

RONALD J. COX, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 12723

3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200

Henderson, Nevada 89074-6571

Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc.

# EXHIBIT 12

1	RICHARD L. PEEL, ESQ.	
2	Nevada Bar No. 4359 ERIC B. ZIMBELMAN, ESQ.	
3	Nevada Bar No. 9407	
4	RONALD J. COX, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 12723	
5	PEEL BRIMLEY LLP 3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200	
6	Henderson, Nevada 89074-6571	
7	Telephone: (702) 990-7272 Facsimile: (702) 990-7273	
8	rpeel@peelbrimley.com ezimbelman@peelbrimley.com	
9	rcox@peelbrimley.com	
	Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc.	
10	FIFTH JUDICIAL DIS	STRICT COURT
11	NYE COUNTY,	NEVADA
12	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	CASE NO. : C
13	limited liability company,	Consolidated wii
14	Plaintiff,	Case No. CV397
15	vs.	
16	BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation,	DEPT. NO. : 2
17	Defendant.	BRAHMA GRO
18	Determant.	COMPLA
19		(II) FIRST AM PARTY C
20		
21		[Arbitration E
22	BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation,	Controversy
23	Lien/Bond Claimant,	
24		
25	vs.	
26	TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY LLC, a Delaware limited liability company; BOE BONDING	
27	COMPANIES I through X; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X; and TOE	
, ,	TENIANTS I through Y inclusive	

NEVADA CASE NO. : CV 39348

Consolidated with:

Case No. CV39799

#### BRAHMA GROUP, INC.'S:

- SECOND AMENDED **COMPLAINT; AND**
- (II) FIRST AMENDED THIRD-PARTY COMPLAINT.

[Arbitration Exemption: Amount in Controversy in Excess of \$50,000]

24

25

26

27

28

Counterdefendants,

BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation,

Lien/Bond Claimant and Third-Party Plaintiff,

vs.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

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

Third-Party Defendants.

#### SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT

Lien/Bond Claimant, BRAHMA GROUP, INC. ("Brahma"), by and through its attorneys of record, the law firm of PEEL BRIMLEY LLP, and by way of this Second Amended Complaint ("Second Amended Complaint"), hereby (i) amends all previously filed claims and causes of action filed in this Action, (ii) brings this Second Amended Complaint against the above-named Counterdefendants, and (iii) complains, avers and alleges as follows:

#### THE PARTIES

- Brahma is and was at all times relevant to this Action: 1.
- A Nevada corporation, duly authorized and qualified to do business in the State of Nevada; and
- A duly licensed contractor holding a Nevada State Contractor's License, b. which license is in good standing.
- Brahma is informed and believes and therefore alleges that the U.S. 2. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ("BLM"), is and was at all times relevant to this Action, an owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or

portions of real property located in Nye County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nye County Parcel Numbers 012-141-01 and 012-151-01 (the "BLM Parcels").

- 3. Brahma is informed and believes and therefore alleges that LIBERTY MOLY, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company ("Liberty"), is and was at all times relevant to this Action, an owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portions of real property located in Nye County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nye County Parcel Number 012-431-06 (the "Liberty Parcel").<sup>2</sup>
- 4. Counterdefendant TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY, LLC ("TSE") is and was at all times relevant to this Action:
- a. A Delaware limited liability company authorized to do business in Nye County and the State of Nevada;
- b. An owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portions of real property located in Nye County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nye County Parcel Numbers 012-031-04, 012-131-03, 012-131-04, 012-140-01, 012-150-01 and 612-141-01 (collectively, the "TSE Parcels");
- c. The lessee, tenant or the person, individual and/or entity who claims a license or leasehold estate with respect to the BLM Parcels and the Liberty Parcels; and
- d. The owner of those certain improvements and/or leasehold estate (the "Project"):
  - i. Commonly known as the Crescent Dunes Solar Energy Project; and
- ii. Constructed on the BLM Parcels, the TSE Parcels, and the Liberty Parcels.<sup>3</sup>
- 5. The TSE Parcels, along with the Project, are collectively referred to herein as the "Work of Improvement," and include all leasehold estates, easements, rights-of-way, common

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The BLM is not a party to this Action and Brahma is not making a claim against the BLM or the fee simple title of the BLM Parcels by way of this Action.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Liberty is not a party to this Action and Brahma is not making a claim against Liberty or the fee simple title of the Liberty Parcel by way of this Action.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The term "Project" as used herein, does not include, and expressly excludes, the fee simple title of the BLM Parcels and the Liberty Parcels.

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

areas and appurtenances related thereto, and the surrounding space as may be required for the convenient use and occupation of the Work of Improvement.

1

- Brahma does not know the true names of the individuals, corporations, partnerships 6. and entities identified and named as Counterdefendants by the fictitious names of (collectively, the "Doe Defendants"), (i) DOES I through X, (ii) ROE CORPORATIONS I through X, (iii) BOE BONDING COMPANIES I through X, and (iv) TOE TENANTS I through X. Brahma alleges that such Doe Defendants are responsible for damages suffered by Brahma as more fully discussed under the claims for relief set forth below. Brahma will request leave of this Honorable Court to amend this Second Amended Complaint to show the true names and capacities of each such fictitious Defendant when Brahma discovers such information.
- TSE and the Doe Defendants are collectively referred to in this Second Amended 7. Complaint as the "Counterdefendants."

#### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Breach of Contract)

- Brahma repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the preceding 8. paragraphs of this Second Amended Complaint, incorporates them by reference, and further alleges as follows:
- 9. On or about February 1, 2017, BGI entered a Services Agreement (the "Agreement") with TSE, wherein BGI agreed to provide certain work, materials and/or equipment (the "Work") for the Work of Improvement.
- BGI furnished the Work for the benefit of and/or at the specific instance and request 10. of TSE and the Work of Improvement and has otherwise performed its duties and obligations as required by the Agreement.
- As required by the Agreement, BGI has, and in the form and manner required by 11. the Agreement, provided monthly invoices or payment applications (collectively, "Payment Applications") to TSE for the Work in an amount totaling more than Twenty-Six Million U.S. Dollars (\$26,000,000.00).

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

111

25

26

27

28

- Pursuant to the Agreement and Nevada law, TSE agreed to and is obligated to pay 12. BGI for its Work within no more than 45 days after TSE's receipt of BGI's Payment Applications.
  - 13. TSE breached the Agreement by, among other things:
    - Failing and/or refusing to pay monies owed to BGI for the Work; and a.
- Otherwise failing and/or refusing to comply with the Agreement and b. Nevada law.
- 14. BGI is owed Twelve Million Eight Hundred Fifty-Nine Thousand Five Hundred Seventy-Seven and 74/100 Dollars (\$12,859,577,74—"Outstanding Balance") from TSE for the Work.
- BGI has been required to engage the services of an attorney to collect the 15. Outstanding Balance, and BGI is entitled to recover its reasonable costs, attorney's fees and interest therefor.

#### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION (Breach of Implied Covenant of Good Faith & Fair Dealing)

- 16. Brahma repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs of the Second Amended Complaint, incorporates them by reference, and further alleges as follows:
- There is a covenant of good faith and fair dealing implied in every agreement, 17. including the Agreement between BGI and TSE.
- TSE breached its duty to act in good faith by performing the Agreement in a manner 18. that was unfaithful to the purpose of the Agreement, thereby denying BGI's justified expectations.
  - Specifically, but without limitation, TSE breached its duty to act in good faith by: 19.
- Asserting pre-textual, extra-contractual and inaccurate reasons for a. withholding payment long after the time required by the Agreement and Nevada law had elapsed for payment to be made by TSE to BGI.
- b. TSE has improperly withheld moneys totaling more than One Million U.S. Dollars for "retention" in purported reliance upon NRS 624.609(2)(a)(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

111

c. Furthermor	e, and even if the Agreement allowed TSE to withhold retention	
from monthly payments (which it	does not), TSE's withholding of retention amounts retroactively	
aggregated from Payment Applications issued (and, in some cases, payments previously made		
long ago constitutes extreme bad f	aith.	

ľ

Due to the actions of TSE, BGI suffered damages in the amount of or exceeding 20. the Outstanding Balance for which BGI is entitled to judgment in an amount to be determined at trial.

21. BGI has been required to engage the services of an attorney to collect the Outstanding Balance, and BGI is entitled to recover its reasonable costs, attorney's fees and interest therefor.

#### THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION (Violation of NRS 624)

- Brahma repeats and realleges each allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs 22. of this Second Amended Counter-Complaint, incorporates them by reference, and further alleges as follows:
- NRS 624.609 and NRS 624.610 (the "Statute") requires owners (such as TSE and 23. as defined by the Statute) to, among other things, (i) timely pay their prime contractors (such as BGI and as defined by the Statute), and (ii) respond to payment applications and change order requests, as provided in the Statute.
- TSE violated the provisions of the Statute by failing or refusing to comply with the 24. requirements set forth therein.
- By reason of the foregoing, BGI is entitled to a judgment against TSE in the amount 25. of the Outstanding Balance as well as other remedies as defined by the applicable law.
- BGI has been required to engage the services of an attorney to collect the 26. Outstanding Balance due and owing for the Work, and BGI is entitled to recover its reasonable costs, attorney's fees and interest therefore.

WHEREFORE, Brahma prays that this Honorable Court:

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	The second second
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

1.	Enters judgment against the Counterdefendants, and each of them, jointly and
severally in th	amount of the Outstanding Balance;

- 2. Enters a judgment against the Counterdefendants, and each of them, jointly and severally, for Brahma's reasonable costs and attorney's fees incurred in the collection of the Outstanding Balance, as well as an award of interest thereon; and
- 3. For such other and further relief as this Honorable Court deems just and proper in the premises.

#### **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 March 2019.

#### 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.

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

#### BRAHMA GROUP, INC.'S FIRST AMENDED THIRD-PARTY COMPLAINT

Lien/Bond Claimant and Third-Party Plaintiff, BRAHMA GROUP, INC. ("Brahma"), by and through its attorneys of record, the law firm of PEEL BRIMLEY LLP, and by way of this First Amended Third-Party Complaint ("Amended Third-Party Complaint"), hereby (i) amends all previously filed claims and causes of action filed in this Third-Party Action, (ii) brings this Amended Third-Party Complaint against the above-named Third-Party Defendants, and (iii) complains, avers and alleges as follows:

#### THE PARTIES

- 1. Brahma is and was at all times relevant to this Third-Party Action:
- a. A Nevada corporation, duly authorized and qualified to do business in the State of Nevada;
- b. A duly licensed contractor holding a Nevada State Contractor's License,
   which license is in good standing; and
- c. Is a party to a negotiated settlement between Cobra and Brahma for the payment of monies owed to Brahma for work Brahma performed directly for Cobra ("Cobra Work") at the Project.
- 2. Brahma is informed and believes and therefore alleges that the U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ("BLM"), is and was at all times relevant to this Third-Party Action, an owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portions of real property located in Nye County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nye County Parcel Numbers 012-141-01 and 012-151-01 (the "BLM Parcels").<sup>4</sup>
- 3. Brahma is informed and believes and therefore alleges that LIBERTY MOLY, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company ("Liberty"), is and was at all times relevant to this Third-Party Action, an owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portions of real

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The BLM is not a party to this Action and Brahma is not making a claim against the BLM or the fee simple title of the BLM Parcels by way of this Action.

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

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

property located in Nye County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nye County Parcel Number 012-431-06 (the "Liberty Parcel").5

- TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY, LLC ("TSE")6 is and was at all times relevant to this Third-Party Action:
- A Delaware limited liability company authorized to do business in Nye County, Nevada;
- An owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portions of real property located in Nye County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nye County Parcel Numbers 012-031-04, 012-131-03, 012-131-04, 012-140-01, 012-150-01 and 612-141-01 (collectively, the "TSE Parcels");
- The lessee, tenant or the person, individual and/or entity who claims a c. license or leasehold estate with respect to the BLM Parcels and the Liberty Parcels; and
- The owner of those certain improvements and/or leasehold estate (the d. "Project"):
  - i. Commonly known as the Crescent Dunes Solar Energy Project; and
  - ii. Constructed on the BLM Parcels, the TSE Parcels, and the Liberty

Parcels.7

- The TSE Parcels, along with the Project, are collectively referred to herein as the 5. "Work of Improvement," and include all leasehold estates, easements, rights-of-way, common areas and appurtenances related thereto, and the surrounding space as may be required for the convenient use and occupation of the Work of Improvement.
- Brahma is informed, believes and therefore alleges that Third-Party Defendant 6. AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE COMPANY ("AHAC"):
- Is and was at all times relevant to this Third-Party Action a bonding company duly licensed and qualified to do business as a surety in Nevada;

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Liberty is not a party to this Action and Brahma is not making a claim against Liberty or the fee simple title of the Liberty Parcel by way of this Action.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> TSE is a party to Brahma's Second Amended Complaint, filed in the Action.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> The term "Project" as used herein, does not include, and expressly excludes, the fee simple title of the BLM Parcels and the Liberty Parcels.

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

- Issued Bond No. 854481 ("Surety Bond") pursuant to NRS 108.2413 as b. discussed more fully below; and
  - Issued a Surety Rider to the Surety Bond as discussed more fully below. c.
- 7. Brahma is informed, believes and therefore alleges that Third-Party Defendant COBRA THERMOSOLAR PLANTS, INC. ("Cobra"):
- Is and was at all times relevant to this Third-Party Action a Nevada a. corporation;
  - Is the principal on the Surety Bond and the Rider; and b.
- Is a party to a negotiated settlement between Cobra and Brahma for the c. payment of monies owed to Brahma for work Brahma performed directly for Cobra ("Cobra Work") at the Project.
- Brahma does not know the true names of the individuals, corporations, partnerships 8. and entities identified and named as Third-Party Defendants by the fictitious names of (collectively, the "Doe Defendants"), (i) BOE BONDING COMPANIES I through X, (ii) DOES I through X, and (iii) ROE CORPORATIONS I through X. Brahma alleges that such Doe Defendants may be liable to Brahma for claims and/or damages arising from the construction of the Work of Improvement, as more fully discussed under the claims for relief set forth below. Brahma will request leave of this Honorable Court to amend this Amended Third-Party Complaint to show the true names and capacities of each such fictitious Doe Defendants when Brahma discovers such information.
- Cobra, AHAC and the Doe Defendants are collectively referred to in this Amended 9. Third-Party Complaint as the "Third-Party Defendants."

#### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Claim Against Surety, Surety Bond and Principal thereon)

Brahma repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the preceding 10. paragraphs of this Amended Third-Party Complaint, incorporates them by reference, and further alleges as follows:

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

- 11. On or about February 1, 2017, Brahma entered a Services Agreement with TSE (the "TSE Agreement") wherein Brahma agreed to provide certain work, materials and/or equipment (the "TSE Work") for the Work of Improvement.
- As provided in NRS 108.245, Brahma gave or served a copy of its Notice of Right 12. to Lien on:
  - The BLM; and a.
  - TSE, even though it had no statutory duty to do so. b.
- The TSE Work was provided for the whole of the Work of Improvement, at the 13. special instance and/or request of TSE.
- On or about April 9, 2018, Brahma timely recorded a Notice of Lien in the Official 14. Records of Nye County, Nevada, as Document No. 890822 ("Original Lien"), in the amount of \$6,982,186.24.
- 15. On or about April 16, 2018 (as allowed by NRS 108.229(1)), Brahma recorded a Notice of First Amended and Restated Lien in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada, as Document 891073 and as re-recorded by Brahma in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada on April 18, 2018, as Document No. 891507, in the amount of \$7,178,376.94 (the "First Amended Lien").
- On or about April 24, 2018 (as allowed by NRS 108.229(1)), Brahma recorded a 16. Notice of Second Amended and Restated Lien in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada, as Document 891766, in the amount of \$7,178,376.94 (the "Second Amended Lien").
- On or about July 19, 2018 (as allowed by NRS 108.229(1)), Brahma recorded a 17. Third Amended and/or Restated Notice of Lien in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada, as Document 896269, in the amount of \$11,902,474.75 (the "Third Amended Lien").
- On or about September 14, 2018 (as allowed by NRS 108.229(1)), Brahma recorded 18. a Fourth Amended and/or Restated Notice of Lien in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada, as Document 899351 in the amount of \$12,859,577.74 (the "Fourth Amended Lien").

28

19.

1

2

3	were:
4	c. In writing;
5	d. Recorded against the Work of Improvement; and
6	e. Were given or served on the authorized agents of the BLM and TSE, or the
7	BLM and/or TSE knew of the existence of the Lien.
8	20. The Lien (as amended) is in the amount Twelve Million Eight Hundred and Fifty-
9	Nine Thousand, Five Hundred and Seventy-Seven Dollars and Seventy-Four Cents.
10	(\$12,859,577,74 - "Lienable Amount").
11	21. The Lienable Amount is due and owing Brahma as of the date of this Amended
12	Third-Party Complaint.
13	22. On or about September 6, 2018, pursuant to NRS 108.2413, Cobra (as principal)
14	and AHAC (as surety) caused a Surety Bond to be recorded in the Official Records of Nye County,
15	Nevada as Document No. 898975.
16	23. On or about October 9, 2018, Cobra (as principal) and AHAC (as surety) caused a
17	Surety Rider ("Rider") to be recorded in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada as Document
18	No. 900303.
19	24. The Rider increased the penal sum of the Surety Bond to \$19,289,300.61.
20	25. NRS 108.2421 authorizes Brahma, as lien claimant, to bring an action against the
21	principal (Cobra) and the surety (AHAC) on the Surety Bond and Rider within this Court.
22	26. Brahma makes claim against the Third-Party Defendants and AHAC is obligated
23	to Brahma for the Lienable Amount plus interest, costs and attorney's fees up to the penal sum of
24	the Surety Bond and Rider as provided in Chapter 108 of the Nevada Revised Statutes.
25	SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
26	(Breach of Settlement Agreement Against Cobra)

The (i) Original Lien, (ii) First Amended Lien, (iii) Second Amended Lien, (iv)

Third Amended Lien, and (iv) Fourth Amended Lien, collectively referred to herein as the "Lien,"

27.	Brahma repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the preceding
paragraphs of	this Amended Third-Party Complaint, incorporates them by reference, and further
alleges as follo	ows:

- 28. Brahma previously contracted directly with Cobra to perform the Cobra Work at the Project.
- 29. Brahma performed the Cobra Work and a payment dispute arose between Brahma and Cobra (the "Cobra Dispute").
- 30. Brahma and Cobra negotiated a resolution of the dispute and agreed to certain terms, which terms were memorialized in writing ("Settlement Agreement").
- 31. Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, Cobra was to make (i) a first payment to Brahma in the amount of \$2,881,397.67 ("First Payment") upon Brahma providing certain documentation/information ("Documentation"), and (ii) a second payment to Brahma in the amount of \$412,224.62 ("Second Payment") upon Brahma providing additional documentation/information ("Additional Documentation").
  - 32. Brahma provided the Documentation and Cobra paid Brahma the First Payment.
- 33. Brahma tendered and/or provided Cobra the Additional Documentation to receive the Second Payment but Cobra has failed to pay Brahma the Second Payment.
- 34. Brahma has tendered and/or performed its duties and obligations as required by the Settlement Agreement.
- 35. Cobra has breached the Settlement Agreement by failing to tender payment of the Second Payment to Brahma, which Second Payment is due and owing.
- 36. Brahma has been required to engage the services of an attorney to collect the Second Payment, and Brahma is entitled to recover its reasonable costs, attorney's fees and interest therefore.

#### THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Breach of Implied Covenant of Good Faith & Fair Dealing Against Cobra)

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

37.	Brahma repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the preceding
paragraphs of	this Amended Third-Party Complaint, incorporates them by reference, and further
alleges as follo	ows:

- There is a covenant of good faith and fair dealing implied in every agreement, 38. including the Settlement Agreement.
- Cobra breached its duty to act in good faith by performing the Settlement 39. Agreement in a manner that was unfaithful to the purpose of the Settlement Agreement, thereby denying Brahma's justified expectations.
- Due to the actions of Cobra, Brahma suffered damages in an amount more than the 40. Second Payment, for which Brahma is entitled to judgment in an amount to be determined at trial.
- Brahma has been required to engage the services of an attorney to collect the 41. Second Payment, and Brahma is entitled to recover its reasonable costs, attorney's fees and interest therefore.

#### FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION (Unjust Enrichment Against Cobra)

- Brahma repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the preceding 42. paragraphs of this Amended Third-Party Complaint, incorporates them by reference, and further alleges as follows:
  - This cause of action is being pled in the alternative. 43.
- Brahma tendered and/or provided the Additional Documentation for the benefit 44. and/or at the specific instance and request of Cobra.
  - Cobra accepted, used and enjoyed the benefit of the Additional Documentation. 45.
  - Brahma has demanded payment of the Second Payment. 46.
  - To Date, Cobra has failed, neglected, and/or refused to pay the Second Payment. 47.
  - 48. Cobra has been unjustly enriched, to the detriment of Brahma.
- Brahma has been required to engage the services of an attorney to collect the 49. Second Payment, and Brahma is entitled to recover its reasonable costs, attorney's fees and interest therefore.

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

#### WHEREFORE, Brahma prays that this Honorable Court:

- Enters judgment against Cobra in the amount of the Second Payment. 1.
- Enters judgment against the Third-Party Defendants and each of them, jointly and 2. severally in the Lienable Amount;
- Enters a judgment against the Third-Party Defendants (as defined therein) and each 3. of them, jointly and severally, for Brahma's reasonable costs and attorney's fees incurred in the collection of the Lienable Amount, as well as an award of interest thereon;
- Enters judgment against AHAC up to the penal sum of the Surety Bond and Rider; 4. and
- For such other and further relief as this Honorable Court deems just and proper in 5. the premises.

#### **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 March 2019.

#### 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.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

D. Lee Roberts, Jr., Esq. Nevada Bar No. 8877 lroberts@wwhgd.com Colby L. Balkenbush, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 13066 cbalkenbush@wwhgd.com Ryan T. Gormley, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 13494 rgormley@wwhgd.com WEINBERG, WHEELER, HUDGINS, GUNN & DIAL, LLC 6385 South Rainbow Blvd., Suite 400 Las Vegas, Nevada 89118 Telephone: (702) 938-3838 Facsimile: (702) 938-3864

Attorneys for Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC

## IN THE FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

#### IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF NYE

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

Plaintiff,

VS.

BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation,

Defendant.

BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation,

Counterclaimant/Lien Claimant,

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.

Case No. CV 39348 Dept. No. 2

Consolidated with: Case No. CV 39799

TSE'S OPPOSITION TO BRAHMA'S COUNTERMOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A SINGLE CONSOLIDATED **COMPLAINT** 

Hearing Date: April 17, 2019 Hearing Time: 10:00 a.m.

1	BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation,
2	Third-Party Plaintiff,
3	VS.
4	COBRA THERMOSOLAR PLANTS, INC., a
5	Nevada corporation; AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE COMPANY, a surety; BOE
6	BONDING COMPANIES I through X; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X,
7	inclusive,
8	Third-Party Defendants.
9	H&E EQUIPMENT SERVICES, INC., a
10	Delaware corporation,
11	Plaintiff-In-Intervention,
12	vs.
13	BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation, TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY LLC, a Delaware
14	limited liability company, COBRA THERMOSOLAR PLANTS, INC., a Nevada
15	corporation; AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE COMPANY, a surety; BOE BONDING
16	COMPANIES I through X; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X, and TOE
17	TENANTS I through X, inclusive,
18	Defendants-In-Intervention.
19	BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation,
20	Plaintiff,
21	vs.
22	COBRA THERMOSOLAR PLANTS, INC., a
23	Nevada corporation; AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE COMPANY, a surety; BOE
24	BONDING COMPANIES I through X; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X,
25	inclusive,
26	Defendants.
27	
28	

Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC ("TSE"), by and through its undersigned counsel, hereby opposes Brahma Group, Inc.'s Countermotion for Leave to File a Single Consolidated Complaint ("Countermotion"). Based on the following Memorandum of Points and Authorities, Brahma's Countermotion should be denied.

DATED this 10th day of April, 2019.

Medical (14946); on behalf of the North Medica

#### MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

#### I. INTRODUCTION

The Nevada Supreme Court's December 2018 decision in *Matter of Estate of Sarge* requires that the Court deny Brahma's Countermotion. Prior to the *Sarge* decision, the *Mallin* case arguably permitted courts to merge two consolidated cases into each other. However, *Sarge* expressly overruled *Mallin* and held that consolidated cases "retain their separate identities" and cannot be merged into one another. Moreover, the *Sarge* decision relied in part on the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Hall*. In *Hall*, the U.S. Supreme Court stated that "consolidated cases should remain separate as to parties, **pleadings**, and judgment." Thus, contrary to Brahma's mischaracterization of it, the *Hall* case actually supports denying the Countermotion.

Perhaps sensing that its motion faces an uphill battle, Brahma seeks to play the victim and argues that Cobra and TSE are conspiring to achieve some kind of procedural victory against it. Brahma is not a victim nor is it in danger of becoming one. It is a massive national contractor with approximately 2,500 employees and hundreds of millions in yearly revenue that submitted millions in fraudulent charges on this Project.

TSE opposes the Countermotion because it seeks relief that is expressly barred by

Page 3 of 9

RA000894

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

Nevada case law and may have unintended consequences as this litigation progresses. The purpose of Nevada's procedural rules is to "secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every action and proceeding." NRCP 1. Taking these goals into account, the Nevada Supreme Court decided in Sarge that consolidated cases should maintain separate pleadings, verdicts and judgments. The Countermotion is a solution in search of a problem. If the Countermotion is denied, both actions (i.e. CV 39348 and CV 39799) will still remain consolidated and be heard together. To the extent judicial economy and convenience are considerations, they have already been achieved by the granting of Brahma's prior Motion to Consolidate.

In addition, although it is irrelevant to the merits of the Countermotion, TSE is compelled to point out that, contrary to Brahma's assertions, TSE and Cobra are not ganging up on Brahma and coordinating their defenses. Any similarity between Cobra's and TSE's arguments is either pure coincidence or a product of Cobra's counsel reading the publicly available prior motion work in this case.

TSE requests that the Court deny the Countermotion as it seeks relief that is prohibited under the Sarge and Hill decisions and could have unforeseen procedural ramifications.

#### II. **LEGAL ARGUMENT**

A. The Nevada Supreme Court's December 2018 Decision in Matter of Estate of Sarge Prohibits the Court From Merging Two Separate Actions into a Single Action and is Directly on Point.

To properly understand the Sarge decision, it is necessary to first look at the case it overruled - Mallin v. Farmers Ins. Exch., 106 Nev. 606, 607, 797 P.2d 978, 979 (1990). In Mallin, the district court granted a motion to consolidate two insurance coverage actions "for all purposes." Id. at 608, 797 P.2d at 980. Put another way, the district court in Mallin granted the exact same motion that Brahma is now bringing before this Court. The Nevada Supreme Court upheld the district court's decision and found that because the two actions had merged into one, an order of the district court disposing of one of the two consolidated cases was not appealable since the action as a whole remained undecided. Id. at 609, 797 P.2d at 980.

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

Mallin remained good law until December 2018 when the Nevada Supreme Court expressly overruled it in Sarge, stating as follows:

> [J]oinder for trial . . . does not merge two suits into a single suit . . . We thus overrule our decision in Mallin to the extent it holds that cases consolidated in the district court become a single case for all appellate purposes. Consolidated cases retain their separate identities so that an order resolving all of the claims in one of the consolidated cases is immediately appealable as a final judgment under NRAP 3A(b)(1).

Matter of Estate of Sarge, 134 Nev. Adv. Op. 105, 432 P.3d 718, 722 (2018) (emphasis added) (internal citations omitted). The Sarge holding is not ambiguous. Prior to December 2018, it was arguably permissible for district courts in Nevada to merge two consolidated cases into a single action "for all purposes" just as Brahma's Countermotion requests. After Sarge, merger of consolidated actions is prohibited. Brahma's Countermotion is three months too late and should be denied.

В. Contrary to Brahma's Assertions, the U.S. Supreme Court's Decision in Hall v. Hall also Stands for the Proposition that Two Separation Actions Cannot Be Merged After Consolidation.

Realizing that the Sarge decision precludes the relief it seeks, Brahma cites to the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in Hall to support its Countermotion. Hall v. Hall, 138 S. Ct. 1118, 1120, 200 L. Ed. 2d 399 (2018). However, Hall is equally unfavorable to Brahma's position. In Hall, the U.S. Supreme Court analyzed whether cases that are consolidated under FRCP 42(a). which is nearly identical to NRCP 42(a), may be merged into a single case. The Court answered the question in the negative after extensively surveying the history of FRCP 42(a), the 1813 statute<sup>1</sup> on which FRCP 42(a) was based and addressing policy concerns. See generally id. ("consolidation is permitted as a matter of convenience and economy in administration, but does not merge the suits into a single cause, or change the rights of the parties, or make those who are parties in one suit parties in another.").

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 28 U.S.C. § 734 (repealed in 1948).

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

In an attempt to distort the Hall holding, Brahma seizes on a section<sup>2</sup> of the decision that states that the term "consolidate" in FRCP 42(a) is ambiguous. See Countermotion at 11:5-15. Brahma goes on to argue that, since the term is ambiguous, merger of two separate actions into one is still permissible in certain circumstances. Id.

What Brahma leaves out is that, after finding this ambiguity, the U.S. Supreme Court resolved the ambiguity by resorting to FRCP 42(a)'s legislative history and determining that the term "consolidate" meant that the two separate cases are joined together but do not lose their separate character. Hall, 138 S. Ct. at 1130 ("No sensible draftsman, let alone a Federal Rules Advisory Committee, would take a term that had meant, for more than a century, that separate actions do not merge into one, and silently and abruptly reimagine the same term to mean that they do.").

The U.S. Supreme Court went on to explain the policy rationale for not permitting merger of two consolidated actions:

> through consolidation under Rule 42(a) one or many or all of the phases of the several actions may be merged. But merger is never so complete in consolidation as to deprive any party of any substantial rights which he may have possessed had the actions proceeded separately. Thus, separate verdicts and judgments are normally necessary.

*Id.* (internal citations omitted) (emphasis added).

Since separate verdicts and judgments are necessary, allowing the filing of a single merged complaint makes no sense and would only create confusion as to what case a particular decision or order applies to. Indeed, the Hall decision notes that federal courts may not merge the pleadings of two consolidated cases as Brahma seeks to do. Id. at 1128 ("Treatises summarizing federal precedent applying the consolidation statute also concluded that consolidated cases remain distinct. They recognized that consolidated cases should remain

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Hall, 138 S. Ct. at 1124 ("Consolidation can thus sometimes signify the complete merger of discrete units: "The company consolidated two branches." But the term can also mean joining together discrete units without causing them to lose their independent character.") (discussing the ambiguity of the term).

separate as to parties, <u>pleadings</u>, and judgment.") (emphasis added) (internal citations and quotations omitted).

In sum, the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Hill* is consistent with the Nevada Supreme Court's decision in *Sarge* and supports denial of Brahma's Countermotion. Both decisions preclude courts from merging two separate cases into one and require that the two cases have separate pleadings and separate judgments.

C. Contrary to Brahma's Assertions, TSE and Cobra are Not Conspiring to Defeat Brahma Via Procedural Trickery. TSE Refused to Stipulate to Allowing the Filing of a Single Merged Complaint Because Such Action is Prohibited by the Nevada Supreme Court and Could Have Unintended Consequences.

Brahma attempts to distract the Court from the above unfavorable case law by accusing TSE and Cobra of ganging up against Brahma to gain some kind of procedural advantage. First, Brahma, a massive contractor with approximately 2,500 employees and hundreds of millions in yearly revenue, is hardly at risk of being taken advantage of in this dispute. Second, Brahma is incorrect that TSE and Cobra are coordinating their defenses. Cobra was the EPC contractor on the Project while TSE was the Project owner. Further, Cobra has no influence over TSE's conduct of this litigation.

TSE is not seeking to gain any procedural advantage but rather to ensure that this case proceeds in the correct procedural manner and to avoid unintended consequences. The *Sarge* case simply prevents the Court from merging the two consolidated cases into a single case.

/// ///

25 | /// 26 | ///

27 ///

28 ///

# WEINBERG WHEELER HUDGINS GUNN & DIAL

### III. CONCLUSION

The Nevada Supreme Court's decision in *Sarge* precludes courts from merging two consolidated actions into each other as Brahma is seeking to do. Further, the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Hall*, upon which the *Sarge* decision in part relied, states that consolidated cases must maintain separate pleadings. For these reasons Brahma's Countermotion should be denied.

DATED this 10th day of April, 2019.

D. Lee Roberts, Jr., Esq.

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

WEINBERG, WHEELER, 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

2

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the <u>10</u> day of April, 2019, a true and correct copy of the foregoing TSE'S OPPOSITION TO BRAHMA'S COUNTERMOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A SINGLE CONSOLIDATED COMPLAINT was hand delivered to the following:

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

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

Z 0 15 ≥ ± 16 ■ 17

# ORIGINAL

1 ORDR RICHARD L. PEEL, ESQ. FILED FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT 2 Nevada Bar No. 4359 ERIC B. ZIMBELMAN, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 9407 3 RONALD J. COX, ESO. Nevada Bar No. 12723 4 PEEL BRIMLEY LLP 3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200 Henderson, Nevada 89074-6571 Telephone: (702) 990-7272 6 Facsimile: (702) 990-7273 7 meel@peelbrimley.com ezimbelman@peelbrimlev.com 8 Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc. 9 FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT 10 NYE COUNTY, NEVADA 11 TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY, LLC, a Delaware CASE NO. : CV 39348 12 limited liability company, Consolidated with: 13 Plaintiff. Case No. CV39799 14 VS. **DEPT. NO.** : 2 15 BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation. ORDER GRANTING BRAHMA'S 16 COUNTERMOTION FOR LEAVE Defendant. TO FILE A SINGLE 17 CONSOLIDATED AMENDED COMPLAINT 18 BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation. 19 Lien/Bond Claimant. 20 VS. 21 TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY LLC, a Delaware 22 limited liability company; BOE BONDING COMPANIES I through X; DOES I through X; 23 ROE CORPORATIONS I through X; and TOE TENANTS I through X, inclusive, 24 25 Counterdefendants, 26 27

3333 E. Serene Avenue, 57t., 20 Henderson, Nevada 89874 (702) 990-7272 4 Fax (702) 990-72

28

RA000901

27

28

Brahma filed its Countermotion in connection with and as part of its Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss filed by filed by Third-Party Defendant Cobra Thermosolar Plants, Inc. ("Cobra"). By way of a separate Stipulation and Order for Partial Dismissal, Cobra withdrew its Motion to Dismiss

RA000902

Page 2 of 3

# PEEL BRIMLEN LLP 3333 E. SERENE AVENUE, STE. 2001 HENDERSON, NEVADA 89074 (702)990-7272 ◆ FAX (702)990-7273

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

Tonapah	Solar v.	Brah	ma G	roup

Case No: CV 39348

### Order Granting Brahma's Countermotion

3. Nothing in this Order shall be deemed to mean that the constituent cases of this consolidated action (Case No. CV39348 and Case No. CV39799) do not "retain their separate identities at least to the extent that a final decision in one is immediately appealable by the losing party." Matter of Estate of Sarge, 134 Nev. Adv. Op. 105, 432 P.3d 718, 722 (2018) citing Hall v. Hall, 138 S. Ct. 1118, 1131, 200 L. Ed. 2d 399 (2018).

Dated this day April 2019.

SENIOR JUDGE STEVEN ELLIOTT

Submitted by:

PEEL BRIMLEY LLP

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

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

Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc.

# 3333 E. Sergne Avenue, str. 200 Hendenson, mevada 89474 (702) 990-7272 + Fax (702) 990-7273

١

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

### Tonapati Solar v. Brahma Group Case No: CV 39348

### Order Granting Brahma's Countermotion

3. Nothing in this Order shall be deemed to mean that the constituent cases of this consolidated action (Case No. CV39348 and Case No. CV39799) do not "retain their separate identities at least to the extent that a final decision in one is immediately appealable by the losing party," Matter of Estate of Sarge, 134 Nev. Adv. Op. 105, 432 P.3d 718, 722 (2018) citing Hall v. Hall, 138 S. Ct. 1118, 1131, 200 L. Ed. 2d 399 (2018).

Dated this 22day April 2019.

SENIOR JUDGE STEVEN ELLIOT

Submitted by:

PEEL BRIMLEY LLP

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

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

Consolidated with: Case No. CV39799 DEPT. NO. : 2 BRAHMA GROUP, INC.'S: SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT; AND (II) FIRST AMENDED THIRD-PARTY COMPLAINT. [Arbitration Exemption: Amount in Controversy in Excess of \$50,000]

BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation,

Lien/Bond Claimant and Third-Party Plaintiff,

VS.

1

7

3

4

5

Õ

7

Ŕ

Ú

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

IB

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

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.

### SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT

Lien/Bond Claimant, BRAHMA GROUP, INC. ("Brahma"), by and through its attorneys of record, the law firm of PEEL BRIMLEY LLP, and by way of this Second Amended Complaint ("Second Amended Complaint"), hereby (i) amends all previously filed claims and causes of action filed in this Action. (ii) brings this Second Amended Complaint against the above-named Counterdefendants, and (iii) complains, avers and alleges as follows:

### THE PARTIES

- 1. Brahma is and was at all times relevant to this Action:
- a. A Nevada corporation, duly authorized and qualified to do business in the State of Nevada: and
- b. A duly licensed contractor holding a Nevada State Contractor's License. which license is in good standing.
- 2. Brahma is informed and believes and therefore alleges that the U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ("BLM"), is and was at all times relevant to this Action, an owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portions of real property located in Nye County. Nevada, and more particularly described as Nye County Parcel Numbers 012-141-01 and 012-151-01 (the "BLM Parcels")

The BLM is not a party to this Action and Brahma is not making a claim against the BLM or the fee simple title of the BLM Parcels by way of this Action

2

3

4

ž

ó

7

ĸ

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Brahma is informed and believes and therefore alleges that LIBERTY MOLY. 3. LLC, a Delaware limited liability company ("Liberty"), is and was at all times relevant to this Action, an owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portions of real property located in Nye County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nye County Parcel Number 012-431-06 (the "Liberty Parcel").2
- 4, Counterdefendant TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY, LLC ("TSE") is and was at all times relevant to this Action:
- A Delaware limited liability company authorized to do business in Nye County and the State of Nevada:
- Ь. An owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portions of real property located in Nye County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nye County Parcel Numbers 012-031-04, 012-131-03, 012-131-04, 012-140-01, 012-150-01 and 612-141-01 (collectively, the "TSE Parcels");
- The lessee, tenant or the person, individual and/or entity who claims a license or leasehold estate with respect to the BLM Parcels and the Liberty Parcels; and
- đ. The owner of those certain improvements and/or leasehold estate (the "Project"):
  - i. Commonly known as the Crescent Dunes Solar Energy Project; and
- ii. Constructed on the BLM Parcels, the TSE Parcels, and the Liberty Parcels.1
- 5. The TSE Parcels, along with the Project, are collectively referred to herein as the "Work of Improvement," and include all leasehold estates, easements, rights-of-way, common areas and appurtenances related thereto, and the surrounding space as may be required for the convenient use and occupation of the Work of Improvement.
- б. Brahma does not know the true names of the individuals, corporations, partnerships and entities identified and named as Counterdefendants by the fictitious names of (collectively,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Liberty is not a party to this Action and Brahma is not making a claim against Liberty or the fee simple title of the Liberry Parcel by way of this Action.

The term "Project" as used herein, does not include, and expressly excludes, the fee simple title of the BLM Parcels and the Liberty Parcels.

2

3

4

5

Ğ

7

8

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

75

26

27

28

the "Doe Defendants"), (i) DOES I through X, (ii) ROE CORPORATIONS I through X, (iii) BOE BONDING COMPANIES I through X, and (iv) TOE TENANTS I through X. Bratuma alleges that such Doe Defendants are responsible for damages suffered by Brahma as more fully discussed under the claims for relief set forth below. Brahma will request leave of this Honorable Court to amend this Second Amended Complaint to show the true names and capacities of each such fictitious Defendant when Brahma discovers such information.

7. TSE and the Doe Defendants are collectively referred to in this Second Amended Complaint as the "Counterdefendants."

### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Breach of Contract)

- 8. Brahma repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Second Amended Complaint, incorporates them by reference, and further alleges as follows:
- 9. On or about February 1, 2017, BGI entered a Services Agreement (the "Agreement") with TSE, wherein BGI agreed to provide certain work, materials and/or equipment (the "Work") for the Work of Improvement.
- BGI furnished the Work for the benefit of and/or at the specific instance and request 10. of TSE and the Work of Improvement and has otherwise performed its duties and obligations as required by the Agreement.
- As required by the Agreement, BGI has, and in the form and manner required by the Agreement, provided monthly invoices or payment applications (collectively, "Payment Applications") to TSE for the Work in an amount totaling more than Twenty-Six Million U.S. Dollars (\$26,000,000.00).
- 12. Pursuant to the Agreement and Nevada law, TSE agreed to and is obligated to pay BGI for its Work within no more than 45 days after TSE's receipt of BGI's Payment Applications,
  - 13. TSE breached the Agreement by, among other things:
    - Failing and/or refusing to pay monies owed to BGI for the Work; and a.

III

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Q

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

	ь.	Otherwise	failing	and/or	refusing	to	comply	with the	Agreement	and
Nevada law.										

- ] 4. BGI is owed Twelve Million Eight Hundred Fifty-Nine Thousand Five Hundred Seventy-Seven and 74/100 Dollars (\$12,859,577,74—"Outstanding Balance") from TSE for the Work.
- BGI has been required to engage the services of an attorney to collect the 15. Outstanding Balance, and BGI is entitled to recover its reasonable costs, attorney's fees and interest therefor.

### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION (Breach of Implied Covenant of Good Faith & Fair Dealing)

- 16. Brahma repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs of the Second Amended Complaint, incorporates them by reference, and further alleges as follows:
- There is a covenant of good faith and fair dealing implied in every agreement, 17. including the Agreement between BGI and TSE.
- 18. TSE breached its duty to act in good faith by performing the Agreement in a manner that was unfaithful to the purpose of the Agreement, thereby denying BGI's justified expectations.
  - 19. Specifically, but without limitation, TSE breached its duty to act in good faith by:
- Asserting pre-textual, extra-contractual and inaccurate reasons for withholding payment long after the time required by the Agreement and Nevada law had elapsed for payment to be made by TSE to BGI.
- b. TSE has improperly withheld moneys totaling more than One Million U.S. Dollars for "retention" in purported reliance upon NRS 624.609(2)(a)(1).
- Furthermore, and even if the Agreement allowed TSE to withhold retention from monthly payments (which it does not), TSE's withholding of retention amounts retroactively aggregated from Payment Applications issued (and, in some cases, payments previously made) long ago constitutes extreme bad faith.

III

2

3

4

5

Ó

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- 20. Due to the actions of TSE, BGI suffered damages in the amount of or exceeding the Outstanding Balance for which BGI is entitled to judgment in an amount to be determined at trial.
- 21. BGI has been required to engage the services of an attorney to collect the Outstanding Balance, and BGI is entitled to recover its reasonable costs, attorney's fees and interest therefor

### THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION (Violation of NRS 624)

- 22. Brahma repeats and realleges each allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Second Amended Counter-Complaint, incorporates them by reference, and further alleges as follows:
- 23. NRS 624.609 and NRS 624.610 (the "Statute") requires owners (such as TSE and as defined by the Statute) to, among other things, (i) timely pay their prime contractors (such as BGI and as defined by the Statute), and (ii) respond to payment applications and change order requests, as provided in the Statute.
- TSE violated the provisions of the Statute by failing or refusing to comply with the 24. requirements set forth therein.
- 25. By reason of the foregoing, BGI is entitled to a judgment against TSE in the amount of the Outstanding Balance as well as other remedies as defined by the applicable law.
- BGI has been required to engage the services of an attorney to collect the 26. Outstanding Balance due and owing for the Work, and BGI is entitled to recover its reasonable costs, attorney's fees and interest therefore.

111

111

23 111

24

25

26

27

2

3

4

5

Ğ

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

111

### WHEREFORE, Brahma prays that this Honorable Court:

- Enters judgment against the Counterdefendants, and each of them, jointly and severally in the amount of the Outstanding Balance;
- Enters a judgment against the Counterdefendants, and each of them, jointly and severally, for Brahma's reasonable costs and attorney's fees incurred in the collection of the Outstanding Balance, as well as an award of interest thereon; and
- For such other and further relief as this Honorable Court deems just and proper in 3. the premises,

### 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 April 2019,

#### PEEL BRIMLEY LLP

RICHARD L. PEEL, ESO. Nevada Bar No. 4359 ERIC ZIMBELMAN, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 9407 RONALD J. COX, ESO. Nevada Bar No. 12723 3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200 Henderson, Nevado 89074-6571 Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc.

### BRAHMA GROUP, INC.'S FIRST AMENDED THIRD-PARTY COMPLAINT

Lien/Bond Claimant and Third-Party Plaintiff, BRAHMA GROUP, INC. ("Brahma"), by and through its attorneys of record, the law firm of PEEL BRIMLEY LLP, and by way of this First Amended Third-Party Complaint ("Amended Third-Party Complaint"), hereby (i) amends all previously filed claims and causes of action filed in this Third-Party Action, (ii) brings this Amended Third-Party Complaint against the above-named Third-Party Defendants, and (iii) complaints, avers and alleges as follows:

### THE PARTIES

- 1. Brahma is and was at all times relevant to this Third-Party Action:
- a. A Nevada corporation, duly authorized and qualified to do business in the State of Nevada;
- b. A duly licensed contractor holding a Nevada State Contractor's License, which license is in good standing; and
- c. Is a party to a negotiated settlement between Cobra and Brahma for the payment of monies owed to Brahma for work Brahma performed directly for Cobra ("Cobra Work") at the Project.
- 2. Brahma is informed and believes and therefore alleges that the U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ("BLM"), is and was at all times relevant to this Third-Party Action, an owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portions of real property located in Nye County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nye County Parcel Numbers 012-141-01 and 012-151-0) (the "BLM Parcels").4
- 3. Brahma is informed and believes and therefore alleges that LIBERTY MOLY.

  LLC. a Delaware limited liability company ("Liberty"), is and was at all times relevant to this

  Third-Party Action, an owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portions of real

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The BLM is not a party to this Action and Brahma is not making a claim against the BLM or the fee simple title of the BLM Perceis by way of this Action.

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

property located in Nyc County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nye County Parcel Number 012-431-06 (the "Liberty Parcel"),5

- TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY, LLC ("TSE")6 is and was at all times relevant to this Third-Party Action:
- ā. A Delaware limited liability company authorized to do business in Nye County, Nevada:
- h. An owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portions of real property located in Nye County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nye County Parcel Numbers 012-031-04, 012-131-03, 012-131-04, 012-140-01, 012-150-01 and 612-141-01 (collectively, the "TSE Parcels");
- Ġ. The lessee, tenant or the person, individual and/or entity who claims a license or leasehold estate with respect to the BLM Parcels and the Liberty Parcels; and
- d. The owner of those certain improvements and/or leasehold estate (the "Project"):
  - i. Commonly known as the Crescent Dunes Solar Energy Project; and
  - ii. Constructed on the BLM Parcels, the TSE Parcels, and the Liberry

Parcels.

- 5. The TSE Parcels, along with the Project, are collectively referred to herein as the "Work of Improvement," and include all leasehold estates, easements, rights-of-way, common areas and appurtenances related thereto, and the surrounding space as may be required for the convenient use and occupation of the Work of Improvement.
- 6. Brahma is informed, believes and therefore alleges that Third-Party Defendant AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE COMPANY ("AHAC"):
- Is and was at all times relevant to this Third-Party Action a bonding company duly licensed and qualified to do business as a surety in Nevada;

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Liberty is not a parry to this Action and Brahma is not making a claim against Liberty or the fee simple title of the Liberty Parcel by way of this Action.

<sup>6</sup> TSE is a party to Brahma's Second Amended Complaint, filed in the Action.

The term "Project" as used herein, does not include, and expressly excludes, the fee simple title of the BLM Parcels and the Liberty Parcels.

ı

?

ь.	Issued Bond No.	854481 ("Surety	y Bond") pursuant	to NRS	108.2413 as
discussed more fully (	below; and				

- Issued a Surety Rider to the Surety Bond as discussed more fully below.
- 7. Brahma is informed, believes and therefore alleges that Third-Party Defendant COBRA THERMOSOLAR PLANTS, (NC. ("Cobra"):
- a. Is and was at all times relevant to this Third-Party Action a Nevada corporation;
  - b. Is the principal on the Surety Bond and the Rider; and
- c. Is a party to a negotiated settlement between Cobra and Brahma for the payment of monies owed to Brahma for work Brahma performed directly for Cobra ("Cobra Work") at the Project.
- Brahma does not know the true names of the individuals, corporations, parmerships and entities identified and named as Third-Party Defendants by the fictitious names of (collectively, the "Doe Defendants"), (i) BOE BONDING COMPANIES I through X, (ii) DOES I through X, and (iii) ROE CORPORATIONS I through X. Brahma alleges that such Doe Defendants may be liable to Brahma for claims and/or damages arising from the construction of the Work of Improvement, as more fully discussed under the claims for relief set forth below. Brahma will request leave of this Honorable Court to amend this Amended Third-Party Complaint to show the true names and capacities of each such fictitious Doe Defendants when Brahma discovers such information.
- 9. Cobra, AHAC and the Doe Defendants are collectively referred to in this Amended Third-Party Complaint as the "Third-Party Defendants."

### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Claim Against Surety, Surety Bond and Principal thereon)

10. Brahma repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Amended Third-Party Complaint, incorporates them by reference, and further alleges as follows:

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

- 11. On or about February 1, 2017, Brahma entered a Services Agreement with TSE (the "TSE Agreement") wherein Brahma agreed to provide certain work, materials and/or equipment (the "TSE Work") for the Work of Improvement.
- As provided in NRS 108,245, Brahma gave or served a copy of its Notice of Right J2. to Lien on:
  - The BLM; and
  - h. TSE, even though it had no statutory duty to do so.
- 13. The TSE Work was provided for the whole of the Work of Improvement, at the special instance and/or request of TSE.
- 14. On or about April 9, 2018, Brahma timely recorded a Notice of Lien in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada, as Document No. 890822 ("Original Lien"), in the amount of \$6,982,186.24.
- 15. On or about April 16, 2018 (as allowed by NRS 108.229(1)), Brahma recorded a Notice of First Amended and Restated Lien in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada, as Document 891073 and as re-recorded by Brahma in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada on April 18, 2018, as Document No. 891507, in the amount of \$7,178,376.94 (the "First Amended Lieo").
- 16 On or about April 24, 2018 (as allowed by NRS 108.229(1)), Brahms recorded a Notice of Second Amended and Restated Lien in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada, as Document 891766, in the amount of \$7,178,376.94 (the "Second Amended Lien"),
- 17. On or about July 19, 2018 (as allowed by NRS 108.229(1)), Brahma recorded a Third Amended and/or Restated Notice of Lien in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada, as Document 896269, in the amount of \$11,902,474.75 (the "Third Amended Lien").
- 18. On or about September 14, 2018 (as allowed by NRS 108.229(1)), Brahma recorded a Fourth Amended and/or Restated Notice of Lien in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada, as Document 899351 in the amount of \$12,859,577.74 (the "Fourth Amended Lien").

27 111

19.

2	Third Amended Lien, and (iv) Fourth Amended Lien, collectively referred to herein as the "Lien,"
3	Were:
4	c. In writing;
5	d. Recorded against the Work of Improvement; and
6	e. Were given or served on the authorized agents of the BLM and TSE, or the
7	BLM and/or TSE knew of the existence of the Lien.
8	20. The Lirn (as amended) is in the amount Twelve Million Eight Hundred and Fifty.
4	Nine Thousand, Five Hundred and Seventy-Seven Dollars and Seventy-Four Cents
10	(\$12,859,577,74 - "Lienable Amount").
11	21. The Lienable Amount is due and owing Brahma as of the date of this Amended
12	Third-Party Complaint.
13	22. On or about September 6, 2018, pursuant to NRS 108.2413, Cobra (as principal
14	and AHAC (as surety) caused a Surety Bond to be recorded in the Official Records of Nye County
15	Nevada as Document No. 898975.
16	23. On or about October 9, 2018, Cobra (as principal) and AHAC (as surety) caused of
17	Surety Rider ("Rider") to be recorded in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada as Document
18	No. 900303.
19	24. The Rider increased the penal sum of the Surety Bond to \$19,289,300.61.
20	25. NRS 108.2421 authorizes Brahma, as lien claimant, to bring an action against the
21	principal (Cobra) and the surety (AHAC) on the Surety Bond and Rider within this Court.
22	26. Brahma makes claim against the Third-Party Defendants and AHAC is obligated
23	to Brahma for the Lienable Amount plus interest, costs and attorney's fees up to the penal sum of
24	the Surety Bond and Rider as provided in Chapter 108 of the Nevada Revised Statutes.
25	<i>111</i>
26	<i>111</i>
27	111
28	

The (i) Original Lien, (ii) First Amended Lien, (iii) Second Amended Lien, (iv)

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

### WHEREFORE, Brahma prays that this Honorable Court:

- 1. Enters judgment against the Third-Party Defendants and each of them, jointly and severally in the Lienable Amount;
- 2. Enters a judgment against the Third-Party Defendants (as defined therein) and each of them, jointly and severally, for Brahma's reasonable costs and attorney's fees incurred in the collection of the Lienable Amount, as well as an award of interest thereon:
- Enters judgment against AHAC up to the penal sum of the Surety Bond and Rider; 3. and
- 4. For such other and further relief as this Honorable Court deems just and proper in the premises.

### 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 April 2019,

#### PEEL BRIMLEY LLP

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

# ORIGINAL

RICHARD L. PEEL, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 4359 2 ERIC B. ZIMBELMAN, ESO. Nevada Bar No. 9407 3 RONALD J. COX, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 12723 4 PEEL BRIMLEY LLP S 3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suite 200 Henderson, Nevada 89074-6571 6 Telephone: (702) 990-7272 Facsimile: (702) 990-7273 7 rpeel@peelbrimley.com czimbelman@peelbrimley.com 8 rcox@peelbrimley.com 9 Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc. 10 11 12 13 limited liability company, 14 Plaintiff. 15 ¥5. lő 17 Defendant. 18 19 20 Lien/Bond Claiment. 21 ¥9. 22 TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY LLC, a Delawere 23 24 25 TENANTS I through X, inclusive. 26 Counterdefendants, 27 28

FILED TETH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

### FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT NYE COUNTY, NEVADA

TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY, LLC, a Delaware

BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation.

BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation.

limited liability company; BOE BONDING COMPANIES I through X; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X; and TOE CASE NO. : CV 39348

Consolidated with:

Case No. CV39799

DEPT. NO. 🕆 2

BRAHMA GROUP, INC.'S:

SECOND AMENDED (1) COMPLAINT: AND

(II) FIRST AMENDED THIRD-PARTY COMPLAINT,

Arbitration Exemption; Amount in Controversy in Excess of \$50,0001

3333 E. Serene Avenue, ete. 200 Henderson, Nevada 89074 (702) 990-7272 → Fax (702) 990-7273

BRAHMA GROUP, INC., a Nevada corporation.

Lien/Bond Claimant and Third-Party Plaintiff,

VS.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

36

27

28

COBRA THERMOSOLAR PLANTS, INC., a comporation: **AMERICAN** ASSURANCE COMPANY, a surety; BOE BONDING COMPANIES I through X: DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS 1 through X, inclusive,

Third-Party Defendants.

### SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT

Lien/Bond Claimant, BRAHMA GROUP, INC. ("Brahma"), by and through its attorneys of record, the law firm of PEEL BRIMLEY LLP, and by way of this Second Amended Complaint ("Second Amended Complaint"), hereby (i) amends all previously filed claims and causes of action filed in this Action, (ii) brings this Second Amended Complaint against the above-named Counterdefendants, and (iii) complains, avers and alleges as follows:

### THE PARTIES

- 1. Brahma is and was at all times relevant to this Action:
- A Nevada corporation, duly authorized and qualified to do business in the State of Nevada; and
- h. A duly licensed contractor holding a Nevada State Contractor's License. which license is in good standing.
- 2. Brahma is informed and believes and therefore alleges that the U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ("BLM"), is and was at all times relevant to this Action, an owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portions of real property located in Nye County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nye County Parcel Numbers 012-141-01 and 012-151-01 (the "BLM Parcels").1

The BLM is not a party to this Action and Brahma is not making a claim against the BLM of the fee simple title of the BLM Parcels by way of this Action.

2

3

4

5

٥

7

8

9

1Û

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Э. Brahma is informed and believes and therefore alleges that LIBERTY MOLY, LLC, a Delaware limited lightlity company ("Liberty"), is and was at all times relevant to this Action, an owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portions of real property located in Nyc County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nyc County Parcel Number 012-431. 06 (the "Liberty Parcel").2
- 4. Counterdefendant TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY, LLC ("TSE") is and was at all times relevant to this Action:
- A Delaware timited liability company authorized to do business in Nye County and the State of Nevada;
- An owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portions of real b. property located in Nyc County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nyc County Parcel Numbers 012-031-04, 012-131-03, 012-131-04, 012-140-01, 012-150-01 and 612-141-01 (collectively, the "TSE Parcels"):
- The lessee, tenant or the person, individual and/or entity who claims a license or leasehold estate with respect to the BLM Parcels and the Liberty Parcels; and
- The owner of those certain improvements and/or leasehold estate (the d. "Project"):
  - Commonly known as the Crescent Dunes Solar Energy Project; and î.
  - Constructed on the BLM Parcels, the TSE Parcels, and the Liberty ii.

### Parcels.3

- 5. The TSE Parcels, along with the Project, are collectively referred to herein as the "Work of Improvement," and include all leasehold estates, easements, rights-of-way, common areas and appurtenances related thereto, and the surrounding space as may be required for the convenient use and occupation of the Work of Improvement.
- 6. Brahma does not know the true names of the individuals, corporations, partnerships and entities identified and named as Counterdefendants by the fictitious names of (collectively,

Liberty is not a party to this Action and Brahma is not making a claim against Liberty or the fee simple title of the Liberry Percel by way of this Action.

The term "Project" as used herein, does not include, and expressly excludes, the fee simple title of the BLM Parcels and the Liberty Parcels.

2

3

4

5

ō

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

the "Doe Defendants"), (i) DOES I through X, (ii) ROE CORPORATIONS I through X, (iii) BOE BONDING COMPANIES I through X, and (iv) TOE TENANTS I through X. Bratinia alleges that such Doe Defendants are responsible for damages suffered by Brahma as more fully discussed under the claims for relief set forth below. Brahma will request leave of this Honorable Court to amend this Second Amended Complaint to show the true names and capacities of each such fictitious Defendant when Brahma discovers such information.

7. TSE and the Doe Defendants are collectively referred to in this Second Amended Complaint as the "Counterdefendants,"

### **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

(Breach of Contract)

- Ê Brahma repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Second Amended Complaint, incorporates them by reference, and further alleges as follows:
- 9. On or about February 1, 2017, BGI entered a Services Agreement (the "Agreement") with TSE, wherein BGI agreed to provide certain work, materials and/or equipment (the "Work") for the Work of Improvement.
- 10. BGI furnished the Work for the benefit of and/or at the specific instance and request of TSE and the Work of Improvement and has otherwise performed its duties and obligations as required by the Agreement.
- 11. As required by the Agreement, BGI has, and in the form and manner required by the Agreement, provided monthly invoices or payment applications (collectively, "Payment Applications") to TSE for the Work in an amount totaling more than Twenty-Six Million U.S. Dollars (\$26,000,000.00).
- 12. Pursuant to the Agreement and Nevada law, TSE agreed to and is obligated to pay BGI for its Work within no more than 45 days after TSE's receipt of BGI's Payment Applications.
  - TSE breached the Agreement by, among other things: 13.
    - a. Failing and/or refusing to pay monies owed to BGI for the Work; and

ŗ		
١		
1		
٠		
ŀ		
•		
•		

	h.	Otherwise	failing	and/or	refusing	to	comply	with	the	Agreement	and
Nevada law.											

- 14. BGI is owed Twelve Million Eight Hundred Fifty-Nine Thousand Five Hundred Seventy-Sevan and 74/100 Dollars (\$12,859,577,74—"Outstanding Balance") from TSE for the Work.
- 15. BGI has been required to engage the services of an attorney to collect the Outstanding Balance, and BGI is entitled to recover its reasonable costs, attorney's fees and interest therefor.

### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION (Breach of Implied Covenant of Good Faith & Fair Dealing)

- 16. Brahma repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs of the Second Amended Complaint, incorporates them by reference, and further alleges as follows:
- 17. There is a covenant of good faith and fair dealing implied in every agreement, including the Agreement between BGI and TSE.
- 18. TSE breached its duty to act in good faith by performing the Agreement in a manner that was unfaithful to the purpose of the Agreement, thereby denying BGI's justified expectations.
  - 19. Specifically, but without limitation, TSE breached its duty to act in good faith by:
- a. Asserting pre-textual, extra-contractual and inaccurate reasons for withholding payment long after the time required by the Agreement and Nevada law had clapsed for payment to be made by TSE to BGI.
- b. TSE has improperly withheld moneys totaling more than One Million U.S. Dollars for "retention" in purported reliance upon NRS 624.609(2)(a)(1).
- c. Furthermore, and even if the Agreement allowed TSE to withhold retention from monthly payments (which it does not), TSE's withholding of retention amounts retroactively aggregated from Payment Applications issued (and, in some cases, payments previously made) long ago constitutes extreme bad faith.

į

2

3

4

5

Ŕ

7

Ķ

¥

10

11

12

13

14

15

Ιó

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- 20. Due to the actions of TSE, BGI suffered damages in the amount of or exceeding the Outstanding Balance for which BGI is entitled to judgment in an amount to be determined at trial.
- 21. BGI has been required to engage the services of an attorney to collect the Outstanding Balance, and BGI is entitled to recover its reasonable costs, attorney's fees and interest therefor.

### THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION (Violation of NRS 624)

- 22. Brahma repeats and realleges each allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Second Amended Counter-Complaint, incorporates them by reference, and further alleges as follows:
- 23. NRS 624.609 and NRS 624.610 (the "Statute") requires owners (such as TSE and as defined by the Statute) to, among other things, (i) timely pay their prime contractors (such as BGI and as defined by the Statute), and (ii) respond to payment applications and change order requests, as provided in the Statute.
- 24. TSE violated the provisions of the Statute by failing or refusing to comply with the requirements set forth therein.
- 25. By reason of the foregoing, BOI is entitled to a judgment against TSE in the amount of the Outstanding Balance as well as other remedies as defined by the applicable law.
- 26. BGI has been required to engage the services of an attorney to collect the Outstanding Balance due and owing for the Work, and BGI is entitled to recover its reasonable costs, attorney's fees and interest therefore.

111 111

24 111

25

26

27

ı

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Q

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

### WHEREFORE, Brahma prays that this Honorable Court:

- Enters judgment against the Counterdefendants, and each of them, jointly and severally in the amount of the Outstanding Balance;
- 2. Enters a judgment against the Counterdefendants, and each of them, jointly and severally, for Brahma's reasonable costs and attorney's fees incurred in the collection of the Outstanding Balance, as well as an award of interest thereon; and
- 3. For such other and further relief as this Honorable Court deems just and proper in the premises.

### 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 Phoday of April 2019.

PEEL BRIMLEY LLP

RICHARD L'PEEL, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 4359 ERIC ZIMBELMAN, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 9407 RONALD J. COX, ESQ. Nevada Ber No. 12723 3333 E, Serene Avenue, Sulte 200 Henderson, Nevada 89074-6571 Attorneys for Brohma Group, Inc.

### BRAHMA GROUP, INC.'S FIRST AMENDED THIRD-PARTY COMPLAINT

Lien/Bond Claimant and Third-Party Plaintiff, BRAHMA GROUP, INC. ("Brahma"), by and through its attorneys of record, the law firm of PEEL BRIMLEY LLP, and by way of this First Amended Third-Party Complaint ("Amended Third-Party Complaint"), hereby (i) amends all previously filed claims and causes of action filed in this Third-Party Action, (ii) brings this Amended Third-Party Complaint against the above-named Third-Party Defendants, and (iii) complains, avers and alleges as follows:

### THE PARTIES

- 1. Brahma is and was at all times relevant to this Third-Party Action:
- a. A Nevada corporation, duly authorized and qualified to do business in the State of Nevada:
- b. A duly licensed contractor holding a Nevada State Contractor's License,
   which license is in good standing; and
- c Is a party to a negotiated settlement between Cobra and Brahma for the payment of monies owed to Brahma for work Brahma performed directly for Cobra ("Cobra Uchora Work") at the Project.
- 2. Brahma is informed and believes and therefore alleges that the U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ("BLM"), is and was at all times relevant to this Third-Party Action, an owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portlons of real property located in Nye County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nye County Parcel Numbers 012-141-01 and 012-151-01 (the "BLM Parcels").4
- 3. Brahma is informed and believes and therefore alleges that LIBERTY MOLY, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company ("Liberty"), is and was at all times relevant to this Third-Party Action, an owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portions of real

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The BLM is not a party to this Action and Brahma is not making a claim against the BLM or the fee simple title of the BLM Parcels by way of this Action.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

[4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

property located in Nye County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nye County Parcel Number 012-431-06 (the "Liberty Parcel").5

- 4. TONOPAH SOLAR ENERGY, LLC ("TSE")<sup>6</sup> is and was at all times relevant to this Third-Party Action:
- a. A Delaware limited liability company authorized to do business in Nye County, Nevada;
- b. An owner or reputed owner of the fee simple title to all or portions of real property located in Nye County, Nevada, and more particularly described as Nye County Parcel Numbers 012-031-04, 012-131-03, 012-131-04, 012-140-01, 012-150-01 and 612-141-01 (collectively, the "TSE Parcels");
- c. The lessee, tenant or the person, individual and/or entity who claims a license or leasehold estate with respect to the BLM Parcels and the Liberty Parcels; and
- d The owner of those certain improvements and/or leasehold estate (the "Project"):
  - i Commonly known as the Crescent Dunes Solar Energy Project; and
  - ii. Constructed on the BLM Parcels, the TSE Parcels, and the Liberty

Parcels.7

- 5. The TSE Parcels, along with the Project, are collectively referred to herein as the "Work of Improvement," and include all leasehold estates, easements, rights-of-way, common areas and appurtenances related thereto, and the surrounding space as may be required for the convenient use and occupation of the Work of Improvement.
- 6. Brahma is informed, believes and therefore alleges that Third-Party Defendant AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE COMPANY ("AHAC"):
- a. Is and was at all times relevant to this Third-Party Action a bonding company duly licensed and qualified to do business as a screty in Nevada;

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Liberty is not a party to this Action and Brahms is not making a claim against Liberty or the fee simple title of the Liberty Parcel by way of this Action.

<sup>\*</sup> TSE is a party to Brahma's Second Amended Complaint, filed in the Action.

The term "Project" as used herein, does not include, and expressly excludes, the fee simple title of the BLM Parcels and the Liberty Parcels.

7

J

4

5

6

7

8

Q

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- b. Issued Bond No. 854481 ("Surety Bond") pursuant to NRS 108,2413 as discussed more fully below; and
  - Issued a Surety Rider to the Surety Bond as discussed more fully below.
- 7. Brahma is informed, believes and therefore alleges that Third-Party Defendant COBRA THERMOSOLAR PLANTS, INC. ("Cobra"):
- is and was at all times relevant to this Third-Party Action a Nevada corporation,
  - h. Is the principal on the Surety Bond and the Rider; and
- C, is a party to a negotiated settlement between Cobra and Brahma for the payment of monies owed to Brahma for work Brahma performed directly for Cobra ("Cobra Work") at the Project.
- 8. Brahma does not know the true names of the individuals, corporations, partnerships and entities identified and named as Third-Party Defendants by the fictitious names of (collectively, the "Doe Defendants"), (i) BOE BONDING COMPANIES I through X, (ii) DOES I through X, and (iii) ROE CORPORATIONS I through X. Brahma alleges that such Doe Defendants may be liable to Brahma for claims and/or damages arising from the construction of the Work of Improvement, as more fully discussed under the claims for relief set forth below. Brahma will request leave of this Honorable Court to amend this Amended Third-Party Complaint to show the true names and capacities of each such fictitious Doe Defendants when Brahma discovers such information.
- 9. Cobra, AHAC and the Doe Defendants are collectively referred to in this Amended Third-Party Complaint as the "Third-Party Defendants,"

### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Claim Against Surety, Surety Bond and Principal thereon)

10. Brahma repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Amended Third-Party Complaint, incorporates them by reference, and further alleges as follows:

ĺ

2

7

4

12.

(the "TSE Work") for the Work of Improvement.

On or about February 1, 2017, Brahma entered a Services Agreement with TSE (the

As provided in NRS 108.245, Brahma gave or served a copy of its Notice of Right

"TSE Agreement") wherein Brahma agreed to provide certain work, materials and/or equipment

	~1	_	1.
<b>2.</b> ,	STE.	1303	36
PEEL BRIMLEY LLP	3333 E. Serene Avenue, ste. 2	HENDERSON, NEVADA 89074	(782) 998-7272 + FAX (782) 998-7
Z	AVE	MEV	FAX
7 22	ENE	S,	Ļ
1	SES	<b>VDER</b>	572
	33 E	HE	3
	, e		2

23

24

25

26

27

28

111

111

18.

a Fourth Amended and/or Restated Notice of Lien in the Official Records of Nye County, Nevada.

On or about September 14, 2018 (as allowed by NRS 108.229(1)), Brahma recorded

as Document 896269, in the amount of \$11,902,474.75 (the "Third Amended Lien").

as Document 899351 in the amount of \$12,859,577.74 (the "Fourth Amended Lien").

ı

2

3

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 19. The (i) Original Lien, (ii) First Amended Lien, (iii) Second Amended Lien, (iv) Third Amended Lien, and (iv) Fourth Amended Lien, collectively referred to herein as the "Lien," were:
  - c. In writing:
  - d. Recorded against the Work of Improvement; and
- e. Were given or served on the authorized agents of the BLM and TSE, or the BLM and/or TSE knew of the existence of the Lien.
- 20. The Lien (as amended) is in the amount Twelve Million Eight Hundred and Fifty-Nine Thousand, Five Hundred and Seventy-Seven Dollars and Seventy-Four Cents. (\$12,859,577,74 "Lienable Amount").
- 21. The Lienable Amount is due and owing Brahma as of the date of this Amended Third-Party Complaint.
- 22. On or about September 6, 2018, pursuant to NRS 108,2413, Cobra (as principal) and AHAC (as surety) caused a Surety Bond to be recorded in the Official Records of Nye County. Nevada as Document No. 898975.
- On or about October 9, 2018, Cobra (as principal) and AHAC (as surety) caused a Surety Rider ("Rider") to be recorded in the Official Records of Nye County. Nevada as Document No. 900303.
  - 24. The Rider increased the penal sum of the Surety Bond to \$19,289,300.61
- 25. NRS 108.2421 authorizes Brahma, as lien claimant, to bring an action against the principal (Cobra) and the surety (AHAC) on the Surety Bond and Rider within this Court.
- 26. Brahma makes claim against the Third-Party Defendants and AHAC is obligated to Brahma for the Lienable Amount plus interest, costs and attorney's fees up to the penal sum of the Surety Bond and Rider as provided in Chapter 108 of the Nevada Revised Statutes.

25 ///

26 ///

27 1//

2

3

4

ä

6

7

8

٥

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

### WHEREFORE, Brahma prays that this Honorable Court:

- Enters judgment against the Third-Party Defendants and each of them, jointly and severally in the Lienable Amount;
- 7. Enters a judgment against the Third-Party Defendants (as defined therein) and each of them, jointly and severally, for Brahma's reasonable costs and attorney's fees incurred in the collection of the Lienable Amount, as well as an award of interest thereon;
- Enters judgment against AHAC up to the penal sum of the Surety Bond and Rider: 3. and
- 4. For such other and further relief as this Honorable Court deems just and proper in the premises.

### 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 19 day of April 2019.

PEEL BRIMLEY LL

RICHARDL PEEL, ESO. Nevada Kar No. 4359

ERIĆ ZIMBELMAN, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 9407

RONALD J. COX, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 12723

3333 E. Serene Avenue, Suité 200

Henderson, Nevada 89074-6571

Attorneys for Brahma Group, Inc