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

BARRICK GOLDSTRIKE MINES, INC..

Electronically Filed Mar 10 2020 04:29 p.m. Elizabeth A. Brown

Supreme Court Case No. 18-A-785913

Petitioner

VS.

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT FOR THE STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK, AND THE HONORABLE ELIZABETH GONZALEZ, DISTRICT JUDGE,

Respondents,

and

BULLION MONARCH MINING, INC.,

Real Party in Interest.

/

### PETITIONER'S SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX

PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER
Michael R. Kealy, Nevada State Bar No. 971
Ashley C. Nikkel, Nevada State Bar No. 12838
50 West Liberty Street, Suite 750, Reno, Nevada 89501
Telephone: 775.323.1601
mkealy@parsonsbehle.com
anikkel@parsonsbehle.com

Brandon J. Mark (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
201 S. Main Street, Suite 1800, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: 801-532-1234
kjohnson@parsonsbehle.com
bmark@parsonsbehle.com

Attorneys for Petitioner BARRICK GOLDSTRIKE MINES, INC.

# PETITIONER'S SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX INDEX Vol. No. Page Nos. Declaration of Abraham G. Smith in Support of Supp. PSA 0001 -Motion to Compel Discovery Appx. **PSA 0132** Supp. PSA 0133 -Reply Brief on "Motion to Compel Discovery" Appx. PSA 0139 - 1 -

PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER

1 2	DANIEL F. POLSENBERG Nevada Bar No. 2376 JOEL D. HENRIOD Nevada Bar No. 8492	. 9		
3	ABRAHAM G. SMITH			
4	Nevada Bar No. 13,250 LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE L	LP		
5	3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite Las Vegas, Nevada 89169-5996	e 600		
6	(702) 949-8200 (702) 949-8398 (Fax)			
7	DPolsenberg@LRRC.com JHenriod@LRRC.com			
8	THOMAS L. BELAUSTEGUI			
9	Nevada Bar No. 732 CLAYTON P. BRUST			
10	Nevada Bar No. 5234 ROBISON, BELAUSTEGUI, SHARP & LOW 71 Washington Street			
11	Reno, Nevada 89503			
12	(775) 329-3151 (775) 329-7941 (Fax) CBrust@RBSLAttys.com			
13				
14	Attorneys for Plaintiff			
15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA			
16	BULLION MONARCH MINING, INC.,	Case No. 03:09-CV-612-MMD-WGC		
17	Plaintiff,			
18	<i>US</i> .	DECLARATION OF ABRAHAM G.		
19	BARRICK GOLDSTRIKE MINES, INC.,	SMITH IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY		
20	Defendant.			
21	STATE OF NEVADA )			
22	COUNTY OF CLARK ): ss.			
23	I, Abraham G. Smith, under the penalty of perjury, state that the follow-			
. 24				
25				
26				
27	knowledge of the statements contained in this declaration; and I am prepared to			
28	testify regarding this declaration.			
Lewis Roca ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE		1		

- Attached as Exhibit 1 is a true and correct copy of "Barrick 2. Goldstrike Mines, Inc.'s Answers and Objections to Plaintiff's Interrogatories [Set One]," dated April 5, 2010.
- Attached as Exhibit 2 is a true and correct copy of "Barrick 3. Goldstrike Mines, Inc.'s Responses to Plaintiff's Request for Production of Documents [Set One]," dated April 5, 2010.
- 4. Attached as Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy of "Barrick Goldstrike Mines, Inc.'s First Supplemental Responses to Plaintiff's Request for Production of Documents [Set One]," dated July 1, 2010.
- 5. Attached as Exhibit 4 is a true and correct copy of "Barrick Goldstrike Mines, Inc.'s Second Supplemental Answer's and Objections to Plaintiff's Interrogatories [Set One]," dated July 1, 2010.
- Attached as Exhibit 5 is a true and correct copy of a letter dated October 26, 2016, from Clayton P. Brust to Michael P. Petrogeorge.
- Attached as Exhibit 6 is a true and correct copy of a letter Novem-7. ber 1, 2016, from Michael P. Petrogeorge to Clayton P. Brust.

Executed this 17th day of November, 2016.

Attorney for Plaintiff

Bullion Monarch Mining, Inc.

# INDEX OF EXHIBITS

2	EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION NUMBER		Number
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	
3			OF PAGES
4			
1	1	Barrick Goldstrike Mines, Inc.'s Answers and Ob-	32
5		jections to Plaintiff's Interrogatories [Set One]	
0	2	Barrick Goldstrike Mines, Inc.'s Responses to	28
6		Plaintiff's Request for Production of Documents	
7		[Set One]	
	3	Barrick Goldstrike Mines, Inc.'s First Supple-	28
8		mental Responses to Plaintiff's Request for Pro-	
9		duction of Documents [Set One]	
	4	Barrick Goldstrike Mines, Inc.'s Second Supple-	32
10		mental Answers and Objections to Plaintiff's In-	
11		terrogatories [Set One]	
	5	October 26, 2016 Letter from Clayton P. Brust to	1
12		Michael P. Petrogeorge	
13	6	November 1, 2016 Letter from Michael P. Petro-	2
		george to Clayton P. Brust	
14	1	, <u> </u>	

Lewis Roca

# EXHIBIT 1

# Barrick's Answers and Objections to Plaintiff's Interrogatories

# EXHIBIT 1

RECEIVED

APR 0 9 2010 1 PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER 2 Michael R. Kealy (Nevada Bar No. 0971) 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 750 Reno, NV 89501 3 Telephone: (775) 323-1601 Facsimile: 4 (775) 348-7250 5 Francis M. Wikstrom (Utah Bar No. 3462; admitted pro hac vice) Michael P. Petrogeorge (Utah Bar No. 8870; admitted pro hac vice) Brandon Mark (Utah Bar No. 10439; admitted pro hac vice) 6 One Utah Center 201 South Main Street, Suite 1800 7 Salt Lake City, UT 84111 8 Telephone: (801) 536-6700 Facsimile: (801) 536-6111 Email: ecf@parsonsbehle.com 9 Attorneys for Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc. 10 11 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 12 FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA 13 14 Case No. CV-N-08-00227-ECR-VPC BULLION MONARCH MINING, INC., 15 BARRICK GOLDSTRIKE MINES Plaintiff. 16 INC.'S ANSWERS AND OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFF'S 17 v. INTERROGATORIES [SET ONE] BARRICK GOLDSTRIKE MINES INC., et 18 19 Defendants. 20 Pursuant to Rules 26 and 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure ("FRCP"), defendant 21 Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc. ("Goldstrike") hereby objects to and answers plaintiff Bullion 22 Monarch Mining, Inc.'s ("Bullion") first set of interrogatories served on Goldstrike via mail on or 23 24 about February 24, 2010 (hereinafter, the "Interrogatories"). **GENERAL OBJECTIONS** 25 1. Goldstrike objects to the Interrogatories to the extent that they contain more than 26 the number of written interrogatory requests allowed pursuant to FRCP 33. In particular, FRCP 27 28

33 states: "Unless otherwise stipulated or ordered by the court, a party may serve on any other party no more than 25 written interrogatories, including discrete subparts." Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(a). When discrete subparts are taken into account, the Interrogatories contain at least 34 different written interrogatory requests. Goldstrike has elected to respond to each of the Interrogatories, including each discrete subpart, despite this technical violation. But Goldstrike reserves the right to refuse to answer any future interrogatory requests or provide additional information in response to any current interrogatory request or discrete subpart therein on the basis that Bullion has exceeded the number of written interrogatory requests allowed under Rule 33.

- 2. Goldstrike objects to the Interrogatories to the extent that the information sought therein has been previously produced or provided to Bullion or its counsel through documents produced by Newmont in related litigation, in response to a subpoena *duces tecum* which Bullion issued to Barrick Gold of North America in 2009 (the "Subpoena") and/or as part of Goldstrike's own initial disclosures or any supplements thereto.
- 3. Goldstrike objects to the Interrogatories to the extent that the information sought therein is contained in publicly available records which are equally available to both Goldstrike and Bullion.
- 4. Goldstrike objects to the Interrogatories insofar as they seek information that is not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this matter.
- 5. Goldstrike objects to the Interrogatories to the extent they are overbroad, vague, ambiguous, compound, complex, unduly burdensome, or oppressive in the amount, scope, or type of information requested.
- 6. Goldstrike objects to the Interrogatories insofar as they seek to impose burdens on Goldstrike that are inconsistent with or in addition to its discovery obligations as set forth in Rules 26 and/or 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
- 7. Goldstrike objects to the Interrogatories as overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive insofar as they seek to impose upon Goldstrike the obligation to identify information that is not currently known or available to Goldstrike. Goldstrike will not undertake any

- 2 -

BEHLE &

. .

obligation to identify or disclose information that is not reasonably and readily within its current knowledge, custody, possession or control.

- 8. Goldstrike objects to each Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks disclosure of information that would violate rights of privacy, or other statutorily or judicially recognized protections and privileges, confidentiality agreements, or court orders restricting dissemination of information, or result in disclosure of materials or information prepared in anticipation of litigation or of confidential settlement discussions.
- 9. Goldstrike objects to the Interrogatories to the extent that they seek information and documents protected from discovery by the attorney client privilege, the work product doctrine, the common interest privilege, the joint defense privilege or other applicable privileges or protections. Goldstrike does not waive but rather intends to preserve and is preserving the attorney client privilege, the work product protection, the common interest privilege, the joint defense privilege and every other privilege or protection with respect to all information and each and every document protected by any of such privileges or protections. Goldstrike will not knowingly identify information which is subject to any applicable privileges or protections. If any privileged or protected information is inadvertently disclosed by Goldstrike at anytime, Goldstrike requests that defendants immediately return to Goldstrike's counsel all documents, copies and other media which refer to or reflect in any way such inadvertently disclosed information.
- 10. Goldstrike objects to the "Preliminary Definitions and Instructions" set forth on pages 2-6 of the Interrogatories insofar as they seek to impose burdens on Goldstrike that are inconsistent with, or in addition to, Goldstrike's obligations as set forth in Rules 26 and/or 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
- 11. Goldstrike objects to the Interrogatories insofar as they fail to adequately define the terms "Barrick" and "you." For purposes of responding to the Interrogatories, Goldstrike interprets the terms "Barrick" and "you" to refer only to defendant, Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc., and not to any defendant, or to any other related or affiliated entity.

- 12. Goldstrike does not in any manner waive or intend to waive, but rather intends to preserve and is preserving, (1) all objections as to competency, relevancy, materiality, and admissibility; (2) all objections to the use of any of the responses herein or the submission of any documents produced in response hereto in any proceeding, motion, hearing, or the trial in this or any other action; and (3) all objections to any further discovery or request involving or related to any of the Requests. The supplying of any information in response to the Interrogatories does not constitute an admission by Goldstrike that such information is relevant, admissible or material to any of the issues in this action, and Goldstrike reserves the right to object to any further inquiry with respect to any subject matter at any time.
- 13. Goldstrike incorporates each of the foregoing general physicitions into each and every answer below as if specifically and fully set forth therein. A republication or restatement, in whole or in part, of any one or more of the foregoing general objections in response to a specific Interrogatory is not intended to waive and does not waive an objection not specifically stated.

#### SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS AND ANSWERS

INTERROGATORY NO. 1: Is Barrick the successor in interest to High Desert Mineral Resources of Nevada, Inc. ("High Desert")?

- a. Did Barrick, or Barrick's predecessors in interest, in or about 1995 acquire all of the stock in High Desert through purchase, merger or other transaction?
- b. Did Barrick, or Barrick's predecessors in interest, in or about 1995 acquire all of the assets and obligations of High Desert?
- c. If the answer to either of the above questions is "yes", please describe the nature of the transaction?

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 1: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike specifically objects to Interrogatory No. 1 on the basis that it requires Goldstrike to make legal conclusions rather than state facts. Goldstrike also objects to Interrogatory No. 1 insofar as it seeks information which is already known or available to Bullion through the review of documents which were produced by

-4-

Newmont in the related litigation and/or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena. Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing general or specific objections, Goldstrike answers Interrogatory No. 1 as follows:

On November 30, 1995, Barrick HD, Inc. ("Barrick HD") became the corporate successor of High Desert Mineral Recourses of Nevada, Inc. ("High Desert") as the result of a merger transaction. On May 3, 1999, Goldstrike became the corporate successor of Barrick HD as the result of a different merger transaction. As to the remainder of Interrogatory No. 1, Goldstrike invokes Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and refers Bullion to the following documents, which have been or will be produced to Bullion, and which relate to and provide the relevant details of the above identified merger transactions: BGBM001538-67; BGBM004953-58; BGBM005920-24; BGBM006157-279; BGBM006553-58; BGBM008078-215; BAR001977-80.

INTERROGATORY NO. 2: Please list all interests in unpatented mining claims and fee land located or otherwise acquired by High Desert or Barrick since July 10, 1990, within the Area of Interest described in Ex. A-2 to the May 10, 1979 Agreement ("the 1979 AOI"), including (a) a description of the mining claims or fee land, together with legal description of the ¼ section where they are situated, (b) the nature of the interest acquired, (c) the dates of location or acquisition; (d) a list of all documents that evidences the location or acquisition; and, (d) the names of any witnesses who have knowledge about your answer. (The 1979 Agreement has been produced in this litigation as documents numbered "Newmont000165-271").

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 2: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above.

Goldstrike specifically objects to Interrogatory No. 2 insofar as it fails to define the term "unpatented mining claim." In particular, Bullion fails to specify whether it seeks information on unpatented lode mining claims, unpatented mill site claims, or both. For purposes of responding to this Interrogatory, Goldstrike will assume that Bullion only seeks information relating to

unpatented lode mining claims, as those are the only mining claims with any apparent relevancy to the pending dispute.

Goldstrike also objects to Interrogatory No. 2 insofar as it is overbroad and unduly burdensome and requires Goldstrike to provide information that is not relevant or likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this matter. In particular, Goldstrike objects to Bullion's request for information about unpatented mining claims and fee lands which Goldstrike acquired prior to May 3, 1999, when it became the corporate successor of Barrick HD, which was the corporate successor of High Desert. This is the earliest possible date on which Goldstrike could have potentially become bound to the provisions of the 1979 Agreement, and Bullion has no basis for obtaining any information about mining claims or fee lands acquired by Goldstrike prior to that date.

Goldstrike likewise objects to Bullion's request insofar as it seeks information about unpatented mining claims and fee lands which Barrick HD may have acquired prior to November 30, 1995, when it became the corporate successor of High Desert. This is the earliest possible date on which Barrick HD could have potentially become bound to the provisions of the 1979 Agreement, and Bullion has no basis for obtaining any information about mining claims or fee lands acquired by Barrick HD prior to that date.

Goldstrike also objects to Interrogatory No. 2 insofar as it requires Goldstrike to provide information about acquisitions made by High Desert and/or by Barrick HD. Insofar as any such transactions occurred, Goldstrike was not itself involved in those transactions, and there is no one at Goldstrike that is currently known to have any information about such transactions. Goldstrike will not undertake any affirmative obligation to obtain information about High Desert's or Barrick HD's transactions in the Alleged AOI prior to May 3, 1999.

Finally, Goldstrike objects to Interrogatory No. 2 insofar as it seeks information that is available to Bullion in the public domain, and is therefore equally available to both Bullion and Goldstrike.

Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing general or specific objections, Goldstrike answers Interrogatory No. 2 as follows:

- 1. Goldstrike participated in an asset exchange transaction with Newmont which closed on May 3, 1999. As a result of that exchange, Goldstrike acquired certain unpatented lode mining claims and fee lands from Newmont, most of which are located within the Area of Interest purportedly created by the May 10, 1979 Agreement (the "Alleged AOI"). The specific mining claims and fee lands which Goldstrike acquired from Newmont as part of the asset exchange transaction are identified in the following documents, which have already been produced to Bullion, and to which Bullion is referred pursuant to Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure: BGBM004829-41; BGBM007963-8025; BGBM008026-36.
- 2. On or about July 14, 2004, Goldstrike acquired certain additional unpatented lode mining claims and fee lands from Newmont, most of which are located within the Alleged AOI. The specific mining claims and fee lands which Goldstrike acquired from Newmont on or about July 14, 2004 are identified in the following documents, which are being produced to Bullion simultaneously herewith, and to which Bullion is referred pursuant to Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure: BAR043773-83; BAR043822-26.
- 3. On or about August 15, 2005, Goldstrike acquired certain properties from Elko Land and Livestock Company ("ELLCO") most of which are located within the Alleged AOI. The specific properties which Goldstrike acquired from ELLCO on or about August 15, 2005 are identified in the following documents which are being produced to Bullion simultaneously herewith, and to which Bullion is referred pursuant to Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure: BAR043811-15; BAR043816-21.
- 4. On or about August 15, 2005, Goldstrike acquired certain additional properties from Newmont, most of which are located in the Alleged AOI. The specific properties which Goldstrike acquired from Newmont on or about August 15, 2005 are identified in the following documents which are being produced to Bullion simultaneously herewith, and to which Bullion is

4 5

3

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27 28

<sup>1</sup> High Desert's remaining 2% undivided interest was transferred by High Desert to SLH Co. prior to the merger. - 8 -

referred pursuant to Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure: BAR043801-05; BAR043806-10.

5. As noted above, Barrick HD merged with High Desert on or about November 30, 1995. See BGBM006358-541; BGBM006157-279. At that time, and as a result of the merger, Goldstrike is informed and believes that Barrick HD acquired an undivided 38% interest in the mining claims and/or fee lands which were then owned by High Desert, and which are identified on BGBM005936-84 (which documents Bullion is referred pursuant to Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure). On May 3, 1999, and as a result of the merger with Barrick HD, Goldstrike became the *temporary* owner of Barrick HD's 38% undivided interest in these mining claims and/or properties. See infra Answer to Interrogatory No. 7, which is expressly incorporated herein by reference.

Other than the mining claims and/or properties identified on BGBM005936-84, Goldstrike does not currently have specific knowledge of any other mining interests or fee simple properties which Barrick HD acquired in the Alleged AOI on or after November 30, 1995. Goldstrike asserts that other information about Barrick HD's mining claim and/or land acquisitions in the Alleged AOI on or after November 30, 1995 may be contained within some of the other documents which have been or will be produced, either by Barrick Gold of North America in response to the Subpoena, as a supplement to Goldstrike's initial disclosures, or in response to Bullion's latest discovery requests. Because the burden of reviewing such documentation and locating any such information is the same for Bullion as it is for Goldstrike, Goldstrike has no obligation to search for any such information.

6. Other than those properties identified on BGBM000785-802 and BGBM005936-84 (which documents Bullion is specifically referred to pursuant to Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure), Goldstrike does not currently have specific knowledge of those mining interests or fee simple properties, if any, which High Desert might have acquired in the Alleged AOI on or after July 7, 1990. Goldstrike asserts that other information about High Desert's land acquisitions in the Alleged AOI on or after July 7, 1990 may be contained within some of the documents which have been or will be produced, either by Barrick Gold of North America in response to the Subpoena, as a supplement to Goldstrike's initial disclosures, or in response to Bullion's latest discovery requests. Because the burden of locating any such information is the same for Bullion as it is for Goldstrike, Goldstrike has no obligation to search for any such information. The following individuals may have information relating to Goldstrike's acquisitions in the Alleged AOI on or after May 3, 1999: Steve Hull Parsons Behle & Latimer 201 S. Main Street, Suite 1800 Salt Lake City, UT 84111 Mr. Hull should be contacted solely through counsel for Goldstrike Rich Haddock Barrick Gold of North America 136 East South Temple, Suite 1800 Salt Lake City, UT 84111 Mr. Haddock should be contacted solely through counsel for Goldstrike Cy Wilsey Barrick Gold of North America 136 East South Temple, Suite 1800 Salt Lake City, UT 84111 Mr. Wilsey should be contacted solely through counsel for Goldstrike **Orson Tingey** Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc. P.O. Box 29 Elko, NV 89803 Mr. Tingey should be contacted solely through counsel for Goldstrike The following individual may have information relating to High Desert's acquisitions in the Alleged AOI after July 7, 1990: Lee Halavais 4790 Caughlin Pkwy #242 Reno, NV 89519 775-721-5796 or 775-753-7619

PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER 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

Tom Erwin Erwin & Thompson LLP One East Liberty Street, Suite 424 P.O. Box 40817 Reno, NV 89501-2123 775-786-9494

Mr. Erwin should be contacted solely through counsel for Goldstrike

INTERROGATORY NO. 3: For any interest in unpatented mining claims or fee land acquired by Barrick from High Desert after July 10, 1990, if said unpatented mining claims or fee land are located within the 1979 AOI, please state each and every reason why Barrick does not believe that it is obligated to pay a production royalty to Plaintiff for production from said unpatented mining claims or fee land.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 3: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above.

Goldstrike specifically objects to Interrogatory No. 3 insofar as it fails to define the term "unpatented mining claim." In particular, Bullion fails to specify whether it seeks information on unpatented lode mining claims, unpatented mill site claims, or both. For purposes of responding to this Interrogatory, Goldstrike will assume that Bullion only seeks information relating to unpatented lode mining claims, as those are the only mining claims with any apparent relevancy to the pending dispute.

Goldstrike also objects to Interrogatory No. 3 insofar as it is overbroad and unduly burdensome and requires Goldstrike to provide information that is not relevant or likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this matter. In particular, Goldstrike objects to Bullion's request for information about unpatented mining claims and fee lands which Goldstrike acquired prior to May 3, 1999, when it became the corporate successor of Barrick HD, which was the corporate successor of High Desert. *See also supra* Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated herein by reference.

Goldstrike further objects to Interrogatory No. 3 insofar as it seeks information which is already available to Bullion through documents that were previously produced by Newmont in related litigation, by Barrick Gold of North America pursuant to the Subpoena, or through Goldstrike's initial disclosures. Goldstrike will not undertake the burden of reviewing the

- 10 -

3

4 5

7

6

8 9

11 12

10

13 14

15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25 26

27

28

previously produced documents in order to provide information in response to Interrogatory No. 3 as Bullion is equally capable of performing that task.

Finally, Goldstrike objects to Interrogatory No. 3 insofar as it is written in such a manner as to suggest that Goldstrike is somehow bound by the May 10, 1979 Agreement ("the 1979 Agreement"), which it is not.

Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing general or specific objections, Goldstrike answers Interrogatory No. 3 as follows:

Goldstrike asserts that while Barrick HD became the owner of a 38% undivided interest in certain mining claims and/or fee lands as a result of its merger with High Desert on or about November 30, 1995, and while Goldstrike became the owner of those same interests as a result of its merger with Barrick HD on or about May 3, 1999, Goldstrike did not acquire any claims or properties directly from High Desert. The specific mining claims and fee lands which Goldstrike acquired a 38% undivided interest in as a result of Goldstrike's merger with Barrick HD are identified on BGBM006358-541 and BGBM006157-279, which documents have already been produced to Bullion, and to which Bullion is specifically referred pursuant to Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Goldstrike further asserts that it is not obligated to pay a production royalty to Bullion based on mineral production from any of the unpatented mining claims or fee lands which it acquired through the merger with Barrick HD, or on any of the other mining claims or fee lands identified in response to Interrogatory No. 2, because Goldstrike is not bound by paragraph 11 or any other provision of the 1979 Agreement. Goldstrike specifically asserts that it is not bound by the 1979 Agreement, or any provisions therein, because, among other things:

- Neither Goldstrike, Barrick HD nor High Desert are parties to the 1979 1. Agreement, or successors of any party to the 1979 Agreement;
- 2. Neither Goldstrike, Barrick HD nor High Desert ever assumed the 1979 Agreement or any of the obligations created therein;

- 3. The royalty obligations purportedly created by paragraph 11 of the 1979 Agreement are personal convents and do not create covenants running with the land, and cannot therefore be enforced against subsequent owners of land;
- 3. The royalty obligations purportedly created by paragraph 11 of the 1979 Agreement are void because they violate the Rule Against Perpetuities; and
  - 4. The 1979 Agreement constitutes an unreasonable restraint on alienation.

Goldstrike further incorporates by reference its Answer to Bullion's Second Amended Complaint, and each of the affirmative defenses set forth therein.

INTERROGATORY NO. 4: For any interest in unpatented mining claims or fee land acquired by Barrick from Newmont after December 23, 1991, if said unpatented mining claims or fee land are located within the 1979 AOI, please state each and every reason why Barrick does not believe that it is obligated to pay a production royalty to Plaintiff for production from said unpatented mining claims or fee land.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 4: Goldstrike incorporates by reference its objections (general and specific) and answers to Interrogatory No. 3, above, as if expressly and fully set forth herein. Additionally, Goldstrike asserts that many of the unpatented mining claims which it acquired from Newmont on or after May 3, 1999 were invalid because they purported to be located entirely on private lands already held by Goldstrike and/or are inferior or invalid because they were located over the top of patented mining claims.

INTERROGATORY NO. 5: For any interest in unpatented mining claims or fee land however acquired by Barrick after 1995, whether by location, lease, purchase or exchange, if said mining claims or fee land are located within the 1979 AOI, please state each and every reason Barrick does not believe that it is obligated to pay to plaintiff a production royalty for production from said unpatented mining claims or fee land.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 5: Goldstrike incorporates by reference its objections (general and specific) and answers to Interrogatory Nos. 3 and 4, above, as if expressly and fully set forth herein.

26

27

PARSONS Венге & LATIMER

PSA 0016

INTERROGATORY NO. 6: Please state the name of the party you believe is responsible to pay the royalty obligation to Plaintiff for production from mineral property described in paragraph 11 of the 1979 Agreement at issue in this matter, including all facts, documents, and witnesses that support your belief.

<u>ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 6:</u> Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above.

Goldstrike specifically objects to Interrogatory No. 6 insofar as it incorrectly assumes that the 1979 Agreement is a viable and enforceable agreement binding upon any party, and that Bullion actually has standing to enforce the agreement against any party. Goldstrike disputes both of these assumptions.

Goldstrike also objects to Interrogatory No. 6 insofar as it requires Goldstrike to provide information that is not relevant and likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this matter. The only issue in this case is whether Goldstrike is bound by the production royalty obligations allegedly set forth in the 1979 Agreement. Whether other parties may or may not be bound by the 1979 Agreement is irrelevant.

Finally, Goldstrike objects to Interrogatory No. 6 insofar as it requires Goldstrike to provide information which is not in Goldstrike's current custody, possession or control. Goldstrike will not undertake any obligation to obtain information about the 1979 Agreement, or potential parties that may be bound by the 1979 Agreement, or provide information which is not already in Goldstrike's current possession and control.

Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing general or specific objections, Goldstrike answers Interrogatory No. 6 as follows:

At this time, Goldstrike does not believe that anyone owes Bullion any type of royalty under the 1979 Agreement, or that the 1979 Agreement can be enforced by Bullion against any party. First, Goldstrike asserts that it has seen no evidence to establish that Bullion is an actual successor to any party of the 1979 Agreement, or that Bullion has been properly assigned any rights under the 1979 Agreement. Goldstrike asserts that Bullion therefore lacks standing to

assert any rights under the agreement against Goldstrike or any other party. Second, Goldstrike asserts that the 1979 Agreement, and paragraph 11 in particular, violates the Rule Against Perpetuities and therefore cannot be legally enforced by any party against any other party. See also Goldstrike's answers and objections to Interrogatory No. 3, above, which are expressly incorporated herein by reference. Third, Goldstrike is not currently aware of any particular person or entity that is specifically bound by or obligated under the 1979 Agreement. The last parties with any express obligations under paragraph 11 of the 1979 Agreement were Universal Explorations, Ltd. and/or Universal Gas, Inc. (collectively, "Universal). See 1979 Agreement. Goldstrike forms no opinion on whether Universal or any corporate successors have any ongoing obligations, to Bullion or otherwise, under the 1979 Agreement.

INTERROGATORY NO. 7: Please state whether you have sold, assigned, exchanged, or in any way divested yourself of an ownership interest in any mining claims or fee land located within the 1979 AOI which were acquired by you or High Desert after July 10, 1990.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 7: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above.

Goldstrike specifically objects to Interrogatory No. 7 insofar as it fails to define the term "mining claims." In particular, Bullion fails to specify whether it seeks information on patented lode mining claims, unpatented lode mining claims, patented mill site claims, or unpatented mill site claims. For purposes of responding to this Interrogatory, Goldstrike will assume that Bullion only seeks information relating to patented and unpatented lode mining claims, as those are the only mining claims with any apparent relevancy to the pending dispute.

Goldstrike specifically objects to Interrogatory No. 7 insofar as it is overbroad and unduly burdensome and requires Goldstrike to provide information that is not relevant and likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this matter. In particular, Goldstrike objects to Bullion's request for information about mining claims and fee lands which Goldstrike acquired and/or disposed of in the Alleged AOI prior to May 3, 1999, when it became the corporate successor of Barrick HD, which was the corporate successor of High Desert. This is the earliest

BEHLE & LATIMER

possible date on which Goldstrike could have potentially become bound to the provisions of the 1979 Agreement, and Bullion has no basis for obtaining any information about claims and properties acquired or disposed of by Goldstrike prior to that date. *See also* objections to Interrogatory No. 2, above.

Goldstrike likewise objects to Interrogatory No. 7 insofar as it seeks information about unpatented mining claims and fee lands which Barrick HD may have acquired or disposed of prior to November 30, 1995, when it became the corporate successor of High Desert. This is the earliest possible date on which Barrick HD could have potentially become bound to the provisions of the 1979 Agreement, and Bullion has no basis for obtaining any information about claims and properties acquired or disposed of by Barrick HD prior to that date. *See also id*.

Goldstrike also objects to Interrogatory No. 7 insofar as it requires Goldstrike to provide information about acquisitions or dispositions of mining claims or fee lands made by High Desert after July 7, 1990, and/or by Barrick HD after November 30, 1995. Insofar as any such transactions occurred, Goldstrike was not itself directly involved in those transactions, and there is no one at Goldstrike that is currently known to have any information about such transactions. Goldstrike will not undertake any affirmative obligation to obtain information about High Desert's or Barrick HD's transactions in the Alleged AOI which occurred prior to May 3, 1999. See also id.

Goldstrike further objects to Interrogatory No. 7 insofar as it seeks information which is already available to Bullion through documents that were previously produced by Newmont in related litigation, or by Barrick Gold of North America pursuant to the Subpoena. Goldstrike will not undertake the burden of reviewing the previously produced documents in order to provide information in response to Interrogatory No. 7 as Bullion is equally capable of performing that task.

Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing general or specific objections, Goldstrike answers Interrogatory No. 7 as follows:

- 1. On May 3, 1999 at approximately 10:01 a.m., Goldstrike merged with Barrick HD. At that time, and as a result of the merger, Goldstrike acquired Barrick HD's undivided 38% interests in those properties identified in BGBM000785-802 and/or BGBM005936-84. See supra Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated herein by reference. Later that same day, Goldstrike transferred all of its interests in those properties to Newmont. See id. To the best of Goldstrike's current knowledge and belief, none of the other mining claims or fee simple lands which Goldstrike acquired in the Alleged AOI on or after May 3, 1999 have been transferred to any other owner.
- 2. On May 3, 1999, Goldstrike transferred certain additional properties to Newmont as part of the asset exchange transaction, at least some of which were located within the Alleged AOI. The specific claims and properties which Goldstrike transferred to Newmont as part of the asset exchange transaction are identified in the following documents, which have already been produced to Bullion, and to which Bullion is referred pursuant to Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure: BGBM004842-903; BGBM004904-17; BGBM0000785-802. Goldstrike notes, however, that with the exception of those properties which were acquired through the merger with Barrick HD, as described in paragraph 1, above, all of the properties transferred to Newmont as part of the asset exchange were acquired by Goldstrike prior to May 3, 1999.
- 3. Other than the mining claims and/or properties identified on BGBM0000785-802 and/or BGBM005936-84, Goldstrike does not currently have knowledge of which mining interests or fee simple properties, if any, Barrick HD might have acquired or disposed of in the Alleged AOI between November 30, 1995 and May 3, 1999. Goldstrike asserts that information about Barrick HD's mining claim and/or fee land acquisitions or dispositions in the Alleged AOI between November 30, 1995 and May 3, 1999 may be contained within some of the documents which have been or will be roduced, either by Barrick Gold of North America in response to the Subpoena, as a supplement to Goldstrike's initial disclosures, or in response to Bullion's latest discovery requests. Because the burden of locating any such information is the same for Goldstrike as it is for Bullion, Goldstrike has no obligation to search for any such information.

Венье &

4. Other than those properties identified on BGBM000785-802 and BGBM005936-84, Goldstrike does not currently have knowledge of which properties, if any, High Desert might have acquired in the Alleged AOI between July 7, 1990 and November 30, 1995. Goldstrike asserts that an undivided 2% participating interest in some or all of those properties identified on BGBM000785-802 and BGBM005936-84 was transferred from High Desert to SLH Co. on or about November 3, 1995. *See* BGBM002430; BGBM005936-84; BGBM006000-57 (which documents Bullion is referred pursuant to Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure). Goldstrike asserts that information about High Desert's land acquisitions in the Alleged AOI between July 7, 1990 and November 30, 1995 may be contained within some of the documents which have been or will be produced, either by Barrick Gold of North America in response to the Subpoena, as a supplement to Goldstrike's initial disclosures, or in response to Bullion's latest discovery requests. Because the burden of locating any such information is the same for Goldstrike as it is for Bullion, Goldstrike has no obligation to search for any such information.

INTERROGATORY NO. 8: Please list all mines, or the commonly used name for areas of mineral production, owned and/or operated by High Desert or Barrick or by a member of any joint venture in which High Desert or Barrick was a member, within the 1979 AOI since July 10, 1990, on unpatented mining claims or fee land in which High Desert or Barrick acquired an interest on or after July 10, 1990, including for each mine (a) the dates of operation; (b) the gross annual production for gold, silver, and any other metals for each year of production; (c) the gross smelter return received for each year of production; (d) a list of all documents that support your answer; (e) the names of any witnesses who have knowledge about your answer.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 8: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above.

Goldstrike specifically objects to Interrogatory No. 8 insofar as it is overbroad and unduly burdensome and requires Goldstrike to provide information that is not relevant and likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this matter. In particular, Goldstrike objects to Bullion's request for information about mining operations, production and gross smelter returns

BEHLE &

on mining claims or fee lands which Goldstrike acquired in the Alleged AOI prior to May 3, 1999, when it became the corporate successor of Barrick HD, which was the corporate successor of High Desert. This is the earliest possible date on which Goldstrike could have potentially become bound to the provisions of the 1979 Agreement, and Bullion has no basis for obtaining any information about mining operations, production and gross smelter returns on mining claims or fee lands acquired by Goldstrike prior to that date. *See also supra* Answer to Interrogatory No. 2.

Goldstrike likewise objects to Interrogatory No. 8 insofar as it seeks information about mining operations, production and/or gross smelter returns, if any, on mining claims or fee lands which Barrick HD may have acquired prior to November 30, 1995, when it became the corporate successor of High Desert. This is the earliest possible date on which Barrick HD could have potentially become bound to the provisions of the 1979 Agreement, and Bullion has no basis for obtaining any information about mining operations, production and/or gross smelter returns, if any, on mining claims or fee lands acquired by Barrick HD prior to that date. *See also id*.

Goldstrike also objects to Interrogatory No. 8 insofar as it requires Goldstrike to provide information about mining operations, production and/or gross smelter returns, if any, on mining claims or properties acquired by High Desert and/or Barrick HD prior to May 3, 1999. Insofar as any such operations occurred, Goldstrike was not itself directly involved in such operation, and there is no one at Goldstrike that is currently known to have any information about such operations. Goldstrike will not undertake any affirmative obligation to obtain information about High Desert's or Barrick HD's operations in the Alleged AOI prior to May 3, 1999. See also id.

Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing general or specific objections, Goldstrike answers Interrogatory No. 8 as follows:

### Part A:

1. Goldstrike operates an open pit mine in the Alleged AOI commonly referred to as the "Betze Post" mine. The Betze Post mine has been in operation since 1987. The majority of the production from the Betze Post mine since May 3, 1999 has come from mining claims or

2. Goldstrike also operates an underground mine in the Alleged AOI commonly referred to as the "Miekle" mine. The Miekle mine has been in operation since 1996. The majority of the production from the Miekle mine has come from mining claims or properties which Goldstrike acquired or patented prior to May 3, 1999. A smaller amount of production from the Miekle underground mine has come from some of the mining claims or properties which Goldstrike acquired from Newmont on May 3, 1999, as part of the asset exchange. The production from these properties is tracked by Goldstrike, and is commonly referred to as the "Barrick Fee" underground production (indicating that Goldstrike does not believe there to be any royalties owed on such production). Since May 3, 1999, Goldstrike has mined 2,760,668 tons

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

BEHLE & LATIMER

<sup>2627</sup> 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> A number of the claims which Goldstrike obtained from Newmont as part of the 1999 asset exchange overlapped with Goldstrike's prior owned private land and/or patented claims, and are therefore invalid or inferior claims. Production from the area of these claims is properly deemed to have come from Goldstrike's prior owned private land and/or patented claims, and not from the invalid or inferior claims Goldstrike obtained from Newmont as part of the 1999 asset exchange.

from the "Barrick Fee" underground mining area, and has shipped 856,589 ounces of gold and 106,253 ounces of silver from such production. Goldstrike does not produce or track any metals other than gold and silver. Goldstrike has not calculated a gross smelter return on the "Barrick Fee" production because no royalty is believed to be owed on those ounces, and thus no such calculation is required. To the best of Goldstrike's current knowledge, belief and understanding, there has been no underground production on any of the other properties acquired from Newmont in the 1999 asset exchange,<sup>3</sup> from any of the claims or properties acquired from Newmont in July 2004, or from the claims or properties acquired from ELLCO and Newmont in August 2005.

Documents containing information about the production and gross smelter royalties from the Betze Post and Miekle mines are still being processed for production. Goldstrike will supplement these responses with a list of the relevant documents, by Bates number, as soon as this process has been completed and Bates numbers have been assigned.

The following individuals likely have information relevant to Part A of Goldstrike's answer to Interrogatory No. 8:

Jim Byers

Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc.

Elko, Nevada

Mr. Byers should be contacted solely through Goldstrike's counsel

Curtis Caldwell

Barrick Gold of North America

Salt Lake City, Utah

Mr. Caldwell should be contacted solely through Goldstrike's counsel

20 Russ Hofland

Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc.

Elko, Nevada

Mr. Hoffland should be contacted solely through Goldstrike's counsel

John Langhans

Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc.

Elko, Nevada

Mr. Langhans should be contacted solely through Goldstrike's counsel

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

27 WP

<sup>26</sup> 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> A number of the claims which Goldstrike obtained from Newmont as part of the 1999 asset exchange overlapped with Goldstrike's prior owned private land and/or patented claims, and are therefore invalid or inferior claims. Production from the area of these claims is properly deemed to have come from Goldstrike's prior owned private land and/or patented claims, and not from the invalid or inferior claims Goldstrike obtained from Newmont as part of the 1999 asset exchange.

Janna Linebarger Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc. Elko, Nevada 2 Ms. Linebarger should be contacted solely through Goldstrike's counsel 3 Sam Marich Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc. 4 Elko, Nevada 5 Mr. Marich should be contacted solely through Goldstrike's counsel 6 Tracy Miller Barrick Goldstrike Mines, Inc. 7 Elko, Nevada Ms. Miller should be contacted solely through Goldstrike's counsel 8 Mark Rantapaa 9 Barrick Goldstrike Mines, Inc. Elko, Nevada Mr. Rantapaa should be contacted solely through Goldstrike's counsel 10 11 Paul Tehnet Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc. 12 Elko, Nevada Mr. Tehnet should be contacted solely through Goldstrike's counsel 13 This list may be amended and/or supplemented from time to time as additional people 14 with potentially relevant information are identified by Goldstrike. 15 Part B: 16 Goldstrike asserts that the mining claims and/or fee lands identified in BGBM000785-802 17 were likely acquired either by High Desert on or after July 7, 1990 and/or by Barrick HD on or 18 after November 30, 1995, and may have been part of a mine in the Alleged AOI commonly 19 known as the Leeville Mine. All of these mining claims and/or fee lands were acquired by 20 Goldstrike at approximately 10:01 a.m. on May 3, 1999, when Barrick HD merged into 2.1 Goldstrike. Goldstrike transferred these properties to Newmont later that same day (May 3, 22 1999). Neither Barrick HD nor Goldstrike actually operated the Leeville Mine. Goldstrike 23 asserts on information and belief that there was no production from the Leeville Mine prior to 24 May 3, 1999, and that Goldstrike therefore has no information to provide on the production from 25 the Leeville Mine in response to Interrogatory No. 8. Goldstrike is not currently aware of any 26 other mining claims or fee lands which might have been acquired in the Alleged AOI by High 27

Desert on or after July 7, 1990 and/or by Barrick HD on or after November 30, 1995, or whether

-21 -

28

any such properties were part of the Leeville Mine or any other mine. Goldstrike transferred all of its interests in the Leeville Mine to Newmont just hours after those interests were obtained. To the best of Goldstrike's knowledge and belief, no production occurred from those mining claims or fee lands during the brief period of time in which they were held by Goldstrike.

Goldstrike is not currently aware of any specific person who might have information relevant to the operations of or production from the Leeville Mine, but asserts that such information is most likely under the possession and control of Newmont, as the operator of that mine.

INTERROGATORY NO. 9: Please describe in chronological order all transactions/ dealings between you and High Desert and/or the Halavaises (or entities controlled or owned by the Halavaises) related to any mineral interests or other property rights within the 1979 AOI from July 10, 1990, to the current date.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 9: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above.

Goldstrike specifically objects to Interrogatory No. 9 insofar as it is overbroad and unduly burdensome and requires Goldstrike to provide information that is not relevant and likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this matter.

Goldstrike also objects to Interrogatory No. 9 as vague with respect to the terms "transactions/dealings", the phrase "related to any mineral interests", and the phrase "mineral interests or other property rights within the 1979 AOI."

Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing general or specific objections, Goldstrike answers Interrogatory No. 9 as follows:

1994-1996: Transactions relating to a project commonly known as the Gold Venture project, the Little High Desert project and/or the Simon Creek project. With respect to the details of those transactions, Goldstrike invokes Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and refers Bullion to the following documents which are produced concurrently herewith: BAR000339-44; BAR003367-463; BAR003593-98; BAR043764-66; BG016429-31.

Parsons Behle & Latimer

PSA 0026

1998-1999: Transactions relating to the termination of the Newmont Gold and High Desert Venture, and the termination of the 2% carried participating interest in that venture held by High Desert Mineral Resources, Inc., a Delaware corporation, formerly known as SLH Co. With respect to the details of those transactions, Goldstrike invokes Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and refers Bullion to the following documents which have already been produced: BGBM00239-1237; BGBM003345-57; BGBM004382-99; BGBM006767-84; BGBM011499-507; BGBM011717-19; BGBM013673-74.

INTERROGATORY NO. 10: Please describe in chronological order, all transactions/ dealings between you and Newmont related to any mineral interests or other property rights within the 1979 AOI from December 23, 1991, to the current date.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 10: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above.

Goldstrike specifically objects to Interrogatory No. 10 as vague with respect to the terms "transactions/dealings", the phrase "related to any mineral interests", and the phrase "property rights within the 1979 AOI."

Goldstrike further objects to Interrogatory No. 10 insofar as it is overbroad and unduly burdensome and requires Goldstrike to provide information that is not relevant and likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this matter. In particular, Goldstrike objects to Bullion's request for information about dealings between Goldstrike and Newmont prior to May 3, 1999, when Goldstrike actually became the corporate successor of Barrick HD, which was the corporate successor of High Desert. Goldstrike will not provide any information relating to transactions between Newmont and Goldstrike prior to May 3, 1999. *See also supra* Answer to Interrogatory No. 2 which is expressly incorporated herein by reference.

Goldstrike further objects that Interrogatory No. 10 is so broadly worded that it would require Goldstrike to provide information about transactions and dealings with Newmont or its related companies that have nothing to do with the acquisition or disposition of any mining claims or fee lands within the Alleged AOI, or the production of minerals from such claims, and

therefore have absolutely no bearing on this litigation. Goldstrike has entered into numerous agreements and arrangements with Newmont or its related companies over its years in operation, including but not limited to easement and right of way agreements, joint operating agreements, dewatering agreements, etc. All of these agreements and arrangements might, under the broadest interpretation, be technically "related to . . . mineral interests or other property rights within the 1979 AOI", but the vast majority of them have absolutely no bearing on any of the issues raised in this litigation. Goldstrike will not provide information on agreements and arrangements with Newmont that have no possible bearing on the issues raised in this case.

Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing general or specific objections, Goldstrike answers Interrogatory No. 10 as follows:

May 3, 1999: Transactions relating to the 1999 asset exchange, the termination of the Newmont Gold and High Desert Venture and the termination of the 2% participating interest in the Newmont Gold and High Desert Venture that was granted to SLH Co. in 1995. With respect to the details of those transactions, Goldstrike invokes Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and refers Bullion to the following documents which have already been produced: BGBM002118-2209; BGBM000239-756; BGBM004400-16; BGBM004223-83; BGBM001238-565; BGBM006236-313; BGBM001566-95; BGBM004368-81; BGBM004829-41; BGBM004382-99; BGBM002210-85; BGBM006818-35; BGBM006011-43; BGBM001778-851; BGBM004423-39; BGBM006852-81; BGBM004440-47; BGBM003408; BGBM007059-69; BGBM006901-16; BGBM003991-4007; BGBM006044-61; BGBM004306-67; BGBM001852-89; BGBM006767-84; BGBM006981-95; BGBM004284-92; BGBM006882-90; BGBM004457-85; BGBM007752-84; BGBM007070-77; BGBM002107-14; BGBM006917-80; BGBM006220-35; BGBM006996-7058; BGBM006723-57.

2004 and 2005: Transactions relating to Goldstrike's acquisition of certain fee lands and mill sites from Newmont. With respect to the details of those transactions, Goldstrike invokes Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and refers Bullion to the following documents,

27

25

15

16

23 24

25

21

22

26 27

28

which are produced concurrently herewith: BAR043773-83; BAR04382-26; BAR043811-15; BAR043816-21; BAR043811-15; BAR043816-21; BAR043801-05; BAR043806-10.

INTERROGATORY NO. 11: For each Barrick mine in production at any time from July 10, 1990, until the present date within the 1979 AOI, please set forth the following:

- The date the mineral interests being mined were acquired or if by location, a. the dates of location of unpatented mining claims.
- b. For mineral interest acquired after July 10, 1990;
  - (i) From whom the mineral interests being mined were acquired;
  - (ii) The annual gross smelter returns for each mineral recovered from each mine from July 10, 1990 through 2009.
- The monthly gross smelter returns for each mineral recovered from each c. mine since January 1, 2010.
- The proven mineral reserves for each mine. d.
- e. The probable mineral reserves for each mine.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 11: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above.

Goldstrike specifically objects to Interrogatory No. 11 insofar as it is overbroad and unduly burdensome and requires Goldstrike to provide information that is not relevant and likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this matter. In particular, Goldstrike objects to Bullion's request for information about mining operations, production, smelter returns and mineral reserves on mining claims or fee lands which Goldstrike acquired in the Alleged AOI prior to May 3, 1999, when it actually became the corporate successor of Barrick HD, which was the corporate successor of High Desert. This is the earliest possible date on which Barrick HD could have potentially become bound to the provisions of the 1979 Agreement, and Bullion has no basis for obtaining any information about mining claims or fee lands acquired by Goldstrike prior to that date. See also supra Answer to Interrogatory No. 2 which is expressly incorporated herein by reference.

2 | 3 | 4 |

Goldstrike also objects to Interrogatory No. 11 insofar as it requires Goldstrike to provide information about mining operations, production, smelter returns or mineral reserves on mining claims or fee lands which were acquired by Barrick HD prior to November 30, 1995, when Barrick HD became the corporate successor of High Desert. This is the earliest possible date on which Barrick HD could have potentially become bound to the provisions of the 1979 Agreement, and Bullion has no basis for obtaining any information about claims and properties acquired by Barrick HD prior to that date. *See also id.* 

Goldstrike also objects to Interrogatory No. 11 insofar as it requires Goldstrike to provide information about mining operations, production, smelter returns and mineral reserves on mining claims or fee lands properties which were acquired and/or owned by High Desert and/or Barrick HD. Insofar as any such mining operations even occurred, Goldstrike was not itself involved in those operations, and does not have any information about those operations. Goldstrike will not undertake any affirmative obligation to obtain information about High Desert's or Barrick HD's operations in the Alleged AOI prior to May 3, 1999. *See also id*.

Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing general or specific objections, Goldstrike answers Interrogatory No. 11 as follows:

Goldstrike operates an open pit mine in the Alleged AOI commonly referred to as the "Betze Post" mine. The Betze Post mine has been in operation since 1987. The majority of the Betze Post mine sits on mining claims or fee lands which Goldstrike acquired or patented prior to May 3, 1999. Information about production, smelter returns and mineral reserves relating to these mining claims and fee lands has no relevance in this case. A smaller amount of production from the Betze Post open pit mine has come from some of the mining claims or fee lands which Goldstrike acquired from Newmont on May 3, 1999, as part of the asset exchange. The production and reserves from these properties are tracked by Goldstrike and is commonly referred to as the "Barrick Fee" open pit production and reserves. As of December 31, 2008, reserves on the "Barrick Fee" open pit mining area were estimated at 1,503,777 ounces.

Goldstrike also operates an underground mine in the Alleged AOI commonly referred to as the "Miekle" mine. The Miekle mine has been in operation since 1996. The majority of the Miekle underground mine sits on mining claims or fee lands which Goldstrike acquired or patented prior to May 3, 1999. Information about production, smelter returns and mineral reserves relating to these mining claims and fee lands has no relevance in this case. A smaller amount of production from the Miekle underground mine has come from some of the mining claims or fee lands which Goldstrike acquired from Newmont on May 3, 1999, as part of the asset exchange. The production and reserves from these properties are tracked by Goldstrike and is commonly referred to as the "Barrick Fee" open pit production and reserves. As of December 31, 2008, reserves on the "Barrick Fee" underground area were estimated at 865,996 ounces.

Goldstrike has not calculated a smelter return on the production from the "Barrick Fee" lands because no royalty is believed to be owed on those ounces, and thus no such calculation is required.

Documents containing additional information about the production, smelter returns, and mineral reserves on or from the "Barrick Fee" properties (open pit and underground) will be produced in response to these interrogatories and the simultaneously served document requests. Those documents are still being collected from Goldstrike and processed for production. Goldstrike will supplement these responses with a list of the relevant documents, by Bates number, as soon as this process has been completed and Bates numbers have been assigned.

There are no other mines in the Alleged AOI which have been operated by Goldstrike since May 3, 1999.

INTERROGATORY NO. 12: For each of the proven mineral reserves situated within the 1979 AOI not listed in response to Interrogatory 11, in which Barrick has an interest, please set forth the following:

- a. The mining claims or fee land on which the mineral reserve is located.
- b. The value of each mineral reserve, specifying the value of each type mineral.

PARSONS
BEHLE &
LATIMER

- c. The date the unpatented or patented mining claim or fee land associated with each mineral reserve was acquired.
- d. From whom Barrick acquired the unpatented or patented mining claim on fee land on which each mineral reserve is located.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 12: Goldstrike incorporates by reference its objections and answers to Interrogatory No. 11 as if expressly and fully set forth herein.

INTERROGATORY NO. 13: For each of the probable reserves situated within the 1979 AOI not listed in response to Interrogatory 11, please set forth the following:

- a. The mining claims or fee land on which the mineral reserve is located.
- b. The value of each mineral reserve, specifying the value of each type mineral.
- c. The date the unpatented or patented mining claim or fee land associated with each mineral reserve was acquired.
- d. From whom Barrick acquired the unpatented or patented mining claim on fee land on which each mineral reserve is located.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 13: Goldstrike incorporates by reference its objections and answers to Interrogatory No. 11 as if expressly and fully set forth herein.

INTERROGATORY NO. 14: Please state the names of any persons or companies Barrick or High Desert has offered a 50% participation interest as discussed in paragraph 11 of the May 10, 1979 Agreement at issue in this matter. Said provision is specifically discussed in the first full paragraph on page 11 of the 1979 Agreement.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 14: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above.

Goldstrike specifically objects to Interrogatory No. 14 insofar as it is overbroad and unduly burdensome and requires Goldstrike to provide information that is not relevant and likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this matter. In particular, Goldstrike objects to Bullion's request for information about actions taken by Goldstrike prior to May 3, 1999, when it actually became the corporate successor of Barrick HD, which was the corporate successor of

4 5

6 7

9

10

8

11 12

13 14

15

17

16

18 19

20 21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

Behle & LATIMER High Desert. See also supra Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated herein by reference.

Goldstrike also objects to Interrogatory No. 14 insofar as it requires Goldstrike to provide information about actions taken by High Desert or Barrick HD after July 7, 1990, which actions Goldstrike was not itself involved those transactions, and there is no one at Goldstrike that is currently known to have information about such transactions. Goldstrike will not undertake any obligation to obtain information about High Desert's or Barrick HD's actions which is not already in its possession and control. See also id.

Finally, Goldstrike objects to Interrogatory No. 14 insofar as it is written in such a manner as to suggest that Goldstrike, Barrick HD or High Desert are somehow bound by the 1979 Agreement, which neither Goldstrike, Barrick HD nor High Desert are. See also supra Answer to Interrogatory No. 3 which is expressly incorporated herein by reference.

Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing general or specific objections, Goldstrike answers Interrogatory No. 14 as follows:

Goldstrike asserts that it has not itself offered a 50% participation interest to any persons or companies as discussed in paragraph 11 of the 1979 Agreement, and asserts that it had no obligation to offer any such participation interest to any person or company because it has never been a party to or otherwise bound by the 1979 Agreement. See also id.

Goldstrike asserts that to the best of its current knowledge, information and belief, neither High Desert nor Barrick HD offered a 50% participation interest to any persons or companies as discussed in paragraph 11 of the 1979 Agreement, and asserts that neither High Desert nor Barrick had an obligation to offer any such participation interest to any person or company because neither High Desert nor Barrick HD were ever a party to or otherwise bound by the 1979 Agreement. See also id.

INTERROGATORY NO. 15: If Barrick's answer to Interrogatory 14 was that Barrick or High Desert has not offered a 50% participation interest to anyone, please set forth all reasons why Barrick has not done so.

## Case 3:09-cv-00612-MMD-WGC Document 244-1 Filed 12/09/16 Page 31 of 33

1	ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 15: Goldstrike incorporates by reference its		
2	objections and answers to Interrogatory No. 14 as if expressly set forth herein.		
3	objections and answers to meeting atory 100. I has it empressity see form nevent		
4	Date de Ameil 6 2010 DADSONS DELLI E & LATIMED		
5	Dated: April 5, 2010 PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER		
6	By: Michael Witwood		
7	Michael R. Kealy Francis M. Wikstrom		
8	Michael P. Petrogeorge Brandon J. Mark		
9	Attorneys for Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc.		
10	·		
11			
12	·		
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	- 30 -		

Parsons Behle & Latimer

1 **VERIFICATION** 2 STATE OF UTAH 3 : ss COUNTY OF SALT LAKE 4 I, Richie D. Haddock, Vice President and General Counsel, North America, as designated in-5 house counsel for Barrick Goldstrike Mines, Inc., have read the foregoing BARRICK 6 GOLDSTRIKE MINES INC.'S ANSWERS AND OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFF'S 7 INTERROGATORIES [SET ONE], and am familiar with the objections, answers and responses 8 set forth therein. I am executing this Verification solely in my professional capacity as 9 designated in-house counsel for Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc., and am duly authorized in that 10 capacity to affirm on behalf of Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc., under the penalties of perjury, and 11 to the best of my current knowledge, information and belief, that Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc.'s 12 foregoing answers to plaintiff Bullion Monarch Mining, Inc.'s first set of interrogatories are true 13 and correct. 14 15 Richie D! Haddock 16 Vice President and General Counsel, North America, as designated in-house legal counsel for Barrick 17 Goldstrike Mines Inc. 18 SUBSCRIBED and SWORN to before this  $5^{+1/2}$ day of April, 2010. 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 - 31 -

Parsons Behle & Latimer

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Pursuant to FRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of Parsons Behle & Latimer, and that on this 5<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2010, I caused to be mailed, via U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, a true and correct copy of BARRICK GOLDSTRIKE MINES INC.'S ANSWERS AND OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFF'S INTERROGATORIES [SET ONE], to the following:

Clayton P. Brust, Esq. ROBISON, BELAUSTEGUI, SHARP & LOW 71 Washington Street Reno, NV 89503

By: Michael / Loginge

Parsons Behle &

LATIMER

- 32 -

### EXHIBIT 2

### Barrick's Responses to Plaintiff's Request for Production of Documents

# EXHIBIT 2

RECEIVED

APR 09 2010 PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER - 1 2 Michael R. Kealy (Nevada Bar No. 0971) 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 750 3 Reno, NV 89501 Telephone: (775) 323-1601 Facsimile: 4 (775) 348-7250 5 Francis M. Wikstrom (Utah Bar No. 3462; admitted pro hac vice) Michael P. Petrogeorge (Utah Bar No. 8870; admitted pro hac vice) Brandon Mark (Utah Bar No. 10439; admitted pro hac vice) 6 One Utah Center 7 201 South Main Street, Suite 1800 Salt Lake City, UT 84111 8 Telephone: (801) 536-6700 Facsimile: (801) 536-6111 Email: ecf@parsonsbehle.com 10 Attorneys for Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc. 11 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 12 FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA 13 14 Case No. CV-N-08-00227-ECR-VPC BULLION MONARCH MINING, INC., 15 Plaintiff, BARRICK GOLDSTRIKE MINES 16 INC.'S RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF 17 v. DOCUMENTS [SET ONE] BARRICK GOLDSTRIKE MINES INC., et 18 al., 19 Defendants. 20 Pursuant to Rules 26 and 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure ("FRCP"), defendant 21 22 Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc. ("Goldstrike") hereby objects and responds to plaintiff Bullion Monarch Mining, Inc.'s ("Bullion") first set of requests for production of documents served on 23

Goldstrike on or about February 24, 2010 (hereinafter, the "Requests").

#### **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

1. Goldstrike objects to the Requests to the extent that the documents sought have been previously produced or provided to Bullion or its counsel by Newmont in related litigation,

28

24

25

26

27

PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER

in response to a subpoena *duces tecum* that Bullion issued to Barrick Gold of North America Inc. in 2009 (the "Subpoena"), and/or as part of Goldstrike's own initial disclosures.

- 2. Goldstrike bases its responses and objections to the Requests on currently known and available information. Goldstrike will amend or supplement its responses to the extent required by Rule 26 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure if additional information is discovered.
- 3. Goldstrike objects to the Requests to the extent that the documents sought therein are publicly available records that are equally available to both Goldstrike and Bullion.
- 4. Goldstrike objects to the Requests insofar as they seek documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this matter.
- 5. Goldstrike objects to the Requests to the extent they are overbroad, vague, ambiguous, compound, complex, unduly burdensome, or oppressive in the amount, scope, or format of information or documents requested.
- 6. Goldstrike objects to the Requests insofar as they seek to impose burdens on Goldstrike that are inconsistent with or in addition to its discovery obligations as set forth in Rules 26 and 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
- 7. Goldstrike objects to each Request to the extent that it seeks disclosure of information that would violate rights of privacy and other statutorily or judicially recognized protections and privileges, confidentiality agreements, or court orders restricting dissemination of information, or result in disclosure of materials prepared in anticipation of litigation or confidential settlement discussions.
- 8. Goldstrike objects to the Requests to the extent that they seek information and documents protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege, the work-product doctrine, the common-interest privilege, the joint-defense privilege, or other applicable privileges or immunities. Goldstrike will not knowingly produce documents that are subject to any applicable privileges or protections. Goldstrike does not waive but rather intends to preserve and is preserving the attorney-client privilege, the work-product protection, the common-interest privilege, the joint-defense privilege, and every other privilege or protection with respect to all

11 12

10

13

15 16

17

18

19

2021

2223

24

25

2627

28

information and each and every document protected by any such privilege or protection. If any privileged or protected information or document is inadvertently disclosed by Goldstrike at anytime, Goldstrike requests that Bullion and its counsel immediately return to Goldstrike's counsel all documents, copies, and other media that refer to or reflect in any way such inadvertently disclosed information, pursuant to the terms of the Protective Order entered in this matter.

9. Goldstrike objects to the "Preliminary Definitions and Instructions" set forth on pages 1-3 of the Requests insofar as they seek to impose burdens on Goldstrike that are inconsistent with, or in addition to, Goldstrike's obligations as set forth in Rules 26 and/or 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Goldstrike specifically objects that the phrase "related affiliates," which Bullion used in several definitions, is vague, ambiguous, and otherwise undefined. Bullion does not limit the phrase in any way and does not provide examples of who or what constitutes a related affiliate. In particular, Goldstrike notes that it is the corporate successor of Barrick HD, which was the corporate successor of High Desert Mineral Resource of Nevada, Inc. ("High Desert"). Goldstrike is not the corporate successor to any of High Desert's related affiliates, therefore, Goldstrike does not have possession, custody, or control of any documents belonging to any such related affiliates. If Bullion intends for the phrase "related affiliates" to mean any person or entity related in any way to Newmont, Goldstrike, or High Desert, then the definitions are overbroad and any Requests employing the defined terms are unduly burdensome. Specifically, Goldstrike will interpret (1) the term "Barrick" to mean and refer solely to defendant Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc., (2) the term "High Desert" to mean and refer solely to High Desert Mineral Resources of Nevada, Inc., and (3) the term "Newmont" to collectively refer to Newmont USA Limited and Newmont Mining Corporation.

Goldstrike also objects that the definition for the term "Mineral Interests" is vague and ambiguous, specifically the term "unpatented mining claim" is not further defined. Bullion fails to specify whether it refers to unpatented lode mining claims, unpatented mill site claims, or both. For purposes of responding to these Requests, Goldstrike will assume that Bullion only seeks documents relating to unpatented lode mining claims, as those are the only mining claims with

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

any apparent relevancy to the pending dispute.

- Goldstrike objects to the Requests insofar as they fail to adequately define the term "you." For purposes of responding to the Requests, Goldstrike interprets the term "you" to refer only to the named defendant in this action, Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc., and not to any other entity.
- 11. Goldstrike does not in any manner waive or intend to waive, but rather intends to preserve and is preserving, (1) all objections as to competency, relevancy, materiality, and admissibility; (2) all objections to the use of any of the responses herein or the submission of any documents produced in response hereto in any proceeding, motion, hearing, or the trial in this or any other action; and (3) all objections to any further discovery or request involving or related to any of the Requests. The supplying of any information or document in response to the Requests does not constitute an admission by Goldstrike that such information is relevant, admissible, or material to any of the issues in this action, and Goldstrike reserves the right to object to any further inquiry with respect to any subject matter at any time.
- 12. Goldstrike incorporates each of the foregoing general objections into each and every response below as if specifically and fully set forth therein. A republication or restatement, in whole or in part, of any one or more of the foregoing general objections in response to a specific Request is not intended to waive and does not waive an objection not otherwise stated.

#### SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS AND ANSWERS

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1: All documents evidencing any transactions set forth in your response to interrogatory number 2 served herewith.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 1: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike specifically objects to Request No. 1 to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena issued in 2009. Goldstrike also objects to the extent the Request seeks documents that are publicly available and therefore equally accessible to all parties.

-4-

PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER

Goldstrike specifically objects that the phrase "transactions set forth in your response to interrogatory number 2 served herewith" is vague and ambiguous because Bullion's Interrogatory No. 2 does not relate to any "transactions." Instead, Interrogatory No. 2 requests information about "unpatented mining claims and fee land located or otherwise acquired by" High Desert or Goldstrike. Goldstrike will interpret this request to seek documents relating to Goldstrike's or High Desert's acquisition of the "unpatented mining claims and fee land" identified in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2. Because Bullion's request refers to its Interrogatory No. 2, Goldstrike further incorporates by reference all objections, limitations, and clarifications set forth in its Answer to Interrogatory No. 2 as if specifically set forth herein.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds that the following documents may be responsive to Bullion's request: BGBM00785-802; BGBM004829-41; BGBM005936-84; BGBM006358-541; BGBM006157-279; BGBM007963-8025; BGBM008026-36; BAR043773-83; BAR043822-26; BAR043811-15; BAR043816-21; BAR043801-05; and BAR043806-10. The documents marked with the "BAR" prefix are being produced simultaneously herewith. Additional responsive documents may have already been produced by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. in response to the Subpoena, or they may be produced as a supplement to Goldstrike's initial disclosures in the near future.

<u>REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2</u>: All documents evidencing any transactions set forth in your response to interrogatory number 3 served herewith.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 2: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike specifically objects to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena. Goldstrike also objects to the extent the request seeks documents that are publicly available and therefore equally accessible to all parties.

Goldstrike specifically objects that the phrase "transactions set forth in your response to interrogatory number 3 served herewith" is vague and ambiguous because Bullion's Interrogatory

- 5 -

No. 3 does not relate to any "transactions." Instead, Interrogatory No. 3 requests that Goldstrike "state each and every reason why Barrick" disputes its liability to Bullion with respect to certain claims. Although Interrogatory No. 3 refers to "land acquired by Barrick from High Desert," if the word "transactions" is interpreted to refer to the acquisition of unpatented mining claims and fee land from High Desert, then this request asks for a subset of the documents already sought through Request No. 1. Because Bullion's request refers to its Interrogatory No. 3, Goldstrike further incorporates by reference all objections, limitations, and clarifications set forth in its Answer to Interrogatory No. 3 as if fully set forth herein.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds by incorporating by reference its Response to Request No. 1, *supra*, as if fully set forth herein.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3: All documents by which you or High Desert acquired any interest in any unpatented mining claims or fee land after July 10, 1990, within the Area of Interest.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 3: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike specifically objects to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena. Goldstrike also objects to the extent the request seeks documents that are publicly available and therefore equally accessible to all parties.

Goldstrike further objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it seeks documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate successor to Barrick HD, which was the successor to High Desert, until May 3, 1999. Therefore, documents relating to mining claims or fee lands acquired by Goldstrike prior to that date are irrelevant. Additionally, because Barrick HD did not become the corporate successor to High

LATIMER

Desert until November 30, 1995, any documents relating to Barrick HD's acquisition of unpatented mining claims and fee lands prior to that date are also not relevant to this matter.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds by noting that this request seeks a subset of the documents sought by Request No. 1 and therefore incorporates by reference its Response to Request No. 1, *supra*, as if fully set forth herein.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4: All agreements between you and High Desert.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 4: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike specifically objects to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena. Goldstrike also objects to the extent the request seeks documents that are publicly available and therefore equally accessible to all parties.

Goldstrike further objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it requests documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate successor to Barrick HD, which was the successor to High Desert, until May 3, 1999. Therefore, documents relating to agreements between Goldstrike and any other party prior to that date are irrelevant.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks "All" agreements between Goldstrike and High Desert, without any temporal limitations and regardless of whether such agreements pertain to any subject matter potentially relevant to this dispute.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds that, to the best of its current knowledge, information, and belief, there have not been any agreements between Goldstrike and High Desert since May 3, 1999. As noted above and in Goldstrike's

- 7 -

Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, Barrick HD, and not Goldstrike, became the corporate successor to High Desert as the result of a merger transaction on or about November 30, 1995. The documents relating to the merger transaction were identified in Goldstrike's Response to Request No. 1, *supra*, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein.

<u>REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5</u>: All agreements between you and/or any company affiliated with Newmont Gold Company dated after December 23, 1991.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 5: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike specifically objects to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena. Goldstrike also objects to the extent the request seeks documents that are publicly available and therefore equally accessible to all parties. Goldstrike also objects that the request is vague, ambiguous, and unintelligible, specifically the phrase "between you and/or any company."

Goldstrike further objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it requests documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate successor to Barrick HD, which was the successor to High Desert, until May 3, 1999. Therefore, documents relating to agreements between Goldstrike and any other party prior to that date are irrelevant.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks "All" agreements between Goldstrike and multiple other entities, regardless of whether such agreements pertain to any subject matter relevant to this dispute. The request is so broadly worded that it would require Goldstrike to provide documents about transactions and dealings with Newmont or its related companies that have nothing to do with the acquisition or disposition of any mining claims or fee lands within the Area of Interest, or the production of minerals from such claims, and therefore have absolutely no bearing on this litigation. Goldstrike has entered into numerous agreements and arrangements with Newmont or its related companies over its

PARSONS

PARSONS
BEHLE &
LATIMER

years in operation, including but not limited to easement and right-of-way agreements, joint operating agreements, dewatering agreements, etc. None of these agreements has any bearing on any of the issues raised in this litigation. Goldstrike will not provide documents relating to agreements and arrangements with Newmont or its related companies that have no possible bearing on the issues raised in this case.

Furthermore, Goldstrike objects that the phrase "any company affiliated with Newmont Gold Company" is vague, ambiguous, and otherwise undefined. If Bullion intends for the phrase to mean any company affiliated in any way with Newmont, then the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it would extend to dozens, if not hundreds, of companies with which Newmont has had a relationship of any kind at any time during the past two decades.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds that the only agreements possibly relevant to these proceedings relate to the 1999 asset exchange with Newmont, which closed on May 3, 1999, and any subsequent agreements between Goldstrike and Newmont relating to the acquisition of properties in the Area of Interest after that date. *See* Answers to Interrogatories Nos. 2 and 10, which are expressly incorporated herein by reference. Copies of the documents relating to this asset exchange, which have been previously produced, may be found at BGBM004829-41; BGBM007963-8025; and BGBM008026-36. Documents relating to subsequent agreements, which are being produced herewith, include, without limitation, BAR043801-05; BAR043806-10; BAR043773-83; and BAR043822-26. Responsive documents may have also been produced by Barrick Gold of North America in response to the Subpoena, or may be produced in supplements to Goldstrike's initial disclosures in the near future.

<u>REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6</u>: All agreements between you and any other person or entity regarding the Area of Interest.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 6: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike further objects to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation

-9-

Parsons Behle & or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena. Goldstrike also objects to the extent the request seeks documents that are publicly available and therefore equally accessible to all parties.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it requests documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate successor to Barrick HD, which was the successor to High Desert, until May 3, 1999. Therefore, documents relating to agreements between Goldstrike and any other party prior to that date are irrelevant.

Goldstrike objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks "All" agreements between Goldstrike and any other parties, without any temporal limitations, which could require the production of agreements spanning more than three decades. Goldstrike will interpret the request to relate only to agreements on limited subject matter (see next paragraph) entered into by Goldstrike on or after May 3, 1999.

Goldstrike also objects that the phrase "regarding the Area of Interest" is vague, ambiguous, and otherwise undefined. To the extent Bullion intended this phrase to cover any agreements relating in any way to the Area of Interest as that term is defined by Bullion, the request is overbroad, unduly burdensome, and oppressive. The Area of Interest covers approximately 64-square miles of land in two different Nevada counties, including an area in which Goldstrike conducts extensive mining, milling, and exploration activities. Such request could conceivably include, for example, contracts with various service providers, employment contracts, contracts relating to water and power, and innumerable other contracts and agreements that are irrelevant to this dispute. Goldstrike will interpret the phrase "regarding the Area of Interest" to mean agreements that expressly refer to land acquisitions within the area covered by the Area of Interest.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds that it

- 10 -

PSA 0047

is not currently aware of any agreements, other than those identified in response to Request Nos. 1, 4, and 5, above, with any other party relating to land acquisitions within the area covered by the Area of Interest.

<u>REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 7</u>: All correspondence between you and High Desert or the Halavaises.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 7: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike further objects to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it requests documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate successor to Barrick HD, which was the successor to High Desert, until May 3, 1999. Therefore, correspondence between Goldstrike and High Desert or the Halavaises prior to May 3, 1999, is irrelevant.

Goldstrike objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks "All" correspondence between Goldstrike and High Desert or the Halavaises, without any temporal limitations, which could encompass correspondence spanning more than three decades. Goldstrike further objects that the request is overbroad, unduly burdensome, and oppressive because it seeks "All" correspondence, irrespective of whether such correspondence is related to any subject matter possibly relevant to this dispute.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike states that all responsive documents, if any, were produced by Barrick Gold of North America in response to the Subpoena, or may be produced as supplements to Goldstrike's initial disclosures in the near future.

5

8

12

11

14

15

13

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

24

23

25 26

27

28

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 8: All correspondence between you and Newmont and/or High Desert relating to Mineral Interests owned by either Newmont or High Desert in the Area of Interest.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 8: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike further objects to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it requests documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate successor to Barrick HD, which was the successor to High Desert, until May 3, 1999. Therefore, correspondence between Goldstrike and High Desert or Newmont prior to May 3, 1999, is not relevant.

Goldstrike objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks "All" correspondence between Goldstrike and High Desert or Newmont relating to certain specified "Mineral Interests," without any temporal limitations, which could conceivably encompass correspondence spanning more than three decades.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike states that responsive documents may have been produced by Barrick Gold of North America in response to the Subpoena or by Newmont in the related litigation, and that additional responsive documents may be produced as supplements to Goldstrike's initial disclosures in the near future.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 9: All Agreements dated after July 10, 1990, by which Barrick or High Desert acquired Mineral Interests in the Area of Interest from any third party.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 9: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike further objects to the extent that Bullion

- 12 -

requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena. Goldstrike also objects to the extent the request seeks documents that are publicly available and therefore equally accessible to all parties.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it requests documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate successor to Barrick HD, which was the successor to High Desert, until May 3, 1999. Therefore, agreements between Goldstrike and any other party prior to that date are irrelevant.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it purports to require Goldstrike to produce agreements to which it was not a party, specifically agreements "by which . . . High Desert acquired Mineral Interests in the Area of Interest." If any such transactions occurred, Goldstrike was not itself involved in them and may not have any such agreements in its current possession, custody, or control. Goldstrike will not undertake any affirmative obligation to obtain agreements relating to High Desert's acquisitions in the Area of Interest.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad, unduly burdensome, and oppressive because it purports to require Goldstrike to produce "All" agreements concerning the acquisition of certain interests within the Area of Interest, which covers approximately 64-square miles of land spanning two different Nevada counties. In addition to the broad scope of the area covered by the request, the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it requests any such agreements from the past two decades.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds by incorporating by reference its Response to Request No. 1, *supra*, as if set forth herein. Additionally, responsive documents may have been produced by Barrick Gold of North America in response to the

5 6 7

8 9

11 12

10

13 14

16

15

17 18

19 20 21

22 23

24

25

26

27 28 Subpoena or by Newmont in the related litigation, and additional responsive documents may be produced as supplements to Goldstrike's initial disclosures in the near future.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10: A list of all unpatented mining claims located (staked) by Barrick in the Area of Interest after January 1, 1992, and the dates of location.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 10: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike further objects to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena. Goldstrike also objects to the extent the request seeks documents that are publicly available and therefore equally accessible to all parties.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it requests documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate successor to Barrick HD, which was the successor to High Desert, until May 3, 1999. Therefore, information about mining claims located by Goldstrike prior to May 3, 1999, is not relevant to this dispute.

Goldstrike specifically objects that the request improperly attempts to require Goldstrike to create a new document—"A list"—containing certain requested information. As a result, this request appears to be an interrogatory masquerading as a document request and is an apparent effort to avoid the limitations and restrictions on the use of interrogatories under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, including, but not limited to, the limitation on the number of interrogatories that may be propounded by any one party.

Subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds by noting that it is not aware of any "list of all unpatented mining claims located (staked) by Barrick in the Area of Interest after January 1, 1992, and the dates of location" in its possession, custody, or control. Goldstrike further responds that a summary of Goldstrike's acquisitions in the Area of Interest after May 3, 1999, has been

provided in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated herein by reference.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11: In addition to the Agreements referenced above, any Agreement to which Barrick is a party which references, includes, or in any way affects those patented and unpatented mining claims referred to in Exhibit A-1 to the 1979 Agreement.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 11: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike further objects to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena. Goldstrike also objects to the extent the request seeks documents that are publicly available and therefore equally accessible to all parties.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it requests documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate successor to Barrick HD, which was the successor to High Desert, until May 3, 1999. Therefore, agreements prior to that date are irrelevant.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad, unduly burdensome, and oppressive because it purports to require Goldstrike to produce "any" agreements that "reference, include, or in any way affect[]," various patented and unpatented mining claims referenced in Exhibit A-1 to the 1979 Agreement. In particular, the phrase "in any way affect[]" could include any agreements that tangentially or remotely relate to such mining claims but which have no bearing on the issues relevant to this dispute. Goldstrike also objects that the introductory qualifier "In addition to the Agreements referenced above" is vague and ambiguous. It is not evident what "Agreements referenced above" are included or intended given that the prior Requests discuss and identify a large number of disparate agreements, and many of those agreements do not appear related to this request whatsoever.

SECTION DESCRIPTION OF SECTION OF

THE CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds that the only agreement that Goldstrike is a party to that specifically and expressly references in any way the mining claims listed in Exhibit A-1 to the 1979 Agreement is the Asset Exchange Agreement entered into between Goldstrike and Newmont in 1999 and that copies of that agreement and related documents have previously been produced in this litigation. *See* Response to Request No. 1, *supra*.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12: In addition to the Agreements referenced above, any Agreement to which Barrick is a party which references the 1979 Agreement.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 12: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike further objects to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena. Goldstrike also objects to the extent the request seeks documents that are publicly available and therefore equally accessible to all parties.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it requests documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate successor to Barrick HD, which was the successor to High Desert, until May 3, 1999. Therefore, agreements prior to that date are irrelevant.

Goldstrike also objects that the introductory qualifier "In addition to the Agreements referenced above" is vague and ambiguous. It is not evident what "Agreements referenced above" are included or intended given that the prior Requests discuss and identify a large number of disparate agreements, and many of those agreements do not appear related to this request whatsoever.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds that the

- 16 -

Венсе &

Parsons

BEHLE &

only agreement that Goldstrike is a party to that specifically and expressly references the 1979 Agreement is the Asset Exchange Agreement between Goldstrike and Newmont in 1999, which has previously been produced in this litigation. *See* Response to Request No. 1, *supra*.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13: In addition to the correspondence referenced above, any correspondence sent by Barrick to any other party which references the 1979 Agreement.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 13: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike further objects to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena.

Goldstrike also objects insofar as the request seeks documents protected by any applicable privileges or protections. Specifically, any correspondence that Goldstrike sent to its legal counsel, or any representative of its legal counsel, is protected by the attorney-client privilege and will not be produced. Additionally, any correspondence that Goldstrike sent to counsel of a party with which Goldstrike shared a common interest is also privileged and protected from discovery and will not be produced. Furthermore, any correspondence about joint defense matters is privileged and protected from discovery and will not be produced. To the extent Goldstrike communicated any documents protected by the work-product doctrine in any correspondence protected by any applicable privilege, such documents retain their protections under Rule 26(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and will not be produced.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it requests documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate successor to Barrick HD, which was the successor to High Desert, until May 3, 1999. Therefore, correspondence sent by Goldstrike prior to that date is irrelevant to this litigation.

Goldstrike also objects that the introductory qualifier "In addition to the correspondence referenced above" is vague and ambiguous. It is not evident what "correspondence referenced

1

4

6 7

9 10

8

12

11

14

13

15 16

17

18 19

2021

22

2324

2526

27

28

above" is included or intended given that the prior Requests discuss and identify numerous categories of correspondence, and many of those categories of correspondence do not appear related to this request whatsoever.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike states that it is not currently aware of the existence of any correspondence between Goldstrike and any other party relating to the 1979 Agreement, other than (1) correspondence between Goldstrike and its legal counsel during the negotiation and due diligence period for the 1999 asset exchange transaction (which communications are protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege), (2) correspondence between Goldstrike and its counsel in this lawsuit (which communications are also protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege and/or work-product doctrine), (3) correspondence between Goldstrike and prior counsel for High Desert as part of the pending litigation (which communications are also protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege and/or work-product doctrine), (4) correspondence between Goldstrike and/or its counsel and counsel for Newmont relating to this lawsuit (which correspondence is protected from discovery by the common-interest and/or joint-defense privileges), and (5) correspondence between Goldstrike and/or its counsel and counsel for Bullion relating to this matter (which correspondence is already in the possession and control of Bullion's counsel). Goldstrike asserts that insofar as there is any non-privileged correspondence between Goldstrike and any other party relating to the 1979 Agreement, such correspondence has either already been produced by Barrick Gold of North America in response to the Subpoena or by Newmont in the related litigation, or will be included in supplements to Goldstrike's initial disclosures which will be produced in the near future.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 14: Any and all documents of any kind which reflect the "Gross smelter return" as described in paragraph 4.E. of the 1979 Agreement payable or paid to Barrick resulting from any mining activity in the Area of Interest from December 23, 1991 to the current date.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 14: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above.

Goldstrike objects that the request is vague, ambiguous, and unintelligible. Specifically, the request seeks documents relating to a royalty described in the 1979 Agreement that is "payable or paid *to*" Goldstrike. To the extent the request attributes a position to Goldstrike that it has never taken, Goldstrike objects.

Goldstrike also objects that any such royalty exists whatsoever. The 1979 Agreement is neither valid nor binding on any party, Goldstrike has never assumed an obligation to pay any royalties under the 1979 Agreement, and Goldstrike has never claimed any entitlement to be paid any royalties under the 1979, Agreement. *See* Goldstrike's Answers to Interrogatories Nos. 3, 4, 14 and 15, which are expressly incorporated by reference as if set forth herein.

Goldstrike objects that the term "reflect" is vague, ambiguous, and otherwise undefined. Goldstrike interprets the term "reflect" to mean "expressly reference."

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds that it is not now and has never been liable to pay to any party, nor is it entitled to receive from any party, any royalty under the 1979 Agreement. Thus, Goldstrike is not aware of any documents in its possession, custody, or control that expressly reference the "Gross smelter return' as described in paragraph 4.E. of the 1979 Agreement" that is (or was) "payable or paid to" Goldstrike.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 15: For each mine within the Area of Interest acquired by High Desert or Barrick after July 10, 1990, which has been under production at anytime between January, 1992, and the current date, please provide the following:

- (a) Daily production records, including the location of the production, the tonnage of ore produced from each location and the grade of ore produced from each location.
- (b) Resource models, if any, which include grade, blocks, and resource category, whether that category be "proven", "probable", "inferred" or "mineralized material".
  - (c) Reserve models.

- (d) Metallurgical test work, both original before mining and any done during production.
  - (e) All documents showing projected and actual gold recoveries for each block of ore.
- (f) All documents showing or describing the mining segregation methods used for material mined, including how ore is defined and mined, what is done with material that is mineralized but low grade (sub-ore) but above waste cut-offs, and waste.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 15: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike also objects to the extent the request seeks documents that are publicly available and therefore equally accessible to all parties.

Goldstrike specifically objects that the request as a whole is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it requests documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate successor to Barrick HD, which was the successor to High Desert, until May 3, 1999. Therefore, any documents prior to that date are irrelevant and will not be produced.

Goldstrike also objects that this request as a whole is overbroad, unduly burdensome, and oppressive because it seeks "All" documents within certain enumerated categories. The categories identified in this request are extraordinarily broad, and Goldstrike often maintains information possibly falling within these categories in numerous forms and in numerous places. It would be unreasonably onerous and burdensome for Goldstrike to identify, gather, and produce all forms of such information from all sources when one form would suffice for Bullion's purposes in this lawsuit. Goldstrike has endeavored in good faith to obtain and produce documents containing the information that Bullion appears to seek through the various categories of requested documents but will not undertake the obligation to produce every single document in Goldstrike's possession that might contain such information in some alternative form.

Goldstrike also objects that the phrase "each mine within the Area of Interest" is vague, ambiguous, and otherwise undefined. Goldstrike does not necessarily maintain its documents and records by "mine," as the term appears to be used by Bullion's request. Specifically, many of

TO AND CONTRACTOR CONT

Goldstrike's records are divided between different areas of mining activity, at varying levels of specificity. In this regard, Goldstrike hereby incorporates by reference its Answer to Interrogatory No. 11, which is incorporated herein by reference as if set forth herein.

Additionally, Goldstrike objects to the extent Bullion requests documents that are only maintained in electronic form and which are not reasonably accessible because of undue burden or expense. Goldstrike has undertaken a good-faith effort to obtain information from numerous electronically stored sources, including sources that are no longer in "active" use. However, some electronically stored information is no longer reasonably accessible without undue burden or cost, and will not be produced.

Subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds and objects to each discrete subpart of Request No. 15 as follows:

(a) Goldstrike objects to the terms "Daily production records," "tonnage of ore," and "grade of ore" as used in Request No. 15(a) because they are vague, ambiguous, and otherwise undefined. Goldstrike does not maintain "daily production records" as Bullion appears to use that term. Goldstrike will not attempt to speculate about the meaning that Bullion intended for these terms.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds that it will produce concurrently herewith several different forms of production records from various areas of Goldstrike's mining activity. These documents, as well as others responsive to these Requests and to Bullion's Interrogatories, are control labeled with the prefix "BAR."

Goldstrike specifically notes that such records, which are produced as they are maintained in the ordinary course of business, include production information from areas acquired both before and after July 10, 1990, as well as areas acquired both before and after May 3, 1999. Some production records that Goldstrike will produce differentiate production from various areas of mining activity based on certain designated characteristics. By providing production records from areas of mining activity acquired before May 3, 1999, Goldstrike does not intend to imply -21 -

Parsons Behle &

LATIMER

that they are relevant to this dispute or that such areas of mining activity are in anyway subject to Bullion's claims in this litigation. Production from areas acquired prior to May 3, 1999 has no relevance to this lawsuit, and Goldstrike reserves the right to object to the admissibility of such information at any trial or other proceeding, and reserves the right to oppose any further request for information relating to such prior production. *See* Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 11, which is incorporated herein by reference as if set forth herein.

(b) and (c) Goldstrike objects to the terms "Resource models," "grade," "blocks," "resource category," "proven," "probable," "inferred," "mineralized material," and "Reserve models" as used in Request Nos. 15(b) and 15(c) because they are vague, ambiguous, and otherwise undefined. Goldstrike will not attempt to speculate about the meaning that Bullion intended for these terms.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds that it will produce documents containing several different forms of reserve and resource information. These documents, as well as others responsive to these Requests and to Bullion's Interrogatories, are control labeled with the prefix "BAR." Goldstrike notes that reserve and resource information is also available from various publicly available sources, including publicly available portions of Barrick Gold Corporation's website, as well as from publicly available databases maintained by U.S. (EDGAR) and Canadian (SEDAR) regulatory authorities.

As before, Goldstrike notes that the documents produced in response to Request Nos. 15(b) and/or 15(c) are produced as they are maintained in the ordinary course of business and may include resource and reserve information from areas acquired both before and after July 10, 1990, as well as areas acquired both before and after May 3, 1999. By providing resource and reserve information from areas of mining activity acquired before May 3, 1999, Goldstrike does not intend to imply that they are relevant to this dispute or that such areas of mining activity are in anyway subject to Bullion's claims in this litigation. Resource and reserve information from areas acquired prior to May 3, 1999 has no relevance to this lawsuit, and Goldstrike reserves the right to object to the admissibility of such information at any trial or other proceeding, and

reserves the right to oppose any further request for information relating to such resources and reserves. *See* Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 11, which is incorporated herein by reference as if set forth herein.

(d) Goldstrike objects to the term "Metallurgical test work" as used in Request No. 15(d) because it is vague, ambiguous, and otherwise undefined. Goldstrike will not attempt to speculate about the meaning that Bullion intended for this term.

Goldstrike also objects to the request insofar as it purports to require Goldstrike to produce responsive information in multiple forms from multiple sources. A complete and exhaustive production of all metallurgical test data would be prohibitively voluminous because it can only be produced in a form in which the vast majority of the information and data provided would not be relevant to Bullion's claims. In particular, one database contains the results of metallurgical testing on materials from mines around the world that are owned by other Barrick Gold Corporation subsidiaries. It would be unduly burdensome and tremendously expensive for Goldstrike to search, identify, and retrieve from this database only the test results relating to mining claims acquired by Goldstrike on or after May 3, 1999, or even just the test results relating to Goldstrike after May 3, 1999.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds that it will produce several forms of metallurgical test information. These documents, as well as others responsive to these Requests and to Bullion's Interrogatories, are control labeled with the prefix "BAR."

As before, Goldstrike specifically notes that the documents produced in response to Request No. 15(d) will be produced as they are maintained in the ordinary course of business and may include metallurgical test information from areas acquired both before and after July 10, 1990, as well as areas acquired both before and after May 3, 1999. By providing metallurgical test information from areas of mining activity acquired before May 3, 1999, Goldstrike does not intend to imply that they are relevant to this dispute or that such areas of mining activity are in anyway subject to Bullion's claims in this litigation. Metallurgical test information from areas

SHEWARANIAN CHARACTER CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR

acquired prior to May 3, 1999 has no relevance to this lawsuit, and Goldstrike reserves the right to object to the admissibility of such information at any trial or other proceeding, and reserves the right to oppose any further request for information relating to such metallurgical test work. *See* Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 11, which is incorporated herein by reference as if set forth herein.

(e) Goldstrike objects to the terms "projected gold recoveries," "actual gold recoveries," and "block of ore" as they are used in Request No. 15(e) because they are vague, ambiguous, and otherwise undefined. Goldstrike will not attempt to speculate about the meaning that Bullion intended for these terms.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds that it will produce information related to recovery rates and predicted recovery curves, among other information that may be responsive to this request. These documents, as well as others responsive to these Requests and to Bullion's Interrogatories, are control labeled with the prefix "BAR."

As before, Goldstrike specifically notes that the documents produced in response to Request No. 15(e) will be produced as they are maintained in the ordinary course of business and may include information related to recovery rates and predicted recovery curves from areas acquired both before and after July 10, 1990, as well as areas acquired both before and after May 3, 1999. By providing information related to recovery rates and predicted recovery curves from areas of mining activity acquired before May 3, 1999, Goldstrike does not intend to imply that they are relevant to this dispute or that such areas of mining activity are in anyway subject to Bullion's claims in this litigation. Documents and information about recovery rates and predicted recovery curves from areas acquired prior to May 3, 1999, have no relevance to this lawsuit, and Goldstrike reserves the right to object to the admissibility of such information at any trial or other proceeding, and reserves the right to oppose any further request for information relating to such recovery rates and predicted recovery curves. See Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 11, which is incorporated herein by reference as if set forth herein.

MANAGORMANAMA

TO SELECTION OF THE PROPERTY O

(f) Goldstrike objects to the terms "mining segregation methods," "mineralized," "waste cut-offs," and to the phrases "how ore is defined and mined" and "what is done with material that is mineralized but low grade," as used in Request No. 15(f) because they are vague, ambiguous, and otherwise undefined. Goldstrike will not attempt to speculate about the meaning that Bullion intended for these terms and phrases.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds that it will produce documents relating to, among other things, ore tracking and cut-off grades. These documents, as well as others responsive to these Requests and to Bullion's Interrogatories, are control labeled with the prefix "BAR."

As before, Goldstrike specifically notes that the documents produced in response to Request No. 15(f) will be produced as they are maintained in the ordinary course of business and may include information relating to ore tracking and cut-off grades from areas acquired by Goldstrike well before May 3, 1999, including areas Goldstrike acquired prior to July 10, 1990. By providing documents relating to ore tracking and cut-off grades from areas of mining activity acquired before May 3, 1999, Goldstrike does not intend to imply that they are relevant to this dispute or that such areas of mining activity are in anyway subject to Bullion's claims in this litigation. Documents and information about ore tracking and cut-off grades relating to areas acquired prior to May 3, 1999, have no relevance to this lawsuit, and Goldstrike reserves the right to object to the admissibility of such information at any trial or other proceeding, and reserves the right to oppose any further request for information relating to such ore tracking and cut-off grades. See Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 11, which is incorporated herein by reference as if set forth herein.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 16: Please produce all documents listed in Exhibit H at Bates numbers Newmont 5124-5132.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 16: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike further objects to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation

- 25 -

4 5

Parsons Behle & or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena. Goldstrike also objects to the extent the request seeks documents that are publicly available and therefore equally accessible to all parties.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it requests documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate successor to Barrick HD, which was the successor to High Desert, until May 3, 1999. Therefore, any documents related to events prior to that date are not relevant to this litigation.

Subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds and objects to each discrete subpart of Exhibit H as follows:

The following documents, which are given the specified numbers on the document control labeled NEWMONT5124-32, are publicly available documents and are equally accessible to all parties: 6 through 11, 13 through 24, 27, and 33. Goldstrike notes further, however, that many of these documents have already been produced by Barrick Gold of North America in response to the Subpoena, or by Bullion and/or Newmont in the related litigation.

The following documents, which are given the specified numbers on the document control labeled NEWMONT5124-32, are subject to claims of privilege and will not be produced: 1 and 2, 4 and 5, 35 and 36, 43, the first document described in 44, 52, 86 and 87. Goldstrike specifically notes that several of these documents were the subject of Goldstrike's motion for a protective order in the related in Newmont litigation, which the Court granted.

The following documents, which are given the specified numbers on the document control labeled NEWMONT5124-32, are, to the best of Goldstrike's current knowledge, information, and belief, not in the possession, custody, or control of Goldstrike: 28, 53, 56, 58, and 85.

The following documents, which are given the specified numbers on the document control labeled NEWMONT5124-32, have already been produced, either by Barrick Gold of North

America in response to the Subpoena, or by Bullion and/or Newmont in the related litigation: 3, 12, 51, 59 through 61, 63 through 65, 67, and 70 through 84. The following documents, which are given the specified numbers on the document control labeled NEWMONT5124-32, will be as supplements to Goldstrike's initial disclosures in the near future: 25 and 26, 29 through 32, 34, 37 through 42, the second document described in 44, 45 through 50, 54 and 55, 57, 62, 66, 68 and 69. Dated: April 5, 2010 PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER Francis M. Wikstrom Michael P. Petrogeorge Brandon J. Mark Attorneys for Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc. - 27 -

PARSONS
BEHLE &

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Pursuant to FRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of Parsons Behle & Latimer, and that on this 5<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2010, I caused to be mailed, via U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, a true and correct copy of BARRICK GOLDSTRIKE MINES INC.'S RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS [SET ONE], to the following:

Clayton P. Brust, Esq. ROBISON, BELAUSTEGUI, SHARP & LOW 71 Washington Street Reno, NV 89503

By: Michael Hetrograg

Parsons

BEHLE &

LATIMER

## EXHIBIT 3

Barrick's First Supplemental Responses to Plaintiff's Request for Production of Documents

# EXHIBIT 3

Oase 3:09-cv-00612-MMD-WGC Document 244-3 Filed 12/09/16 Page 2 of 29 RECEIVED JUL 0 6 2010 1 PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER 2 Michael R. Kealy (Nevada Bar No. 0971) 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 750 3 Reno, NV 89501 Telephone: (775) 323-1601 4 Facsimile: (775) 348-7250 5 Francis M. Wikstrom (Utah Bar No. 3462; admitted pro hac vice) Michael P. Petrogeorge (Utah Bar No. 8870; admitted pro hac vice) 6 Brandon Mark (Utah Bar No. 10439; admitted pro hac vice) One Utah Center 7 201 South Main Street, Suite 1800 Salt Lake City, UT 84111 8 Telephone: (801) 536-6700 Facsimile: (801) 536-6111 9 Email: ecf@parsonsbehle.com 10 Attorneys for Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc. 11 12 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA 13 14 15 BULLION MONARCH MINING, INC., Case No. CV-N-09-00612-ECR-VPC Plaintiff. BARRICK GOLDSTRIKE MINES 16 INC.'S FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL 17 v. RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF BARRICK GOLDSTRIKE MINES INC., et 18 DOCUMENTS [SET ONE] al., 19 Defendants. 20 21 Pursuant to Rules 26 and 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure ("FRCP"), defendant 22 Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc. ("Goldstrike") hereby objects and responds to plaintiff Bullion Monarch Mining, Inc.'s ("Bullion") first set of requests for production of documents served on 23 24 Goldstrike on or about February 24, 2010 (hereinafter, the "Requests"). 25 **GENERAL OBJECTIONS** 26 1. Goldstrike objects to the Requests to the extent that the documents sought have 27 been previously produced or provided to Bullion or its counsel by Newmont in related litigation, 28 4836-0330-9829.2 PSA 0067

PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER

9

12 13

15

16

14

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24 25

26 27

28

in response to a subpoena duces tecum that Bullion issued to Barrick Gold of North America Inc. in 2009 (the "Subpoena"), and/or as part of Goldstrike's own initial disclosures.

- Goldstrike bases its responses and objections to the Requests on currently known 2. and available information. Goldstrike will amend or supplement its responses to the extent required by Rule 26 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure if additional information is discovered.
- 3. Goldstrike objects to the Requests to the extent that the documents sought therein are publicly available records that are equally available to both Goldstrike and Bullion.
- 4. Goldstrike objects to the Requests insofar as they seek documents that are not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this matter.
- Goldstrike objects to the Requests to the extent they are overbroad, vague, 5. ambiguous, compound, complex, unduly burdensome, or oppressive in the amount, scope, or format of information or documents requested.
- Goldstrike objects to the Requests insofar as they seek to impose burdens on 6. Goldstrike that are inconsistent with or in addition to its discovery obligations as set forth in Rules 26 and 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
- Goldstrike objects to each Request to the extent that it seeks disclosure of 7. information that would violate rights of privacy and other statutorily or judicially recognized protections and privileges, confidentiality agreements, or court orders restricting dissemination of information, or result in disclosure of materials prepared in anticipation of litigation or confidential settlement discussions.
- Goldstrike objects to the Requests to the extent that they seek information and 8. documents protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege, the work-product doctrine, the common-interest privilege, the joint-defense privilege, or other applicable privileges or immunities. Goldstrike will not knowingly produce documents that are subject to any applicable privileges or protections. Goldstrike does not waive but rather intends to preserve and is preserving the attorney-client privilege, the work-product protection, the common-interest privilege, the joint-defense privilege, and every other privilege or protection with respect to all 4836-0330-9829.2

2

8

9

101112

14 15

13

16 17

18 19

2021

2223

24

2526

27

28

information and each and every document protected by any such privilege or protection. If any privileged or protected information or document is inadvertently disclosed by Goldstrike at anytime, Goldstrike requests that Bullion and its counsel immediately return to Goldstrike's counsel all documents, copies, and other media that refer to or reflect in any way such inadvertently disclosed information, pursuant to the terms of the Protective Order entered in this matter.

Goldstrike objects to the "Preliminary Definitions and Instructions" set forth on 9. pages 1-3 of the Requests insofar as they seek to impose burdens on Goldstrike that are inconsistent with, or in addition to, Goldstrike's obligations as set forth in Rules 26 and/or 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Goldstrike specifically objects that the phrase "related affiliates," which Bullion used in several definitions, is vague, ambiguous, and otherwise undefined. Bullion does not limit the phrase in any way and does not provide examples of who or what constitutes a related affiliate. In particular, Goldstrike notes that it is the corporate successor of Barrick HD, Inc. ("Barrick HD"), formerly known as High Desert Mineral Resources of Nevada, Inc. ("High Desert"). Goldstrike is not the corporate successor to any of High Desert's other related affiliates, therefore, Goldstrike does not have possession, custody, or control of any documents belonging to any such related affiliates. If Bullion intends for the phrase "related affiliates" to mean any person or entity related in any way to Newmont, Goldstrike, or High Desert, then the definitions are overbroad and any Requests employing the defined terms are unduly burdensome. Specifically, Goldstrike will interpret (1) the term "Barrick" to mean and refer solely to defendant Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc., (2) the term "High Desert" to mean and refer solely to High Desert Mineral Resources of Nevada, Inc., and (3) the term "Newmont" to collectively refer to Newmont USA Limited and Newmont Mining Corporation.

Goldstrike also objects that the definition for the term "Mineral Interests" is vague and ambiguous, specifically the term "unpatented mining claim" is not further defined. Bullion fails to specify whether it refers to unpatented lode mining claims, unpatented mill site claims, or both. For purposes of responding to these Requests, Goldstrike will assume that Bullion only seeks documents relating to unpatented lode mining claims, as those are the only mining claims with 4836-0330-9829.2

2

3 4

5

6

7 8

10 11

9

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25

26 27

28

any apparent relevancy to the pending dispute.

- Goldstrike objects to the Requests insofar as they fail to adequately define the term 10. "you." For purposes of responding to the Requests, Goldstrike interprets the term "you" to refer only to the named defendant in this action, Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc., and not to any other entity.
- Goldstrike does not in any manner waive or intend to waive, but rather intends to 11. preserve and is preserving, (1) all objections as to competency, relevancy, materiality, and admissibility; (2) all objections to the use of any of the responses herein or the submission of any documents produced in response hereto in any proceeding, motion, hearing, or the trial in this or any other action; and (3) all objections to any further discovery or request involving or related to any of the Requests. The supplying of any information or document in response to the Requests does not constitute an admission by Goldstrike that such information is relevant, admissible, or material to any of the issues in this action, and Goldstrike reserves the right to object to any further inquiry with respect to any subject matter at any time.
- Goldstrike incorporates each of the foregoing general objections into each and 12. every response below as if specifically and fully set forth therein. A republication or restatement, in whole or in part, of any one or more of the foregoing general objections in response to a specific Request is not intended to waive and does not waive an objection not otherwise stated.

### SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS AND ANSWERS

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1: All documents evidencing any transactions set forth in your response to interrogatory number 2 served herewith.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 1: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike specifically objects to Request No. 1 to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena issued in 2009. Goldstrike also objects to the extent the Request seeks documents that are publicly available and therefore equally accessible to all parties.

Goldstrike specifically objects that the phrase "transactions set forth in your response to interrogatory number 2 served herewith" is vague and ambiguous because Bullion's Interrogatory No. 2 does not relate to any "transactions." Instead, Interrogatory No. 2 requests information about "unpatented mining claims and fee land located or otherwise acquired by" High Desert or Goldstrike. Goldstrike will interpret this request to seek documents relating to Goldstrike's or High Desert's acquisition of the "unpatented mining claims and fee land" identified in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2. Because Bullion's request refers to its Interrogatory No. 2, Goldstrike further incorporates by reference all objections, limitations, and clarifications set forth in its Answer to Interrogatory No. 2 as if specifically set forth herein.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds that the following documents may be responsive to Bullion's request: BGBM00785-802; BGBM004829-41; BGBM005936-84; BGBM006358-541; BGBM006157-279; BGBM007963-8025; BGBM008026-36; BAR043773-83; BAR043822-26; BAR043811-15; BAR043816-21; BAR043801-05; and BAR043806-10. The documents marked with the "BAR" prefix are being produced simultaneously herewith. Additional responsive documents may have already been produced by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. in response to the Subpoena, or they may be produced as a supplement to Goldstrike's initial disclosures in the near future.

<u>REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2</u>: All documents evidencing any transactions set forth in your response to interrogatory number 3 served herewith.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 2: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike specifically objects to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena. Goldstrike also objects to the extent the request seeks documents that are publicly available and therefore equally accessible to all parties.

Goldstrike specifically objects that the phrase "transactions set forth in your response to interrogatory number 3 served herewith" is vague and ambiguous because Bullion's Interrogatory 4836-0330-9829.2

LATIMER

No. 3 does not relate to any "transactions." Instead, Interrogatory No. 3 requests that Goldstrike "state each and every reason why Barrick" disputes its liability to Bullion with respect to certain claims. Although Interrogatory No. 3 refers to "land acquired by Barrick from High Desert," if the word "transactions" is interpreted to refer to the acquisition of unpatented mining claims and fee land from High Desert, then this request asks for a subset of the documents already sought through Request No. 1. Because Bullion's request refers to its Interrogatory No. 3, Goldstrike further incorporates by reference all objections, limitations, and clarifications set forth in its Answer to Interrogatory No. 3 as if fully set forth herein.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds by incorporating by reference its Response to Request No. 1, *supra*, as if fully set forth herein.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3: All documents by which you or High Desert acquired any interest in any unpatented mining claims or fee land after July 10, 1990, within the Area of Interest.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 3: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike specifically objects to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena. Goldstrike also objects to the extent the request seeks documents that are publicly available and therefore equally accessible to all parties.

Goldstrike further objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it seeks documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate successor to Barrick HD formerly known as High Desert until May 3, 1999. Therefore, documents relating to mining claims or fee lands acquired by Goldstrike prior to that date are irrelevant.

1

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 accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds by noting that this request seeks a subset of the documents sought by Request No. 1 and therefore incorporates by reference its Response to Request No. 1, supra, as if fully set forth herein.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4: All agreements between you and High Desert.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 4: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike specifically objects to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena. Goldstrike also objects to the extent the request seeks documents that are publicly available and therefore equally accessible to all parties.

Goldstrike further objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it requests documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate successor to Barrick HD formerly known as High Desert until May 3, 1999. Therefore, documents relating to agreements between Goldstrike and any other party prior to that date are irrelevant.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks "All" agreements between Goldstrike and High Desert, without any temporal limitations and regardless of whether such agreements pertain to any subject matter potentially relevant to this dispute.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds that, to the best of its current knowledge, information, and belief, there have not been any agreements between Goldstrike and High Desert since May 3, 1999. As noted above and in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, Goldstrike merged with Barrick HD formerly known as High Desert, a subsidiary of Barrick Gold. Goldstrike did not merge directly with High Desert. The 4836-0330-9829.2

3 4

6 7

5

8 9 10

11

12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27 28 documents relating to the merger transaction were identified in Goldstrike's Response to Request No. 1, supra, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5: All agreements between you and/or any company affiliated with Newmont Gold Company dated after December 23, 1991.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 5: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike specifically objects to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena. Goldstrike also objects to the extent the request seeks documents that are publicly available and therefore equally accessible to all parties. Goldstrike also objects that the request is vague, ambiguous, and unintelligible, specifically the phrase "between you and/or any company."

Goldstrike further objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it requests documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate successor to Barrick HD formerly known as High Desert until May 3, 1999. Therefore, documents relating to agreements between Goldstrike and any other party prior to that date are irrelevant.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks "All" agreements between Goldstrike and multiple other entities, regardless of whether such agreements pertain to any subject matter relevant to this dispute. The request is so broadly worded that it would require Goldstrike to provide documents about transactions and dealings with Newmont or its related companies that have nothing to do with the acquisition or disposition of any mining claims or fee lands within the Area of Interest, or the production of minerals from such claims, and therefore have absolutely no bearing on this litigation. Goldstrike has entered into numerous agreements and arrangements with Newmont or its related companies over its years in operation, including but not limited to easement and right-of-way agreements, joint operating agreements, dewatering agreements, etc. None of these agreements has any bearing on 4836-0330-9829.2 - 8 -

any of the issues raised in this litigation. Goldstrike will not provide documents relating to agreements and arrangements with Newmont or its related companies that have no possible bearing on the issues raised in this case.

Furthermore, Goldstrike objects that the phrase "any company affiliated with Newmont Gold Company" is vague, ambiguous, and otherwise undefined. If Bullion intends for the phrase to mean any company affiliated in any way with Newmont, then the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it would extend to dozens, if not hundreds, of companies with which Newmont has had a relationship of any kind at any time during the past two decades.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds that the only agreements possibly relevant to these proceedings relate to the 1999 asset exchange with Newmont, which closed on May 3, 1999, and any subsequent agreements between Goldstrike and Newmont relating to the acquisition of properties in the Area of Interest after that date. *See* Answers to Interrogatories Nos. 2 and 10, which are expressly incorporated herein by reference. Copies of the documents relating to this asset exchange, which have been previously produced, may be found at BGBM004829-41; BGBM007963-8025; and BGBM008026-36. Documents relating to subsequent agreements, which are being produced herewith, include, without limitation, BAR043801-05; BAR043806-10; BAR043773-83; and BAR043822-26. Responsive documents may have also been produced by Barrick Gold of North America in response to the Subpoena, or may be produced in supplements to Goldstrike's initial disclosures in the near future.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6: All agreements between you and any other person or entity regarding the Area of Interest.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 6: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike further objects to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena. Goldstrike also objects to

1

2

6 7

5

8

10

11

9

12

13 14

15

16 17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

28

27

to all parties. Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it requests documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant

the extent the request seeks documents that are publicly available and therefore equally accessible

evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate successor to Barrick HD formerly known as High Desert until May 3, 1999. Therefore,

documents relating to agreements between Goldstrike and any other party prior to that date are irrelevant.

Goldstrike objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks "All" agreements between Goldstrike and any other parties, without any temporal limitations, which could require the production of agreements spanning more than three decades. Goldstrike will interpret the request to relate only to agreements on limited subject matter (see next paragraph) entered into by Goldstrike on or after May 3, 1999.

Goldstrike also objects that the phrase "regarding the Area of Interest" is vague, ambiguous, and otherwise undefined. To the extent Bullion intended this phrase to cover any agreements relating in any way to the Area of Interest as that term is defined by Bullion, the request is overbroad, unduly burdensome, and oppressive. The Area of Interest covers approximately 64-square miles of land in two different Nevada counties, including an area in which Goldstrike conducts extensive mining, milling, and exploration activities. Such request could conceivably include, for example, contracts with various service providers, employment contracts, contracts relating to water and power, and innumerable other contracts and agreements that are irrelevant to this dispute. Goldstrike will interpret the phrase "regarding the Area of Interest" to mean agreements that expressly refer to land acquisitions within the area covered by the Area of Interest.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds that it is not currently aware of any agreements, other than those identified in response to Request Nos. 4836-0330-9829.2 - 10 -

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

4836-0330-9829.2

1, 4, and 5, above, with any other party relating to land acquisitions within the area covered by the Area of Interest.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 7: All correspondence between you and High Desert or the Halavaises.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 7: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike further objects to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it requests documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate successor to Barrick HD formerly known as High Desert until May 3, 1999. correspondence between Goldstrike and High Desert or the Halavaises prior to May 3, 1999, is irrelevant.

Goldstrike objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks "All" correspondence between Goldstrike and High Desert or the Halavaises, without any temporal limitations, which could encompass correspondence spanning more than three decades. Goldstrike further objects that the request is overbroad, unduly burdensome, and oppressive because it seeks "All" correspondence, irrespective of whether such correspondence is related to any subject matter possibly relevant to this dispute.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike states that all responsive documents, if any, were produced by Barrick Gold of North America in response to the Subpoena, or may be produced as supplements to Goldstrike's initial disclosures in the near future.

3

4

5 6

7 8

9 10

11 12

13

15

14

16 17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24 25

26

28

27

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 8: All correspondence between you and Newmont and/or High Desert relating to Mineral Interests owned by either Newmont or High Desert in the Area of Interest.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 8: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike further objects to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it requests documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate successor to Barrick HD formerly known as High Desert until May 3, 1999. Therefore, correspondence between Goldstrike and High Desert or Newmont prior to May 3, 1999, is not relevant.

Goldstrike objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it seeks "All" correspondence between Goldstrike and High Desert or Newmont relating to certain specified "Mineral Interests," without any temporal limitations, which could conceivably encompass correspondence spanning more than three decades.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike states that responsive documents may have been produced by Barrick Gold of North America in response to the Subpoena or by Newmont in the related litigation, and that additional responsive documents may be produced as supplements to Goldstrike's initial disclosures in the near future.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 9: All Agreements dated after July 10, 1990, by which Barrick or High Desert acquired Mineral Interests in the Area of Interest from any third party.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 9: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike further objects to the extent that Bullion 4836-0330-9829.2 - 12 -

to all parties.

6 7 8

9

10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

requests documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it

requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation

or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena. Goldstrike also objects to

the extent the request seeks documents that are publicly available and therefore equally accessible

agreements between Goldstrike and any other party prior to that date are irrelevant.

successor to Barrick HD formerly known as High Desert until May 3, 1999.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it purports to require Goldstrike to produce agreements to which it was not a party, specifically agreements "by which . . . High Desert acquired Mineral Interests in the Area of Interest." If any such transactions occurred, Goldstrike was not itself involved in them and may not have any such agreements in its current possession, custody, or control. Goldstrike will not undertake any affirmative obligation to obtain agreements relating to High Desert's acquisitions in the Area of Interest.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad, unduly burdensome, and oppressive because it purports to require Goldstrike to produce "All" agreements concerning the acquisition of certain interests within the Area of Interest, which covers approximately 64-square miles of land spanning two different Nevada counties. In addition to the broad scope of the area covered by the request, the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome because it requests any such agreements from the past two decades.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds by incorporating by reference its Response to Request No. 1, supra, as if set forth herein. Additionally, responsive documents may have been produced by Barrick Gold of North America in response to the

Therefore,

Subpoena or by Newmont in the related litigation, and additional responsive documents may be produced as supplements to Goldstrike's initial disclosures in the near future.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10: A list of all unpatented mining claims located (staked) by Barrick in the Area of Interest after January 1, 1992, and the dates of location.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 10: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike further objects to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena. Goldstrike also objects to the extent the request seeks documents that are publicly available and therefore equally accessible to all parties.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it requests documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate successor to Barrick HD formerly known as High Desert until May 3, 1999. Therefore, information about mining claims located by Goldstrike prior to May 3, 1999, is not relevant to this dispute.

Goldstrike specifically objects that the request improperly attempts to require Goldstrike to create a new document—"A list"—containing certain requested information. As a result, this request appears to be an interrogatory masquerading as a document request and is an apparent effort to avoid the limitations and restrictions on the use of interrogatories under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, including, but not limited to, the limitation on the number of interrogatories that may be propounded by any one party.

Subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds by noting that it is not aware of any "list of all unpatented mining claims located (staked) by Barrick in the Area of Interest after January 1, 1992, and the dates of location" in its possession, custody, or control. Goldstrike further responds that a summary of Goldstrike's acquisitions in the Area of Interest after May 3, 1999, has been 4836-0330-9829.2

provided in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated herein by reference.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11: In addition to the Agreements referenced above, any Agreement to which Barrick is a party which references, includes, or in any way affects those patented and unpatented mining claims referred to in Exhibit A-1 to the 1979 Agreement.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 11: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike further objects to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena. Goldstrike also objects to the extent the request seeks documents that are publicly available and therefore equally accessible to all parties.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it requests documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate successor to Barrick HD formerly known as High Desert until May 3, 1999. Therefore, agreements prior to that date are irrelevant.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad, unduly burdensome, and oppressive because it purports to require Goldstrike to produce "any" agreements that "reference, include, or in any way affect[]," various patented and unpatented mining claims referenced in Exhibit A-1 to the 1979 Agreement. In particular, the phrase "in any way affect[]" could include any agreements that tangentially or remotely relate to such mining claims but which have no bearing on the issues relevant to this dispute. Goldstrike also objects that the introductory qualifier "In addition to the Agreements referenced above" is vague and ambiguous. It is not evident what "Agreements referenced above" are included or intended given that the prior Requests discuss and identify a large number of disparate agreements, and many of those agreements do not appear related to this request whatsoever.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds that the only agreement that Goldstrike is a party to that specifically and expressly references in any way the mining claims listed in Exhibit A-1 to the 1979 Agreement is the Asset Exchange Agreement entered into between Goldstrike and Newmont in 1999 and that copies of that agreement and related documents have previously been produced in this litigation. See Response to Request No. 1, supra.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12: In addition to the Agreements referenced above, any Agreement to which Barrick is a party which references the 1979 Agreement.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 12: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike further objects to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena. Goldstrike also objects to the extent the request seeks documents that are publicly available and therefore equally accessible to all parties.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it requests documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate successor to Barrick HD formerly known as High Desert until May 3, 1999. Therefore, agreements prior to that date are irrelevant.

Goldstrike also objects that the introductory qualifier "In addition to the Agreements referenced above" is vague and ambiguous. It is not evident what "Agreements referenced above" are included or intended given that the prior Requests discuss and identify a large number of disparate agreements, and many of those agreements do not appear related to this request whatsoever.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds that the 4836-0330-9829.2

12

10

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

only agreement that Goldstrike is a party to that specifically and expressly references the 1979 Agreement is the Asset Exchange Agreement between Goldstrike and Newmont in 1999, which has previously been produced in this litigation. See Response to Request No. 1, supra.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13: In addition to the correspondence referenced above, any correspondence sent by Barrick to any other party which references the 1979 Agreement.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 13: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike further objects to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena.

Goldstrike also objects insofar as the request seeks documents protected by any applicable privileges or protections. Specifically, any correspondence that Goldstrike sent to its legal counsel, or any representative of its legal counsel, is protected by the attorney-client privilege and will not be produced. Additionally, any correspondence that Goldstrike sent to counsel of a party with which Goldstrike shared a common interest is also privileged and protected from discovery and will not be produced. Furthermore, any correspondence about joint defense matters is privileged and protected from discovery and will not be produced. To the extent Goldstrike communicated any documents protected by the work-product doctrine in any correspondence protected by any applicable privilege, such documents retain their protections under Rule 26(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and will not be produced.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it requests documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate successor to Barrick HD formerly known as High Desert until May 3, 1999. Therefore, correspondence sent by Goldstrike prior to that date is irrelevant to this litigation.

Goldstrike also objects that the introductory qualifier "In addition to the correspondence referenced above" is vague and ambiguous. It is not evident what "correspondence referenced 4836-0330-9829.2 - 17 -

1

3

5

6

4

7 8

9

11

10

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

24

23

25

26 27

28

PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER 4836-0330-9829.2

above" is included or intended given that the prior Requests discuss and identify numerous categories of correspondence, and many of those categories of correspondence do not appear related to this request whatsoever.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike states that it is not currently aware of the existence of any correspondence between Goldstrike and any other party relating to the 1979 Agreement, other than (1) correspondence between Goldstrike and its legal counsel during the negotiation and due diligence period for the 1999 asset exchange transaction (which communications are protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege), (2) correspondence between Goldstrike and its counsel in this lawsuit (which communications are also protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege and/or work-product doctrine), (3) correspondence between Goldstrike and prior counsel for High Desert as part of the pending litigation (which communications are also protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege and/or work-product doctrine), (4) correspondence between Goldstrike and/or its counsel and counsel for Newmont relating to this lawsuit (which correspondence is protected from discovery by the common-interest and/or joint-defense privileges), and (5) correspondence between Goldstrike and/or its counsel and counsel for Bullion relating to this matter (which correspondence is already in the possession and control of Bullion's counsel). Goldstrike asserts that insofar as there is any non-privileged correspondence between Goldstrike and any other party relating to the 1979 Agreement, such correspondence has either already been produced by Barrick Gold of North America in response to the Subpoena or by Newmont in the related litigation, or will be included in supplements to Goldstrike's initial disclosures which will be produced in the near future.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 14: Any and all documents of any kind which reflect the "Gross smelter return" as described in paragraph 4.E. of the 1979 Agreement payable or paid to Barrick resulting from any mining activity in the Area of Interest from December 23, 1991 to the current date.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 14: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above.

Goldstrike objects that the request is vague, ambiguous, and unintelligible. Specifically, the request seeks documents relating to a royalty described in the 1979 Agreement that is "payable or paid *to*" Goldstrike. To the extent the request attributes a position to Goldstrike that it has never taken, Goldstrike objects.

Goldstrike also objects that any such royalty exists whatsoever. The 1979 Agreement is neither valid nor binding on any party, Goldstrike has never assumed an obligation to pay any royalties under the 1979 Agreement, and Goldstrike has never claimed any entitlement to be paid any royalties under the 1979 Agreement. *See* Goldstrike's Answers to Interrogatories Nos. 3, 4, 14 and 15, which are expressly incorporated by reference as if set forth herein.

Goldstrike objects that the term "reflect" is vague, ambiguous, and otherwise undefined.

Goldstrike interprets the term "reflect" to mean "expressly reference."

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds that it is not now and has never been liable to pay to any party, nor is it entitled to receive from any party, any royalty under the 1979 Agreement. Thus, Goldstrike is not aware of any documents in its possession, custody, or control that expressly reference the "Gross smelter return' as described in paragraph 4.E. of the 1979 Agreement" that is (or was) "payable or paid to" Goldstrike.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 15: For each mine within the Area of Interest acquired by High Desert or Barrick after July 10, 1990, which has been under production at anytime between January, 1992, and the current date, please provide the following:

- (a) Daily production records, including the location of the production, the tonnage of ore produced from each location and the grade of ore produced from each location.
- (b) Resource models, if any, which include grade, blocks, and resource category, whether that category be "proven", "probable", "inferred" or "mineralized material".
  - (c) Reserve models.

6

9

10

13

14

16

17 18 19

20

21

22

23 24

26

27

25

28

- Metallurgical test work, both original before mining and any done during (d) production.
  - All documents showing projected and actual gold recoveries for each block of ore. (e)
- All documents showing or describing the mining segregation methods used for (f) material mined, including how ore is defined and mined, what is done with material that is mineralized but low grade (sub-ore) but above waste cut-offs, and waste.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 15: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike also objects to the extent the request seeks documents that are publicly available and therefore equally accessible to all parties.

Goldstrike specifically objects that the request as a whole is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it requests documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate successor to Barrick HD formerly known as High Desert until May 3, 1999. Therefore, any documents prior to that date are irrelevant and will not be produced.

Goldstrike also objects that this request as a whole is overbroad, unduly burdensome, and oppressive because it seeks "All" documents within certain enumerated categories. The categories identified in this request are extraordinarily broad, and Goldstrike often maintains information possibly falling within these categories in numerous forms and in numerous places. It would be unreasonably onerous and burdensome for Goldstrike to identify, gather, and produce all forms of such information from all sources when one form would suffice for Bullion's purposes in this lawsuit. Goldstrike has endeavored in good faith to obtain and produce documents containing the information that Bullion appears to seek through the various categories of requested documents but will not undertake the obligation to produce every single document in Goldstrike's possession that might contain such information in some alternative form.

Goldstrike also objects that the phrase "each mine within the Area of Interest" is vague, ambiguous, and otherwise undefined. Goldstrike does not necessarily maintain its documents and records by "mine," as the term appears to be used by Bullion's request. Specifically, many of - 20 -4836-0330-9829.2

Goldstrike's records are divided between different areas of mining activity, at varying levels of specificity. In this regard, Goldstrike hereby incorporates by reference its Answer to Interrogatory No. 11, which is incorporated herein by reference as if set forth herein.

Additionally, Goldstrike objects to the extent Bullion requests documents that are only maintained in electronic form and which are not reasonably accessible because of undue burden or expense. Goldstrike has undertaken a good-faith effort to obtain information from numerous electronically stored sources, including sources that are no longer in "active" use. However, some electronically stored information is no longer reasonably accessible without undue burden or cost, and will not be produced.

Subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds and objects to each discrete subpart of Request No. 15 as follows:

(a) Goldstrike objects to the terms "Daily production records," "tonnage of ore," and "grade of ore" as used in Request No. 15(a) because they are vague, ambiguous, and otherwise undefined. Goldstrike does not maintain "daily production records" as Bullion appears to use that term. Goldstrike will not attempt to speculate about the meaning that Bullion intended for these terms.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds that it will produce concurrently herewith several different forms of production records from various areas of Goldstrike's mining activity. These documents, as well as others responsive to these Requests and to Bullion's Interrogatories, are control labeled with the prefix "BAR."

Goldstrike specifically notes that such records, which are produced as they are maintained in the ordinary course of business, include production information from areas acquired both before and after July 10, 1990, as well as areas acquired both before and after May 3, 1999. Some production records that Goldstrike will produce differentiate production from various areas of mining activity based on certain designated characteristics. By providing production records from areas of mining activity acquired before May 3, 1999, Goldstrike does not intend to imply 4836-0330-9829.2

6

7

8 9 10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

that they are relevant to this dispute or that such areas of mining activity are in anyway subject to Bullion's claims in this litigation. Production from areas acquired prior to May 3, 1999 has no relevance to this lawsuit, and Goldstrike reserves the right to object to the admissibility of such information at any trial or other proceeding, and reserves the right to oppose any further request for information relating to such prior production. See Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 11, which is incorporated herein by reference as if set forth herein.

Goldstrike objects to the terms "Resource models," "grade," "blocks," (b) and (c) "resource category," "proven," "probable," "inferred," "mineralized material," and "Reserve models" as used in Request Nos. 15(b) and 15(c) because they are vague, ambiguous, and otherwise undefined. Goldstrike will not attempt to speculate about the meaning that Bullion intended for these terms.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds that it will produce documents containing several different forms of reserve and resource information. These documents, as well as others responsive to these Requests and to Bullion's Interrogatories, are control labeled with the prefix "BAR." Goldstrike notes that reserve and resource information is also available from various publicly available sources, including publicly available portions of Barrick Gold Corporation's website, as well as from publicly available databases maintained by U.S. (EDGAR) and Canadian (SEDAR) regulatory authorities.

As before, Goldstrike notes that the documents produced in response to Request Nos. 15(b) and/or 15(c) are produced as they are maintained in the ordinary course of business and may include resource and reserve information from areas acquired both before and after July 10, 1990, as well as areas acquired both before and after May 3, 1999. By providing resource and reserve information from areas of mining activity acquired before May 3, 1999, Goldstrike does not intend to imply that they are relevant to this dispute or that such areas of mining activity are in anyway subject to Bullion's claims in this litigation. Resource and reserve information from areas acquired prior to May 3, 1999 has no relevance to this lawsuit, and Goldstrike reserves the right to object to the admissibility of such information at any trial or other proceeding, and 4836-0330-9829.2 - 22 -

reserves the right to oppose any further request for information relating to such resources and reserves. See Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 11, which is incorporated herein by reference as if set forth herein.

(d) Goldstrike objects to the term "Metallurgical test work" as used in Request No. 15(d) because it is vague, ambiguous, and otherwise undefined. Goldstrike will not attempt to speculate about the meaning that Bullion intended for this term.

Goldstrike also objects to the request insofar as it purports to require Goldstrike to produce responsive information in multiple forms from multiple sources. A complete and exhaustive production of all metallurgical test data would be prohibitively voluminous because it can only be produced in a form in which the vast majority of the information and data provided would not be relevant to Bullion's claims. In particular, one database contains the results of metallurgical testing on materials from mines around the world that are owned by other Barrick Gold Corporation subsidiaries. It would be unduly burdensome and tremendously expensive for Goldstrike to search, identify, and retrieve from this database only the test results relating to mining claims acquired by Goldstrike on or after May 3, 1999, or even just the test results relating to Goldstrike after May 3, 1999.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds that it will produce several forms of metallurgical test information. These documents, as well as others responsive to these Requests and to Bullion's Interrogatories, are control labeled with the prefix "BAR."

As before, Goldstrike specifically notes that the documents produced in response to Request No. 15(d) will be produced as they are maintained in the ordinary course of business and may include metallurgical test information from areas acquired both before and after July 10, 1990, as well as areas acquired both before and after May 3, 1999. By providing metallurgical test information from areas of mining activity acquired before May 3, 1999, Goldstrike does not intend to imply that they are relevant to this dispute or that such areas of mining activity are in anyway subject to Bullion's claims in this litigation. Metallurgical test information from areas 4836-0330-9829.2

acquired prior to May 3, 1999 has no relevance to this lawsuit, and Goldstrike reserves the right to object to the admissibility of such information at any trial or other proceeding, and reserves the right to oppose any further request for information relating to such metallurgical test work. See Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 11, which is incorporated herein by reference as if set forth herein.

7 8 9

6

11 12

10

13 14

15

16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

26 27

28

Goldstrike objects to the terms "projected gold recoveries," "actual gold (e) recoveries," and "block of ore" as they are used in Request No. 15(e) because they are vague, ambiguous, and otherwise undefined. Goldstrike will not attempt to speculate about the meaning that Bullion intended for these terms.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds that it will produce information related to recovery rates and predicted recovery curves, among other information that may be responsive to this request. These documents, as well as others responsive to these Requests and to Bullion's Interrogatories, are control labeled with the prefix "BAR."

As before, Goldstrike specifically notes that the documents produced in response to Request No. 15(e) will be produced as they are maintained in the ordinary course of business and may include information related to recovery rates and predicted recovery curves from areas acquired both before and after July 10, 1990, as well as areas acquired both before and after May 3, 1999. By providing information related to recovery rates and predicted recovery curves from areas of mining activity acquired before May 3, 1999, Goldstrike does not intend to imply that they are relevant to this dispute or that such areas of mining activity are in anyway subject to Bullion's claims in this litigation. Documents and information about recovery rates and predicted recovery curves from areas acquired prior to May 3, 1999, have no relevance to this lawsuit, and Goldstrike reserves the right to object to the admissibility of such information at any trial or other proceeding, and reserves the right to oppose any further request for information relating to such recovery rates and predicted recovery curves. See Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 11, which is incorporated herein by reference as if set forth herein.

BEHLE &

(f) Goldstrike objects to the terms "mining segregation methods," "mineralized," "waste cut-offs," and to the phrases "how ore is defined and mined" and "what is done with material that is mineralized but low grade," as used in Request No. 15(f) because they are vague, ambiguous, and otherwise undefined. Goldstrike will not attempt to speculate about the meaning that Bullion intended for these terms and phrases.

In accordance with these clarifications, and subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds that it will produce documents relating to, among other things, ore tracking and cut-off grades. These documents, as well as others responsive to these Requests and to Bullion's Interrogatories, are control labeled with the prefix "BAR."

As before, Goldstrike specifically notes that the documents produced in response to Request No. 15(f) will be produced as they are maintained in the ordinary course of business and may include information relating to ore tracking and cut-off grades from areas acquired by Goldstrike well before May 3, 1999, including areas Goldstrike acquired prior to July 10, 1990. By providing documents relating to ore tracking and cut-off grades from areas of mining activity acquired before May 3, 1999, Goldstrike does not intend to imply that they are relevant to this dispute or that such areas of mining activity are in anyway subject to Bullion's claims in this litigation. Documents and information about ore tracking and cut-off grades relating to areas acquired prior to May 3, 1999, have no relevance to this lawsuit, and Goldstrike reserves the right to object to the admissibility of such information at any trial or other proceeding, and reserves the right to oppose any further request for information relating to such ore tracking and cut-off grades. See Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 11, which is incorporated herein by reference as if set forth herein.

<u>REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 16</u>: Please produce all documents listed in Exhibit H at Bates numbers Newmont 5124-5132.

ANSWER TO REQUEST NO. 16: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike further objects to the extent that Bullion requests documents that have already been produced, either by Newmont in the related litigation -25 -

6

7 8

9 10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17 18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

PARSONS Венсе & or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to the Subpoena. Goldstrike also objects to the extent the request seeks documents that are publicly available and therefore equally accessible to all parties.

Goldstrike also objects that the request is overbroad and unduly burdensome insofar as it requests documents that are neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence in this matter. As explained further in Goldstrike's Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated by reference herein, Goldstrike did not become the corporate successor to Barrick HD formerly known as High Desert until May 3, 1999. Therefore, any documents related to events prior to that date are not relevant to this litigation.

Subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above and the specific objections set forth herein, Goldstrike responds and objects to each discrete subpart of Exhibit H as follows:

The following documents, which are given the specified numbers on the document control labeled NEWMONT5124-32, are publicly available documents and are equally accessible to all parties: 6 through 11, 13 through 24, 27, and 33. Goldstrike notes further, however, that many of these documents have already been produced by Barrick Gold of North America in response to the Subpoena, or by Bullion and/or Newmont in the related litigation.

The following documents, which are given the specified numbers on the document control labeled NEWMONT5124-32, are subject to claims of privilege and will not be produced: 1 and 2, 4 and 5, 35 and 36, 43, the first document described in 44, 52, 86 and 87. Goldstrike specifically notes that several of these documents were the subject of Goldstrike's motion for a protective order in the related in Newmont litigation, which the Court granted.

The following documents, which are given the specified numbers on the document control labeled NEWMONT5124-32, are, to the best of Goldstrike's current knowledge, information, and belief, not in the possession, custody, or control of Goldstrike: 28, 53, 56, 58, and 85.

The following documents, which are given the specified numbers on the document control labeled NEWMONT5124-32, have already been produced, either by Barrick Gold of North

1	America in response to the Subpoena, or by Bullion and/or Newmont in the related litigation: 3,
2	12, 51, 59 through 61, 63 through 65, 67, and 70 through 84.
3	The following documents, which are given the specified numbers on the document control
4	labeled NEWMONT5124-32, will be as supplements to Goldstrike's initial disclosures in the near
5	future: 25 and 26, 29 through 32, 34, 37 through 42, the second document described in 44, 45
6	through 50, 54 and 55, 57, 62, 66, 68 and 69.
7	
8	Dated: July 1, 2010 PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER
9	$\sim$
10	By: Michael R. Kealy
11	Francis M. Wikstrom Michael P. Petrogeorge
12	Brandon J. Mark  Attorneys for Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc.
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

Qase 3:09-cv-00612-MMD-WGC Document 244-3 Filed 12/09/16 Page 28 of 29

PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER 4836-0330-9829.2

- 27 -

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** Pursuant to FRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of Parsons Behle & Latimer, and that on this 1st day of July, 2010, I caused to be mailed, via U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, a true and correct copy of BARRICK GOLDSTRIKE MINES INC.'S FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS **[SET ONE]**, to the following: Clayton P. Brust, Esq. ROBISON, BELAUSTEGUI, SHARP & LOW 71 Washington Street Reno, NV 89503 By: Michael fletrynge 

**PARSONS** Behle &

LATIMER

4836-0330-9829.2

## EXHIBIT 4

Barrick's Second Supplemental Answers and Objections to Plaintiff's Interrogatories

## EXHIBIT 4

@ase 3:09-cv-00612-MMD-WGC Document 244-4 Filed 12/09/16 €age 2 pt/2 D JUL 0 6 2010 1 PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER Michael R. Kealy (Nevada Bar No. 0971) 2 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 750 3 Reno, NV 89501 Telephone: (775) 323-1601 (775) 348-7250 4 Facsimile: Francis M. Wikstrom (Utah Bar No. 3462; admitted pro hac vice) 5 Michael P. Petrogeorge (Utah Bar No. 8870; admitted pro hac vice) 6 Brandon Mark (Utah Bar No. 10439; admitted pro hac vice) One Utah Center 7 201 South Main Street, Suite 1800 Salt Lake City, UT 84111 (801) 536-6700 8 Telephone: Facsimile: (801) 536-6111 9 Email: ecf@parsonsbehle.com Attorneys for Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc. 10 11 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 12 FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA 13 14 Case No. CV-N-09-00612-ECR-VPC BULLION MONARCH MINING, INC., 15 BARRICK GOLDSTRIKE MINES Plaintiff, 16 INC.'S SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWERS AND OBJECTIONS TO 17 v. PLAINTIFF'S INTERROGATORIES [SET ONE] BARRICK GOLDSTRIKE MINES INC., et 18 al., 19 Defendants. 20 Pursuant to Rules 26 and 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure ("FRCP"), defendant 21 Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc. ("Goldstrike") hereby objects to and answers plaintiff Bullion 22 Monarch Mining, Inc.'s ("Bullion") first set of interrogatories served on Goldstrike via mail on or 23 about February 24, 2010 (hereinafter, the "Interrogatories"). 24 GENERAL OBJECTIONS 25 Goldstrike objects to the Interrogatories to the extent that they contain more than 1. 26 the number of written interrogatory requests allowed pursuant to FRCP 33. In particular, FRCP 27 28 4829-8039-3477.1

33 states: "Unless otherwise stipulated or ordered by the court, a party may serve on any other party no more than 25 written interrogatories, including discrete subparts." Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(a). When discrete subparts are taken into account, the Interrogatories contain at least 34 different written interrogatory requests. Goldstrike has elected to respond to each of the Interrogatories, including each discrete subpart, despite this technical violation. But Goldstrike reserves the right to refuse to answer any future interrogatory requests or provide additional information in response to any current interrogatory request or discrete subpart therein on the basis that Bullion has exceeded the number of written interrogatory requests allowed under FRCP 33.

- 2. Goldstrike objects to the Interrogatories to the extent that the information sought therein has been previously produced or provided to Bullion or its counsel through documents produced by Newmont in related litigation, in response to a subpoena *duces tecum* which Bullion issued to Barrick Gold of North America in 2009 and/or as part of Goldstrike's own initial disclosures.
- 3. Goldstrike objects to the Interrogatories to the extent that the information sought therein is contained in publicly available records which are equally available to both Goldstrike and Bullion.
- 4. Goldstrike objects to the Interrogatories insofar as they seek information that is not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this matter.
- 5. Goldstrike objects to the Interrogatories to the extent they are overbroad, vague, ambiguous, compound, complex, unduly burdensome, or oppressive in the amount, scope, or type of information requested.
- 6. Goldstrike objects to the Interrogatories insofar as they seek to impose burdens on Goldstrike that are inconsistent with or in addition to its discovery obligations as set forth in Rules 26 and/or 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
- 7. Goldstrike objects to the Interrogatories as overbroad, unduly burdensome and oppressive insofar as they seek to impose upon Goldstrike the obligation to identify information that is not currently known or available to Goldstrike. Goldstrike will not undertake any

4 5

7 8

6

10 11 12

9

13 14 15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

PARSONS Венсе & 4829-8039-3477.1

obligation to identify or disclose information that is not reasonably and readily within its current knowledge, custody, possession or control.

- Goldstrike objects to each Interrogatory to the extent that it seeks disclosure of 8. information that would violate rights of privacy and other statutorily or judicially recognized protections and privileges, confidentiality agreements, or court orders restricting dissemination of information, or result in disclosure of materials or information prepared in anticipation of litigation or confidential settlement discussions
- Goldstrike objects to the Interrogatories to the extent that they seek information 9. and documents protected from discovery by the attorney client privilege, the work product doctrine, the common interest privilege, the joint defense privilege or other applicable privileges or protections. Goldstrike does not waive but rather intends to preserve and is preserving the attorney client privilege, the work product protection, the common interest privilege, the joint defense privilege and every other privilege or protection with respect to all information and each and every document protected by any of such privileges or protections. Goldstrike will not knowingly identify information which is subject to any applicable privileges or protections. If any privileged or protected information is inadvertently disclosed by Goldstrike at anytime, Goldstrike requests that defendants immediately return to Goldstrike's counsel all documents, copies and other media which refer to or reflect in any way such inadvertently disclosed information.
- Goldstrike objects to the "Preliminary Definitions and Instructions" set forth on 10. pages 2-6 of the Interrogatories insofar as they seek to impose burdens on Goldstrike that are inconsistent with, or in addition to, Goldstrike's obligations as set forth in Rules 26 and/or 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
- Goldstrike objects to the Interrogatories insofar as they fail to adequately define 11. the terms "Barrick" and "you." For purposes of responding to the Interrogatories, Goldstrike interprets the terms "Barrick" and "you" to refer only to defendant, Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc., and not to any defendant, or to any other related or affiliated entity.

12. Goldstrike does not in any manner waive or intend to waive, but rather intends to preserve and is preserving, (1) all objections as to competency, relevancy, materiality, and admissibility; (2) all objections to the use of any of the responses herein or the submission of any documents produced in response hereto in any proceeding, motion, hearing, or the trial in this or any other action; and (3) all objections to any further discovery or request involving or related to any of the Requests The supplying of any information in response to the Interrogatories does not constitute an admission by Goldstrike that such information is relevant, admissible or material to any of the issues in this action, and Goldstrike reserves the right to object to any further inquiry with respect to any subject matter at any time.

13. Goldstrike incorporates each of the foregoing General Objections into each and every answer below as if specifically and fully set forth therein. A republication or restatement, in whole or in part, of any one or more of the foregoing general objections in response to a specific Interrogatory is not intended to waive and does not waive an objection not otherwise stated.

## SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS AND ANSWERS

<u>INTERROGATORY NO. 1</u>: Is Barrick the successor in interest to High Desert Mineral Resources of Nevada, Inc. ("High Desert")?

- a. Did Barrick, or Barrick's predecessors in interest, in or about 1995 acquire all of the stock in High Desert through purchase, merger or other transaction?
- b. Did Barrick, or Barrick's predecessors in interest, in or about 1995 acquire all of the assets and obligations of High Desert?
- c. If the answer to either of the above questions is "yes", please describe the nature of the transaction?

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 1: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above. Goldstrike specifically objects to Interrogatory No. 1 on the basis that it requires Goldstrike to make legal conclusions rather than state facts. Goldstrike also objects to Interrogatory No. 1 insofar as it seeks information which is already known or available to Bullion through the review of documents which were produced by

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24 25

26

27

28

4829-8039-3477.1

Newmont in the related litigation and/or by Barrick Gold of North America Inc. pursuant to a subpoena issued in 2009. Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing general or specific objections, Goldstrike answers Interrogatory No. 1 as follows:

On November 30, 1995, a subsidiary of Barrick Gold merged with High Desert Mineral Recourses of Nevada, Inc. ("High Desert"), with High Desert as the surviving corporation. High Desert's name was immediately changed to Barrick HD Inc. ("Barrick HD"). On May 3, 1999, Goldstrike became the corporate successor of Barrick HD as the result of a different merger transaction. As to the remainder of Interrogatory No. 1, Goldstrike invokes Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and refers Bullion to the following documents, which have been or will be produced to Bullion, and which relate to and provide the relevant details of the above BGBM001538-67; BGBM004953-58; BGBM005920-24; identified merger transactions: BGBM006157-279; BGBM006553-58; BGBM008078-215; BAR001977-80.

INTERROGATORY NO. 2: Please list all interests in unpatented mining claims and fee land located or otherwise acquired by High Desert or Barrick since July 10, 1990, within the Area of Interest described in Ex. A-2 to the May 10, 1979 Agreement ("the 1979 AOI"), including (a) a description of the mining claims or fee land, together with legal description of the 1/4 section where they are situated, (b) the nature of the interest acquired, (c) the dates of location or acquisition; (d) a list of all documents that evidences the location or acquisition; and, (d) the names of any witnesses who have knowledge about your answer. (The 1979 Agreement has been produced in this litigation as documents numbered "Newmont000165-271").

Goldstrike expressly incorporates by ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 2: reference each of the general objections set forth above.

Goldstrike specifically objects to Interrogatory No. 2 insofar as it fails to define the term "unpatented mining claim." In particular, Bullion fails to specify whether it seeks information on unpatented lode mining claims, unpatented mill site claims, or both. For purposes of responding to this Interrogatory, Goldstrike will assume that Bullion only seeks information relating to

3 4

5 6

7 8

9 10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19

21

22

20

23 24

25

26

27

to the pending dispute. Goldstrike also objects to Interrogatory No. 2 insofar as it is overbroad and unduly

unpatented lode mining claims, as those are the only mining claims with any apparent relevancy

burdensome and requires Goldstrike to provide information that is not relevant or likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this matter. In particular, Goldstrike objects to Bullion's request for information about unpatented mining claims and fee lands which Goldstrike acquired prior to May 3, 1999, when it became the corporate successor of Barrick HD formerly known as High Desert. This is the earliest possible date on which Goldstrike could have potentially become bound to the provisions of the 1979 Agreement, and Bullion has no basis for obtaining any information about mining claims or fee lands acquired by Goldstrike prior to that date.

Goldstrike also objects to Interrogatory No. 2 insofar as it requires Goldstrike to provide information about acquisitions made by High Desert and/or by Barrick HD. Insofar as any such transactions occurred, Goldstrike was not itself involved, and does not have any information about those transactions in its current possession, custody or control. Goldstrike will not undertake any affirmative obligation to obtain information about High Desert's or Barrick HD's transactions in the Alleged AOI.

Finally, Goldstrike objects to Interrogatory No. 2 insofar as it seeks information that is available to Bullion in the public domain, and is therefore equally available to both Bullion and Goldstrike.

Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing general or specific objections, Goldstrike answers Interrogatory No. 2 as follows:

1. Goldstrike participated in an asset exchange transaction with Newmont which closed on May 3, 1999. As a result of that exchange, Goldstrike acquired certain unpatented lode mining claims and fee lands from Newmont, most of which are located within the Area of Interest purportedly created by the May 10, 1979 Agreement (the "Alleged AOI"). The specific mining claims and fee lands which Goldstrike acquired from Newmont as part of the asset exchange transaction are identified in the following documents, which have already been produced to

PARSONS Венсе &

1

8

12

11

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27 28

4829-8039-3477.1

Bullion, and to which Bullion is referred pursuant to Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure: BGBM004829-41; BGBM007963-8025; BGBM8026-36.

- On or about July 14, 2004, Goldstrike acquired certain additional unpatented lode 2. mining claims and fee lands from Newmont, most of which are located within the Alleged AOI. The specific mining claims and fee lands which Goldstrike acquired from Newmont on or about July 14, 2004 are identified in the following documents, which are being produced to Bullion simultaneously herewith, and to which Bullion is referred pursuant to Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure: BAR043773-83; BAR04382-26.
- On or about August 15, 2005, Goldstrike acquired certain properties from Elko 3. Land and Livestock Company ("ELLCO") most of which are located within the Alleged AOI. The specific properties which Goldstrike acquired from ELLCO on or about August 15, 2005 are identified in the following documents which are being produced to Bullion simultaneously herewith, and to which Bullion is referred pursuant to Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure: BAR043811-15; BAR043816-21.
- On or about August 15, 2005, Goldstrike acquired certain additional properties 4. from Newmont, most of which are located in the Alleged AOI. The specific properties which Goldstrike acquired from Newmont on or about August 15, 2005 are identified in the following documents which are being produced to Bullion simultaneously herewith, and to which Bullion is referred pursuant to Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure: BAR043801-05; BAR043806-10.
- As noted above, a subsidiary of Barrick Gold merged with High Desert on or about 5. November 30, 1995. High Desert was the surviving corporation, and its name was immediately changed to Barrick HD. See BGBM006358-541; BGBM006157-279. At that time, Barrick HD was the owner of an undivided 38% interest in the mining claims and/or fee lands which were then owned by High Desert prior to the merger, and which are identified on BGBM005936-84 (which documents Bullion is referred pursuant to Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil

PARSONS

Procedure). On May 3, 1999, and as a result of the merger with Barrick HD, Goldstrike became the *temporary* owner of Barrick HD's 38% undivided interest in these mining claims and/or properties. See infra Answer to Interrogatory No. 7, which is expressly incorporated herein by reference.

Other than the mining claims and/or properties identified on BGBM005936-84, Goldstrike does not currently have specific knowledge of any other mining interests or fee simple properties which Barrick HD acquired in the Alleged AOI on or after November 30, 1995. Goldstrike asserts that other information about Barrick HD's mining claim and/or land acquisitions in the Alleged AOI on or after November 30, 1995 may be contained within some of the other documents which have been or will be produced, either by Barrick Gold of North America in response to the Subpoena, as a supplement to Goldstrike's initial disclosures, or in response to Bullion's latest discovery requests. Because the burden of reviewing such documentation and locating any such information is the same for Bullion as it is for Goldstrike, Goldstrike has no obligation to search for any such information.

6. Other than those properties identified on BGBM00785-802 and BGBM005936-84 (which documents Bullion is specifically referred to pursuant to Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure), Goldstrike does not currently have specific knowledge of those mining interests or fee simple properties, if any, which High Desert might have acquired in the Alleged AOI between July 10, 1990 and November 30, 1995. Goldstrike asserts that other information about High Desert's land acquisitions in the Alleged AOI between July 10, 1990 and November 30, 1995, if any, may be contained within some of the documents which have been or will be produced, either by Barrick Gold of North America in response to the Subpoena, as a supplement to Goldstrike's initial disclosures, or in response to Bullion's latest discovery requests. Because the burden of locating any such information is the same for Bullion as it is for Goldstrike, Goldstrike has no obligation to search for any such information.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> High Desert's remaining 2% undivided interest was transferred to SLH Co. prior to the merger. 4829-8039-3477.1

1	The following individuals may have information relating to Goldstrike's acquisitions in
2	the Alleged AOI on or after May 3, 1999:
3	Steve Hull
4	Parsons Behle & Latimer 201 S. Main Street, Suite 1800
5	Salt Lake City, UT 84111
6	Mr. Hull should be contacted solely through counsel for Goldstrike
7	Rich Haddock Barrick Gold of North America
8	136 East South Temple, Suite 1800 Salt Lake City, UT 84111
9	Mr. Haddock should be contacted solely through counsel for Goldstrike
10	Cy Wilsey Barrick Gold of North America
11	136 East South Temple, Suite 1800 Salt Lake City, UT 84111
12	Mr. Wilsey should be contacted solely through counsel for Goldstrike
13	
14	Orson Tingey Barrick Goldstrike Mines, Inc.
15	P.O. Box 29 Elko, NV 89803
16	Mr. Tingey should be contacted solely through counsel for Goldstrike
17	The following individual may have information relating to High Desert's acquisitions in
18	the Alleged AOI after July 10, 1990:
19	Lee Halavais 4790 Caughlin Pkwy #242
20	Reno, NV 89519 775-721-5796 or 775-753-7619
21	
22	Tom Erwin Erwin & Thompson LLP One Feet Liberty Street, Spite 424
23	One East Liberty Street, Suite 424 P.O. Box 40817
24	Reno, NV 89501-2123 775-786-9494
25	Mr. Erwin should be contacted solely through counsel for Goldstrike
26	INTERROGATORY NO. 3: For any interest in unpatented mining claims or fee land
27	acquired by Barrick from High Desert after July 10, 1990, if said unpatented mining claims or fee
28	4829-8039-3477.1 - 9 -

Parsons Behle & Latimer land are located within the 1979 AOI, please state each and every reason why Barrick does not believe that it is obligated to pay a production royalty to Plaintiff for production from said unpatented mining claims or fee land.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 3: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above.

Goldstrike specifically objects to Interrogatory No. 2 insofar as it fails to define the term "unpatented mining claim." In particular, Bullion fails to specify whether it seeks information on unpatented lode mining claims, unpatented mill site claims, or both. For purposes of responding to this Interrogatory, Goldstrike will assume that Bullion only seeks information relating to unpatented lode mining claims, as those are the only mining claims with any apparent relevancy to the pending dispute.

Goldstrike also objects to Interrogatory No. 3 insofar as it is overbroad and unduly burdensome and requires Goldstrike to provide information that is not relevant or likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this matter. In particular, Goldstrike objects to Bullion's request for information about unpatented mining claims and fee lands which Goldstrike acquired prior to May 3, 1999, when it became the corporate successor of Barrick HD. *See also supra* Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated herein by reference.

Goldstrike further objects to Interrogatory No. 3 insofar as it seeks information which is already available to Bullion through documents that were previously produced by Newmont in related litigation, by Barrick Gold of North America pursuant to a subpoena issued by Bullion in 2009, or through Goldstrike's initial disclosures. Goldstrike will not undertake the burden of reviewing the previously produced documents in order to provide information in response to Interrogatory No. 3 as Bullion is equally capable of performing that task.

Finally, Goldstrike objects to Interrogatory No. 3 insofar as it is written in such a manner as to suggest that Goldstrike is somehow bound by the May 10, 1979 Agreement ("the 1979 Agreement"), which it is not.

2 3

4 5

7 8

6

10

9

12

11

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27 28

Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing general or specific objections, Goldstrike answers Interrogatory No. 3 as follows:

Goldstrike asserts that while Goldstrike became the owner of a 38% interest in certain mining claims as a result of its merger with Barrick HD on or about May 3, 1999, Goldstrike did not acquire any claims or properties directly from High Desert. The specific mining claims and fee lands which Goldstrike acquired a 38% undivided interest in as a result of Goldstrike's merger with Barrick HD are identified on BGBM006358-541 and BGBM006157-279, which documents have already been produced to Bullion, and to which Bullion is specifically referred pursuant to Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Goldstrike further asserts that it is not obligated to pay a production royalty to Bullion based on mineral production from any of the unpatented mining claims or fee lands which it acquired through the merger with Barrick HD, or on any of the other mining claims or fee lands identified in response to Interrogatory No. 2, because Goldstrike is not bound by paragraph 11 or any other provision of the 1979 Agreement. Goldstrike specifically asserts that it is not bound by the 1979 Agreement, or any provisions therein, because, among other things:

- Neither Goldstrike, Barrick HD nor High Desert are parties to the 1979 1. Agreement, nor successors of any party to the 1979 Agreement;
- Neither Goldstrike, Barrick HD nor High Desert ever assumed the 1979 2. Agreement or any of the obligations created therein;
- The royalty obligations purportedly created by paragraph 11 of the 1979 3. Agreement are personal convents and do not create covenants running with the land, and cannot therefore be enforced against subsequent owners of land;
- The royalty obligations purportedly created by paragraph 11 of the 1979 3. Agreement are void because they violate the Rule Against Perpetuities; and
  - The 1979 Agreement constitutes an unreasonable restraint on alienation. 4.

Goldstrike further incorporates by reference its Answer to Bullion's Second Amended Complaint, and each of the affirmative defenses set forth therein.

INTERROGATORY NO. 4: For any interest in unpatented mining claims or fee land acquired by Barrick from Newmont after December 23, 1991, if said unpatented mining claims or fee land are located within the 1979 AOI, please state each and every reason why Barrick does not believe that it is obligated to pay a production royalty to Plaintiff for production from said unpatented mining claims or fee land.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 4: Goldstrike incorporates by reference its objections (general and specific) and answers to Interrogatory No. 3, above, as if expressly and fully set forth herein. Additionally, Goldstrike asserts that many of the unpatented mining claims which it acquired from Newmont on or after May 3, 1999 were invalid because they purported to be located entirely on private lands already held by Goldstrike and/or over inferior or invalid because they were located over the top of patented mining claims.

INTERROGATORY NO. 5: For any interest in unpatented mining claims or fee land however acquired by Barrick after 1995, whether by location, lease, purchase or exchange, if said mining claims or fee land are located within the 1979 AOI, please state each and every reason Barrick does not believe that it is obligated to pay to plaintiff a production royalty for production from said unpatented mining claims or fee land.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 5: Goldstrike incorporates by reference its objections (general and specific) and answers to Interrogatory No. 3 and 4, above, as if expressly and fully set forth herein.

INTERROGATORY NO. 6: Please state the name of the party you believe is responsible to pay the royalty obligation to Plaintiff for production from mineral property described in paragraph 11 of the 1979 Agreement at issue in this matter, including all facts, documents, and witnesses that support your belief.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 6: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above.

Goldstrike specifically objects to Interrogatory No. 6 insofar as it incorrectly assumes that the 1979 Agreement is a viable and enforceable agreement binding upon any party, and that

PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER 4829-8039-3477.1

Bullion actually has standing to enforce the agreement against any party. Goldstrike disputes both of these assumptions.

Goldstrike also objects to Interrogatory No. 6 insofar as it requires Goldstrike to provide information that is not relevant and likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this matter. The only issue in this case is whether Goldstrike is bound by the production royalty obligations allegedly set forth in the 1979 Agreement. Whether other parties may or may not be bound by the 1979 Agreement is irrelevant.

Finally, Goldstrike objects to Interrogatory No. 6 insofar as it requires Goldstrike to provide information which is not in Goldstrike's current possession and control. Goldstrike will not undertake any obligation to obtain information about the 1979 Agreement, or potential parties that may be bound by the 1979 Agreement, or provide information which is not already in Goldstrike's current possession and control.

Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing general or specific objections, Goldstrike answers Interrogatory No. 6 as follows:

At this time, Goldstrike does not believe that anyone owes Bullion any type of royalty under the 1979 Agreement, or that the 1979 Agreement can be enforced by Bullion against any party. First, Goldstrike asserts that it has seen no evidence to establish that Bullion is an actual successor to any party of the 1979 Agreement, or that Bullion has been properly assigned any rights under the 1979 Agreement. Goldstrike asserts that Bullion therefore lacks standing to assert any rights under the agreement against Goldstrike or any party. Second, Goldstrike asserts that the 1979 Agreement, and paragraph 11 in particular, violates the Rule Against Perpetuities and therefore cannot be legally enforced by any party against any other party. See also Goldstrike's answers and objections to Interrogatory No. 3, above, which are expressly incorporated herein by reference. Third, Goldstrike is not currently aware of any particular person or entity that is specifically bound by or obligated under the 1979 Agreement. The last parties with any express obligations under paragraph 11 of the 1979 Agreement were Universal Explorations, Ltd. and/or Universal Gas, Inc. (collectively, "Universal). See 1979 Agreement.

1

3 4

5 6

7 8

10 11

9

12 13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27 28

Goldstrike forms no opinion on whether Universal or any corporate successors have any ongoing obligations, to Bullion or otherwise, under the 1979 Agreement.

INTERROGATORY NO. 7: Please state whether you have sold, assigned, exchanged, or in any way divested yourself of an ownership interest in any mining claims or fee land located within the 1979 AOI which were acquired by you or High Desert after July 10, 1990.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 7: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above.

Goldstrike specifically objects to Interrogatory No. 2 insofar as it fails to define the term "mining claims." In particular, Bullion fails to specify whether it seeks information on patented lode mining claims, unpatented lode mining claims, patented mill site claims, or unpatented mill site claims. For purposes of responding to this Interrogatory, Goldstrike will assume that Bullion only seeks information relating to patented and unpatented lode mining claims, as those are the only mining claims with any apparent relevancy to the pending dispute.

Goldstrike specifically objects to Interrogatory No. 7 insofar as it is overbroad and unduly burdensome and requires Goldstrike to provide information that is not relevant and likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this matter. In particular, Goldstrike objects to Bullion's request for information about mining claims and fee lands which Goldstrike acquired and/or disposed of in the Alleged AOI prior to May 3, 1999, when it became the corporate successor of Barrick HD. This is the earliest possible date on which Goldstrike could have potentially become bound to the provisions of the 1979 Agreement, and Bullion has no basis for obtaining any information about claims and properties acquired or disposed of by Goldstrike prior to that date. See also objections to Interrogatory No. 2, above.

Goldstrike also objects to Interrogatory No. 7 insofar as it requires Goldstrike to provide information about acquisitions or dispositions of mining claims or fee lands made by Barrick HD between November 30, 1995 and May 3, 1999. Insofar as any such transactions occurred, Goldstrike was not itself directly involved in those transactions, and there is no one at Goldstrike that is currently known to have any information about such transactions. Goldstrike will not

undertake any affirmative obligation to obtain information about Barrick HD's transactions in the Alleged AOI which occurred prior to May 3, 1999. See also id.

Goldstrike also objects to Interrogatory No. 7 insofar as it requires Goldstrike to provide information about acquisitions or dispositions of mining claims or fee lands made by High Desert between July 10, 1990 and November 30, 1995. Insofar as any such transactions occurred, Goldstrike was not itself directly involved in those transactions, and there is no one at Goldstrike that is currently known to have any information about such transactions. Goldstrike will not undertake any affirmative obligation to obtain information about High Desert's transactions in the Alleged AOI which occurred prior to May 3, 1999. See also id.

Goldstrike further objects to Interrogatory No. 7 insofar as it seeks information which is already available to Bullion through documents that were previously produced by Newmont in related litigation, or by Barrick Gold of North America pursuant to a subpoena issued by Bullion in 2009. Goldstrike will not undertake the burden of reviewing the previously produced documents in order to provide information in response to Interrogatory No. 7 as Bullion is equally capable of performing that task.

Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing general or specific objections, Goldstrike answers Interrogatory No. 7 as follows:

- 1. On May 3, 1999 at approximately 10:01 a.m., Goldstrike merged with Barrick HD. At that time, and as a result of the merger, Goldstrike acquired Barrick HD's undivided 38% interests in those properties identified in BGBM00785-802 and/or BGBM005936-84. See supra Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated herein by reference. Later that same day, Goldstrike transferred all of its interests in those properties to Newmont. See id. To the best of Goldstrike's current knowledge and belief, none of the other mining claims or fee simple lands which Goldstrike acquired in the Alleged AOI on or after May 3, 1999 have been transferred to any other owner.
- 2. On May 3, 1999, Goldstrike transferred certain additional properties to Newmont as part of the Asset Exchange transaction, at least some of which were located within the Alleged

10

11 12

14 15

13

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER 4829-8039-3477.1

AOI. The specific claims and properties which Goldstrike acquired from Newmont as part of the Asset Exchange transaction identified in the following documents, which have already been produced to Bullion, and to which Bullion is referred pursuant to Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure: BGBM004842-903; BGBM004904-17; BGBM000785-802. Goldstrike notes, however, that with the exception of those properties which were acquired through the merger with Barrick HD, as described in paragraph 1, above, all of the properties transferred to Newmont as part of the asset exchange were acquired by Goldstrike prior to May 3, 1999.

- Other than the mining claims and/or properties identified on BGBM000785-802 3. and/or BGBM005936-84, Goldstrike does not currently have knowledge of which mining interests or fee simple properties, if any, Barrick HD might have acquired or disposed of in the Alleged AOI between November 30, 1995 and May 3, 1999. Goldstrike asserts that information about Barrick HD's mining claim and/or fee land acquisitions or dispositions in the Alleged AOI between November 30, 1995 and May 3, 1999 may be contained within some of the documents which has been previously produced, either by Barrick Gold of North America in response to the Subpoena, as a supplement to Goldstrike's initial disclosures, or in response to Bullion's latest discovery requests. Because the burden of locating any such information is the same for Goldstrike as it is for Bullion, Goldstrike has no obligation to search for any such information.
- Other than those properties identified on BGBM00785-802 and BGBM005936-84, 4. Goldstrike does not currently have knowledge of which properties, if any, High Desert might have acquired in the Alleged AOI between July 10, 1990 and November 30, 1995. Goldstrike asserts that an undivided 2% participating interest in some or all of those properties identified on BGBM00785-802 and BGBM005936-84 was transferred from High Desert to SLH Co. on or about November 3, 1995. See BGBM002430; BGBM005936-84; BGBM006000-57 (which documents Bullion is referred pursuant to Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure). Goldstrike asserts that information about High Desert's land acquisitions in the Alleged AOI between July 10, 1990 and November 30, 1995 may be contained within some of the documents which has been previously produced, either by Barrick Gold of North America in response to the

PSA 0111

Subpoena, as a supplement to Goldstrike's initial disclosures, or in response to Bullion's latest discovery requests. Because the burden of locating any such information is the same for Goldstrike as it is for Bullion, Goldstrike has no obligation to search for any such information.

INTERROGATORY NO. 8: Please list all mines, or the commonly used name for areas of mineral production, owned and/or operated by High Desert or Barrick or by a member of any joint venture in which High Desert or Barrick was a member, within the 1979 AOI since July 10, 1990, on unpatented mining claims or fee land in which High Desert or Barrick acquired an interest on or after July 10, 1990, including for each mine (a) the dates of operation; (b) the gross annual production for gold, silver, and any other metals for each year of production; (c) the gross smelter return received for each year of production; (d) a list of all documents that support your answer; (e) the names of any witnesses who have knowledge about your answer.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 8: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above.

Goldstrike specifically objects to Interrogatory No. 8 insofar as it is overbroad and unduly burdensome and requires Goldstrike to provide information that is not relevant and likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this matter. In particular, Goldstrike objects to Bullion's request for information about mining operations, production and gross smelter returns on mining claims or fee lands which Goldstrike acquired in the Alleged AOI prior to May 3, 1999, when it became the corporate successor of Barrick HD, which was the corporate successor of High Desert. This is the earliest possible date on which Goldstrike could have potentially become bound to the provisions of the 1979 Agreement, and Bullion has no basis for obtaining any information about mining operations, production and gross smelter returns on mining claims or fee lands acquired by Goldstrike prior to that date. *See also supra* Answer to Interrogatory No. 2.

Goldstrike also objects to Interrogatory No. 8 insofar as it requires Goldstrike to provide information about mining operations, production and/or gross smelter returns, if any, on mining claims or properties acquired by High Desert prior to November 30, 1995 and/or by Barrick HD

between November 30, 1995 and May 3, 1999. Insofar as any such operations occurred, Goldstrike was not itself directly involved in such operation, and there is no one at Goldstrike that is currently known to have any information about such operations. Goldstrike will not undertake any affirmative obligation to obtain information about High Desert's or Barrick HD's operations in the Alleged AOI prior to May 3, 1999. *See also id*.

Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing general or specific objections, Goldstrike answers Interrogatory No. 8 as follows:

### Part 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

Goldstrike operates an open pit mine in the Alleged AOI commonly referred to as 1. the "Betze Post" mine. The Betze Post mine has been in operation since 1987. The majority of the production from the Betze Post mine since May 3, 1999 has come from mining claims or properties which Goldstrike acquired or patented prior to May 3, 1999. Such production, and the gross smelter return from such production, is irrelevant to this case. A smaller amount of production from the Betze Post open pit mine has come from some of the properties which Goldstrike acquired from Newmont on May 3, 1999, as part of the Asset Exchange. The production from these properties is tracked separately by Goldstrike, and is commonly referred to as the "Barrick Fee" open pit production (indicating that Goldstrike does not believe there to be any royalties owed on such ounces). Since May 3, 1999, Goldstrike has mined 19,324,502 tons from the Barrick Fee lands contained within the open pit mining area, and has shipped 1,715,698 ounces of gold and 177,083 ounces of silver from that production. Goldstrike does not produce or track any metals other than gold and silver. Goldstrike has not calculated a gross smelter return on the production from the "Barrick Fee" lands because no royalty is believed to be owed on those ounces, and thus no such calculation is required. To the best of Goldstrike's current knowledge, belief and understanding, there has been no open pit production on any of the other properties acquired from Newmont in the 1999 Asset Exchange,<sup>2</sup> or from any of the claims or

<sup>26</sup> 

<sup>27</sup> 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> A number of the claims which Goldstrike obtained from Newmont as part of the 1999 Asset Exchanged overlapped with Goldstrike's prior owned land and/or patented claims, and are inferior to those claims. Production from the area of these claims is properly deemed to have come from Goldstrike's prior owned and superior lands and/or patented claims, and not from the inferior claims Goldstrike obtained from Newmont as part of the 1999 Asset Exchange.

4829-8039-3477.1

- 18 -

properties acquired from Newmont in July 2004, or from the claims or properties acquired from ELLCO and Newmont in August 2005.

Goldstrike also operates an underground mine in the Alleged AOI commonly 2. referred to as the "Miekle" mine. The Miekle mine has been in operation since 1996. The majority of the production from the Miekle mine has come from mining claims or properties which Goldstrike acquired or patented prior to May 3, 1999. A smaller amount of production from the Miekle underground mine has come from some of the mining claims or properties which Goldstrike acquired from Newmont on May 3, 1999, as part of the Asset Exchange. production from these properties is tracked separately by Goldstrike, and is commonly referred to as the "Barrick Fee" underground production (indicating that Goldstrike does not believe there to be any royalties owed on such production). Since May 3, 1999, Goldstrike has mined 2,760,668 tons from the "Barrick Fee" lands contained within the underground mining area, and has shipped 856,589 ounces of gold and 106,253 ounces of silver from such production. Goldstrike does not produce or track any metals other than gold and silver. Goldstrike has not calculated a gross smelter return on the production from the "Barrick Fee" lands because no royalty is believed to be owed on those ounces, and thus no such calculation is required. To the best of Goldstrike's current knowledge, belief and understanding, there has been no underground production on any of the other properties acquired from Newmont in the 1999 Asset Exchange,<sup>3</sup> or from any of the claims or properties acquired from Newmont in July 2004, or from the claims or properties acquired from ELLCO and Newmont in August 2005.

The following documents are identified as containing information about the production and gross smelter royalties from the Betze Post and Miekle mines:

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1. Gross Production: Documents Labeled with "BAR" prefix				
7-68	1981-2580	7008-7108		
69-577	2581-2792	20769-20878		
578-891	2793-2862	43767-43772		

26

27

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> A number of the claims which Goldstrike obtained from Newmont as part of the 1999 Asset Exchanged overlapped with Goldstrike's prior owned land and/or patented claims, and are inferior to those claims. Production from the area of these claims is properly deemed to have come from Goldstrike's prior owned and superior lands and/or patented claims, and not from the inferior claims Goldstrike obtained from Newmont as part of the 1999 Asset Exchange.

4829-8039-3477.1

## Clase 3:09-cv-00612-MMD-WGC Document 244-4 Filed 12/09/16 Page 21 of 33

1 892-964	4361-4426	43830-43832	
965-1976	4427-4479	43871-43990	
2			

3	2. Gross Smelter	Return (Annual):	<b>Documents Label</b>	ed with "BAR" pref	îx
ŀ	7-68	19518-19642	24312-24338	30854-30977	36848-36872
4	1981-2580	19795-19821	24387-24518	30984-31008	36981-37005
	4361-4426	19852-19978	24835-24863	31111-31261	37056-37197
5	7008-7108	20046-20072	25054-25179	31333-31459	37203-37233
_	7234-8122	20103-20260	25247-25275	31604-31727	37495-37669
6	9391-10462	20347-20377	25378-25503	31749-31773	38040-38219
7	11760-12531	20423-20451	25520-25555	31857-31980	38340-38481
_ /	13540-13954	20667-20723	25650-26054	32052-32203	38501-38531
8	14766-15085	20879-21005	26355-26356	32320-32470	38626-38909
°۱	15213-15559	21072-21073	26517-26642	32544-32568	38971-39001
9	15701-15966	21078-21104	26649-26698	32584-32732	39053-39196
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	16020-16075	21123-21149	26766-26793	32832-33108	39258-39288
10	16100-16231	21212-21488	26814-26995	33225-33274	39340-39483
10	16284-16446	21602-21631	27073	33282-33407	39550-39580
11	16513-16541	21701-21855	27095-27218	33454-33478	39632-39773
	16565-16696	21968-21999	27235-27259	33525-33650	38939-39869
12	16762-16790	22017-22175	27429-27482	33741-33891	39919-40062
	16814-16945	22296-22297	27569-27692	33994-34167	40129-40159
13	16996-17024	22315-22438	27760-27811	34301-34426	40212-40361
	17173-17347	22455-22481	27916-28041	34559-34711	40424-40483
14	17445-17600	22579-22580	28218-28244	34818-35065	40540-40684
	17698-17832	22714-22837	28346-28597	35083-35107	40850-40880
15	17834-17864	22905-22935	28725-28901	35193-35317	40936-41079
	18039-18040	23024-23152	28997-28961	35377-35401	41142-41172
16	18045-18075	23218-23249	29064-29115	35453-35578	41326-41609
17	18113-18237	23297-23300	29363-29387	35636-35660	41656-41685 41877-42019
17	18253-18278	23350-23479	29452-29728	35761-35886	
18	18389-18762	23531-23559	29854-30144	35943-35967	42096-42125
10	18953-18979	23608-23634	30216-30218	36070-36195	42221-43603
19	19014-19140	23689-23812	30221-30515	36304-36328	43767-43768
17	19208-19236	23931-2395	30590-30591	36396-36521	43830-43834 43871-43990
20	19267-19393	24011-24163	30598-30623	36579-36603	438/1-43990
	19461-19487	24231-24259	30820-30846	36715-36739	

The following individuals likely have information relevant to Part A of Goldstrike's answer to Interrogatory No. 8:

Jim Byers

Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc.

Elko, Nevada

Mr. Byers should be contacted solely through Goldstrike's counsel

Curtis Caldwell

Barrick Gold of North America

Salt Lake City, Utah

Mr. Caldwell should be contacted solely through Goldstrike's counsel

28

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

4829-8039-3477.1

1 Russ Hofland Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc. 2 Elko, Nevada Mr. Hoffland should be contacted solely through Goldstrike's counsel 3 John Langhans Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc. Elko, Nevada 5 Mr. Langhans should be contacted solely through Goldstrike's counsel 6 Janna Linebarger Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc. 7 Elko, Nevada Ms. Linebarger should be contacted solely through Goldstrike's counsel 8 9 Sam Marich Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc. Elko, Nevada 10 Mr. Marich should be contacted solely through Goldstrike's counsel 11 Tracy Miller Barrick Goldstrike Mines, Inc. 12 Elko, Nevada Ms. Miller should be contacted solely through Goldstrike's counsel 13 Mark Rantapaa 14 Barrick Goldstrike Mines, Inc. Elko, Nevada 15 Mr. Rantapaa should be contacted solely through Goldstrike's counsel 16 Paul Tehnet Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc. 17 Elko, Nevada Mr. Tehnet should be contacted solely through Goldstrike's counsel 18 This list may be amended and/or supplemented from time to time as additional people 19 20 with potentially relevant information are identified by Goldstrike. 21 Part B: 22 Goldstrike asserts that the mining claims and/or fee lands identified in BGBM00785-802 23 were likely acquired either by High Desert between July 10, 1990 and November 30, 1995 and/or 24 by Barrick HD on or after November 30, 1995, and may have been part of a mine in the Alleged 25 AOI commonly known as the Leeville Mine. All of these mining claims and/or fee lands were 26 acquired by Goldstrike at approximately 10:01 a.m. on May 3, 1999, when Barrick HD merged 27 into Goldstrike. Goldstrike transferred these properties to Newmont later that same day (May 3, 28 4829-8039-3477.1 - 21 -

PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER

1999). Neither High Desert, Barrick HD nor Goldstrike actually operated the Leeville Mine. Goldstrike asserts on information and belief that there was no production from the Leeville Mine prior to May 3, 1999, and that Goldstrike therefore has no information to provide on the production from the Leeville Mine in response to Interrogatory No. 8. Goldstrike is not currently aware of any other mining claims or fee lands which might have been acquired in the Alleged AOI by High Desert between July 10, 1990 and November 30, 1995 and/or by Barrick HD between November 30, 1995 and May 3, 1999, or whether any such properties were part of the Leeville Mine or any other mine. Goldstrike transferred all of its interests in the Leeville Mine to Newmont just hours after those interests were obtained. To the best of Goldstrike's knowledge and belief, no production occurred from those mining claims or fee lands during the brief period of time in which they were held by Goldstrike.

Goldstrike is not currently aware of any specific person who might have information relevant to the operations of or production from the Leeville Mine, but asserts that such information is most likely under the possession and control of Newmont, as the operator of that mine.

INTERROGATORY NO. 9: Please describe in chronological order all transactions/ dealings between you and High Desert and/or the Halavaises (or entities controlled or owned by the Halavaises) related to any mineral interests or other property rights within the 1979 AOI from July 10, 1990, to the current date.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 9: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above.

Goldstrike specifically objects to Interrogatory No. 9 insofar as it is overbroad and unduly burdensome and requires Goldstrike to provide information that is not relevant and likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this matter.

Goldstrike also objects to Interrogatory No. 9 as vague with respect to the terms "transactions/dealings", the phrase "related to any mineral interests", and the phrase "mineral interests or other property rights within the 1979 AOI."

Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing general or specific objections, Goldstrike answers Interrogatory No. 9 as follows:

1994-1996: Transactions relating to a project commonly known as the Gold Venture project, the Little High Desert project and/or the Simon Creek project. With respect to the details of those transactions, Goldstrike invokes Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and refers Bullion to the following documents which have already been produced: BAR000339-44; BAR003367-463; BAR003593-98; BAR043764-66; BAR043827-29.

1998-1999: Transactions relating to the termination of the Newmont Gold and High Desert Venture, and the termination of the 2% carried participating interest in that venture held by High Desert Mineral Resources, Inc., a Delaware corporation, formerly known as SLH Co. With respect to the details of those transactions, Goldstrike invokes Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and refers Bullion to the following documents which have already been produced: BGBM00239-1237; BGBM003345-57; BGBM004382-99; BGBM006767-84; BGBM011499-507; BGBM011717-19; BGBM013673-74.

INTERROGATORY NO. 10: Please describe in chronological order, all transactions/ dealings between you and Newmont related to any mineral interests or other property rights within the 1979 AOI from December 23, 1991, to the current date.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 10: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above.

Goldstrike specifically objects to Interrogatory No. 10 as vague with respect to the terms "transactions/dealings", the phrase "related to any mineral interests", and the phrase "property rights within the 1979 AOI."

Goldstrike further objects to Interrogatory No. 10 insofar as it is overbroad and unduly burdensome and requires Goldstrike to provide information that is not relevant and likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this matter. In particular, Goldstrike objects to Bullion's request for information about dealings between Goldstrike and Newmont prior to May 3, 1999, when Goldstrike actually became the corporate successor of Barrick HD. Goldstrike will

M

not provide any information relating to transactions between Newmont and Goldstrike prior to May 3, 1999. See also supra Answer to Interrogatory No. 2 which is expressly incorporated

herein by reference.

Goldstrike further objects that Interrogatory No. 10 is so broadly worded that it would require Goldstrike to provide information about transactions and dealings with Newmont or its related companies that have nothing to do with the acquisition or disposition of any mining claims or fee lands within the Alleged AOI, or the production of minerals from such claims, and therefore have absolutely no bearing on this litigation. Goldstrike has entered into numerous agreements and arrangements with Newmont or its related companies over its years in operation, including but not limited to easement and right of way agreements, joint operating agreements, dewatering agreements, etc. All of these agreements and arrangements might, under the broadest interpretation, be technically "related to . . . mineral interests or other property rights within the 1979 AOI", but the vast majority of them have absolutely no bearing on any of the issues raised in this litigation. Goldstrike will not provide information on agreements and arrangements with Newmont that have no possible bearing on the issues raised in this case.

Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing general or specific objections, Goldstrike answers Interrogatory No. 10 as follows:

May 3, 1999: Transactions relating to the 1999 Asset Exchange, the termination of the Newmont Gold and High Desert Venture and the termination of the 2% participating interest in the Newmont Gold and High Desert Venture that was granted to High Desert in 1995. With respect to the details of those transactions, Goldstrike invokes Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and refers Bullion to the following documents which have already been produced: BGBM002118-2209; BGBM000239-756; BGBM004400-16; BGBM004223-83; BGBM001238-565; BGBM006236-313; BGBM001566-95; BGBM004368-81; BGBM004829-41; BGBM004382-99; BGBM002210-85; BGBM006818-35; BGBM006011-43; BGBM001778-851; BGBM004423-39; BGBM006852-81; BGBM004440-47; BGBM003408; BGBM007059-69; BGBM006901-16; BGBM003991-4007; BGBM006044-61; BGBM004306-67;

BGBM001852-89; BGBM006767-84; BGBM006981-95; BGBM004284-92; BGBM006882-90; BGBM004457-85; BGBM007752-84; BGBM007070-77; BGBM002107-14; BGBM006917-80; BGBM006220-35; BGBM006996-7058; BGBM006723-57.

2004 and 2005: Transactions relating to Goldstrike's acquisition of certain fee lands and mill sites from Newmont. With respect to the details of those transactions, Goldstrike invokes Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and refers Bullion to the following documents, which are produced simultaneously with these responses: BAR043773-83; BAR04382-26; BAR043811-15; BAR043816-21; BAR043811-15; BAR043801-05; BAR043806-10.

INTERROGATORY NO. 11: For each Barrick mine in production at any time from July 10, 1990, until the present date within the 1979 AOI, please set forth the following:

- a. The date the mineral interests being mined were acquired or if by location, the dates of location of unpatented mining claims.
- b. For mineral interest acquired after July 10, 1990;
  - (i) From whom the mineral interests being mined were acquired;
  - (ii) The annual gross smelter returns for each mineral recovered from each mine from July 10, 1990 through 2009.
- c. The monthly gross smelter returns for each mineral recovered from each mine since January 1, 2010.
- d. The proven mineral reserves for each mine.
- e. The probable mineral reserves for each mine.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 11: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above.

Goldstrike specifically objects to Interrogatory No. 11 insofar as it is overbroad and unduly burdensome and requires Goldstrike to provide information that is not relevant and likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this matter. In particular, Goldstrike objects to Bullion's request for information about mining operations, production, smelter returns and mineral reserves on mining claims or fee lands which Goldstrike acquired in the Alleged AOI

4829-8039-3477.1

prior to May 3, 1999, when it actually became the corporate successor of Barrick HD. This is the earliest possible date on which Goldstrike could have potentially become bound to the provisions of the 1979 Agreement, and Bullion has no basis for obtaining any information about mining claims or fee lands acquired by Goldstrike prior to that date. *See also supra* Answer to Interrogatory No. 2 which is expressly incorporated herein by reference.

Goldstrike also objects to Interrogatory No. 11 insofar as it requires Goldstrike to provide information about mining operations, production, smelter returns and mineral reserves on mining claims or fee lands properties which were acquired and/or owned by High Desert and/or Barrick HD prior to May 3, 1999. Insofar as any such mining operations even occurred, Goldstrike was not itself involved in those operations, and does not have any information about those operations. Goldstrike will not undertake any affirmative obligation to obtain information about High Desert's or Barrick HD's operations in the Alleged AOI prior to May 3, 1999. *See also id.* 

Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing general or specific objections, Goldstrike answers Interrogatory No. 11 as follows:

Goldstrike operates an open pit mine in the Alleged AOI commonly referred to as the "Betze Post" mine. The Betze Post mine has been in operation since 1987. The majority of the Betze Post mine sits on mining claims or fee lands which Goldstrike acquired or patented prior to May 3, 1999. Information about production, smelter returns and mineral reserves relating to these mining claims and fee lands has no relevance in this case. A smaller amount of production from the Betze Post open pit mine has come from some of the mining claims or fee lands which Goldstrike acquired from Newmont on May 3, 1999, as part of the Asset Exchange. The production and reserves from these properties are tracked separately by Goldstrike and is commonly referred to as the "Barrick Fee" open pit production and reserves. As of December 31, 2008, reserves on the "Barrick Fee" properties in the open pit mining area were estimated at 1,503,777 ounces.

Goldstrike also operates an underground mine in the Alleged AOI commonly referred to as the "Miekle" mine. The Miekle mine has been in operation since 1996. The majority of the

Miekle underground mine sits on mining claims or fee lands which Goldstrike acquired or patented prior to May 3, 1999. Information about production, smelter returns and mineral reserves relating to these mining claims and fee lands has no relevance in this case. A smaller amount of production from the Miekle underground mine has come from some of the mining claims or fee lands which Goldstrike acquired from Newmont on May 3, 1999, as part of the Asset Exchange. The production and reserves from these properties are tracked separately by Goldstrike and is commonly referred to as the "Barrick Fee" open pit production and reserves. As of December 31, 2008, reserves on the "Barrick Fee" properties in the underground mining area were estimated at 865,996 ounces.

Goldstrike has not calculated a smelter return on the production from the "Barrick Fee" lands because no royalty is believed to be owed on those ounces, and thus no such calculation is required.

The following documents are identified as containing information about the annual gross smelter returns, the monthly gross smelter returns, and information about reserves from the Betze Post and Miekle mines:

	1. Gross Smelter	Return (Annual):	Documents Labelo	ed with "BAR" pref	ix
17	7-68	19518-19642	24312-24338	30854-30977	36848-36872
ľ	1981-2580	19795-19821	24387-24518	30984-31008	36981-37005
18	4361-4426	19852-19978	24835-24863	31111-31261	37056-37197
	7008-7108	20046-20072	25054-25179	31333-31459	37203-37233
19	7234-8122	20103-20260	25247-25275	31604-31727	37495-37669
<u></u>	9391-10462	20347-20377	25378-25503	31749-31773	38040-38219
20	11760-12531	20423-20451	25520-25555	31857-31980	38340-38481
21	13540-13954	20667-20723	25650-26054	32052-32203	38501-38531
21	14766-15085	20879-21005	26355-26356	32320-32470	38626-38909
22	15213-15559	21072-21073	26517-26642	32544-32568	38971-39001
22	15701-15966	21078-21104	26649-26698	32584-32732	39053-39196
23	16020-16075	21123-21149	26766-26793	32832-33108	39258-39288
23	16100-16231	21212-21488	26814-26995	33225-33274	39340-39483
24	16284-16446	21602-21631	27073	33282-33407	39550-39580
- '	16513-16541	21701-21855	27095-27218	33454-33478	39632-39773
25	16565-16696	21968-21999	27235-27259	33525-33650	38939-39869
	16762-16790	22017-22175	27429-27482	33741-33891	39919-40062
26	16814-16945	22296-22297	27569-27692	33994-34167	40129-40159
	16996-17024	22315-22438	27760-27811	34301-34426	40212-40361
27	17173-17347	22455-22481	27916-28041	34559-34711	40424-40483
	17445-17600	22579-22580	28218-28244	34818-35065	40540-40684
28					

4829-8039-3477.1

## Qase 3:09-cv-00612-MMD-WGC Document 244-4 Filed 12/09/16 Page 29 of 33

	1				
1	17698-17832	22714-22837	28346-28597	35083-35107	40850-40880
ł	17834-17864	22905-22935	28725-28901	35193-35317	40936-41079
2	18039-18040	23024-23152	28997-28961	35377-35401	41142-41172
	18045-18075	23218-23249	29064-29115	35453-35578	41326-41609
3	18113-18237	23297-23300	29363-29387	35636-35660	41656-41685
	18253-18278	23350-23479	29452-29728	35761-35886	41877-42019
4	18389-18762	23531-23559	29854-30144	35943-35967	42096-42125
_ ]	18953-18979	23608-23634	30216-30218	36070-36195	42221-43603
5	19014-19140	23689-23812	30221-30515	36304-36328	43767-43768
_	19208-19236	23931-2395	30590-30591	36396-36521	43830-43834
6	19267-19393	24011-24163	30598-30623	36579-36603	43871-43990
7	19461-19487	24231-24259	30820-30846	36715-36739	

8	2. Gross Smelter Return (Monthly): Documents Labeled with "BAK" prefix			
9	7-68	18113-20276	41326-41609	
9	69-577	20279-20767	41638-41791	
10	1981-2580	20879-21073	41877-42019	
	4361-4426	21078-25016	42047-42182	
11	7008-7108	25054-37347	42221-43603	
11	7234-18021	37459-37787	43871-43990	
12	18024-18040	38040-40747		
`~	18045-18075	40850-41232		

4. Reserves: Documents Labeled with "BAR" prefix
2385-2580
4427-7007
43767-43772
43830-43870

There are no other mines in the Alleged AOI which have been operated by Goldstrike since May 3, 1999.

INTERROGATORY NO. 12: For each of the proven mineral reserves situated within the 1979 AOI not listed in response to Interrogatory 11, in which Barrick has an interest, please set forth the following:

- a. The mining claims or fee land on which the mineral reserve is located.
- b. The value of each mineral reserve, specifying the value of each type mineral.
- c. The date the unpatented or patented mining claim or fee land associated with each mineral reserve was acquired.
- d. From whom Barrick acquired the unpatented or patented mining claim on fee land on which each mineral reserve is located.

4829-8039-3477.1

- 28 -

Parsons Behle &

LATIMER

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 12: Goldstrike incorporates by reference its objections and answers to Interrogatory No. 11 as if expressly and fully set forth herein.

<u>INTERROGATORY NO. 13:</u> For each of the probable reserves situated within the 1979 AOI not listed in response to Interrogatory 11, please set forth the following:

- a. The mining claims or fee land on which the mineral reserve is located.
- b. The value of each mineral reserve, specifying the value of each type mineral.
- c. The date the unpatented or patented mining claim or fee land associated with each mineral reserve was acquired.
- d. From whom Barrick acquired the unpatented or patented mining claim on fee land on which each mineral reserve is located.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 13: Goldstrike incorporates by reference its objections and answers to Interrogatory No. 11 as if expressly and fully set forth herein.

INTERROGATORY NO. 14: Please state the names of any persons or companies Barrick or High Desert has offered a 50% participation interest as discussed in paragraph 11 of the May 10, 1979 Agreement at issue in this matter. Said provision is specifically discussed in the first full paragraph on page 11 of the 1979 Agreement.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 14: Goldstrike expressly incorporates by reference each of the general objections set forth above.

Goldstrike specifically objects to Interrogatory No. 14 insofar as it is overbroad and unduly burdensome and requires Goldstrike to provide information that is not relevant and likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this matter. In particular, Goldstrike objects to Bullion's request for information about actions taken by Goldstrike prior to May 3, 1999, when it actually became the corporate successor of Barrick HD. *See also supra* Answer to Interrogatory No. 2, which is expressly incorporated herein by reference.

Goldstrike also objects to Interrogatory No. 14 insofar as it requires Goldstrike to provide information about actions taken by High Desert or Barrick HD between July 10, 1990 and May 3, 1999, which actions Goldstrike was not itself involved in, and which actions Goldstrike may not

1

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

4829-8039-3477.1

have any information about. Goldstrike will not undertake any obligation to obtain information about High Desert's or Barrick HD's actions which is not already in its possession and control. See also id.

Finally, Goldstrike objects to Interrogatory No. 14 insofar as it is written in such a manner as to suggest that Goldstrike (or Barrick HD or High Desert) is somehow bound by the 1979 Agreement, which it (and Barrick HD or High Desert) is not. See also supra Answer to Interrogatory No. 3 which is expressly incorporated herein by reference.

Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing general or specific objections, Goldstrike answers Interrogatory No. 14 as follows:

Goldstrike asserts that it has not itself offered a 50% participation interest to any persons or companies as discussed in paragraph 11 of the 1979 Agreement, and asserts that it had no obligation to offer any such participation interest to any person or company because it has never been a party to or otherwise bound by the 1979 Agreement. See also id.

Goldstrike asserts that to the best of its current knowledge, information and belief, neither High Desert nor Barrick HD offered a 50% participation interest to any persons or companies as discussed in paragraph 11 of the 1979 Agreement, and asserts that neither High Desert nor Barrick had an obligation to offer any such participation interest to any person or company because neither High Desert nor Barrick HD were ever a party to or otherwise bound by the 1979 Agreement. See also id.

INTERROGATORY NO. 15: If Barrick's answer to Interrogatory 14 was that Barrick or High Desert has not offered a 50% participation interest to anyone, please set forth all reasons why Barrick has not done so.

ANSWER TO INTERROGATORY NO. 15: Goldstrike incorporates by reference its objections and answers to Interrogatory No. 14 as if expressly set forth herein.

Q	ase 3:09-cv-00612-MMD-WGC Doo	cument 244-4 Filed 12/09/16 Page 32 of 33
1 2	Dated: July 1, 2010	PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER
3		By: Michael Walny orga
4		Michael R. Kealy Francis M. Wikstrom
5		Michael P. Petrogeorge Brandon J. Mark
6		Attorneys for Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc.
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12 13		
13		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24	·	
25		
26		
27		
28		
	4829-8039-3477.1	- 31 -

Parsons Behle & Latimer

LATIMER

4829-8039-3477.1

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Pursuant to FRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of Parsons Behle & Latimer, and that on this 1st day of July, 2010, I caused to be mailed, via U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, a true and correct copy of BARRICK GOLDSTRIKE MINES INC.'S SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWERS AND OBJECTTIONS TO PLAINTIFF'S INTERROGATORIES [SET ONE], to the following:

Clayton P. Brust, Esq. ROBISON, BELAUSTEGUI, SHARP & LOW 71 Washington Street Reno, NV 89503

By: Michael Hotograge

- 32 -

PARSONS BEHLE &

## EXHIBIT 5

October 26, 2016 Letter

## EXHIBIT 5

Case 3:09-cv-00612-MMD-WGC Document 244-5 Filed 12/09/16 Page 2 of 2

ROBISON, BELAUSTEGUI, SHARP & LOW

ATTORNEYS:

Kent R. Robison

Thomas L. Belaustegui

F. DeArmond Sharp

Keegan G. Low

Barry L. Breslow

Mark G. Simons

Michael E. Sullivan

Clayton P. Brust

Stefanie T. Sharp

Frank C. Gilmore

Michael A. Burke

Therese M. Shanks Scott L. Hernandez October 26, 2016

Parsons Behle & Latimer Michael P. Petrogeorge, Esq. 201 South Main Street, Ste. 1800 Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Via Facsimile: 801.536.6111

Re: Bullion Monarch Mining v. Barrick Goldstrike Mines, et al CV-N-09-00612-ECR-VPC

Dear Mike:

Judge Du's order denying summary judgment made clear that Barrick's (and High Desert's) acquisitions in the Area of Interest since 1990 are at issue in the lawsuit. Pursuant to Magistrate Cooke's May 27, 2010 Minute Order, and in light of Judge Du's order, the parties must now complete discovery regarding Bullion's alleged damages. To that end, please advise within the next 7 days as to when Bullion can expect to receive complete responses to its interrogatories numbered 2, 8, 11, 12, and 13. That information is needed for Bullion's experts to complete their opinions and for Bullion to calculate its damages.

Further, the information provided should also include production and gross smelter return information. Specifically, Barrick must provide the gross smelter return for production from the "Barrick Fee" lands in the Betze Post mine and Miekle mines. Barrick should have these numbers or be able to calculate the same since Barrick is tracking production of gold and silver from the "Barrick Fee" lands in those two mines. As a reminder, FRCP(e)(1) requires timely supplementation of discovery responses, so the information proved by Barrick should be current through 2016. Depending on the completeness of Barrick's responses, we may need to also depose the witnesses listed as having knowledge regarding the information provided. In light of the above, it makes sense that we contact the Court to advise that the current deadline for filing the Joint Pretrial Order needs to be moved back.

Sincerely

Clayton P. Brus

Attended the train and we have built by the part of the

CPB

P 775.329.3151 F 775.329.7941

71 Washington Street Reno, Nevada 89503

www.rbsllaw.com

## EXHIBIT 6

November 1, 2016 Letter

# EXHIBIT 6



201 South Main Street, Suite 1800 Salt Lake City, Utah 84111 Main 801.532.1234 Fax 801.536.6111 parsonsbehle.com

A Professional Law Corporation Michael P. Petrogeorge Attorney at Law Direct 801.536.6899 MPetrogeorge@parsonsbehle.com

November 1, 2016

#### VIA EMAIL

Clayton P. Brust Robinson, Belaustegui, Sharp & Low 71 Washington Street Reno, Nevada 89503

Re: Bullion Monarch Mining Company v. Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc., Case No. 3:09-cv-00612-MMD-WGC (United States District Court for the District of Nevada)

Dear Clay:

I am in receipt of your letter dated October 26, 2016, requesting supplemental fact and expert discovery. After reviewing the record, we cannot agree to your request. As a threshold matter, we do not see anything in Judge Du's order indicating that "acquisitions in the Area of Interest since 1990 are at issue in the lawsuit." That order does not address the issue at all. More importantly, expert damages discovery has been stayed, at your suggestion and with your consent, pending a determination of liability at trial and the potential ordering of an accounting.<sup>1</sup>

At the Case Management Conference held on May 27, 2010, you suggested that expert discovery be stayed pending the outcome at trial and a determination of liability on the part of Barrick and the ordering of an accounting. Your suggestion was appropriate because until we know whether there is liability, and for what mining properties, and for what period of time, potential damages cannot be determined. I agreed, on behalf of Barrick, that it made sense not to spend time delving into records when the merits of the case could be resolved in a way that would either eliminate the issue entirely or narrow the scope of liability.

In response, Magistrate Judge Cook ordered that "supplemental expert reports shall be deferred until such time the District Court denies the accounting claim in a summary judgment motion or orders accounting at the trial." See Minutes from May 27, 2010, Case Management Conference [Dkt. 32]. Pursuant to our prior agreements and Magistrate Cooke's express order thereon, and since liability still has not been determined and no accounting has been ordered, further expert discovery is premature and inappropriate. As such, Barrick will not agree to any further discovery.

00606.131\4846-5888-7995 v2 PSA 0131

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Fact discovery closed on May 25, 2010. On May 27, 2010, Magistrate Judge Cooke granted a limited extension to allow Bullion to take the depositions of Daniel Jensen and Clayton Parr. Beyond that, no further fact discovery was allowed. And we will not agree to the reopening of fact discovery at this juncture.

Clayton P. Brust November 1, 2016 Page Two

Sincerely,

Parsons Behle & Latimer

Michael P. Petrogeorge Attorney at Law

cc: Dan Polsenberg (via email) Fran Wikstrom (via email) Brandon Mark (via email) Peter Webster (via email)

## Case 3:09-cv-00612-MMD-WGC Document 249 Filed 01/13/17 Page 1 of 7

1	DANIEL F. POLSENBERG Nevada Bar No. 2376	
2	JOEL D. HENRIOD Nevada Bar No. 8492	
3	ABRAHAM G. SMITH Nevada Bar No. 13,250	
4	Lewis Roca Rothgerber Christie Lli 3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 6	P 300
5	Las Vegas, Nevada 89169-5996 (702) 949-8200	
6 7	(702) 949-8398 (Fax) DPolsenberg@LRRC.com JHenriod@LRRC.com	
8	ASmith@LRRC.com	
9	THOMAS L. BELAUSTEGUI Nevada Bar No. 732	
10	CLAYTON P. BRUST Nevada Bar No. 5234 ROBISON, BELAUSTEGUI, SHARP & LOW	
11	71 Washington Street Reno, Nevada 89503	
12	(775) 329-3151 (775) 329-7941 (Fax)	
13	CBrust@RBSLAttys.com	
14	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
15		S DISTRICT COURT OF NEVADA
16	BULLION MONARCH MINING, INC.,	Case No. 03:09-CV-612-MMD-WGC
17 18	Plaintiff,	REPLY BRIEF ON
19	vs.	"MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY"
	BARRICK GOLDSTRIKE MINES, INC.,	
20 21	Defendant.	
22	Barrick's opposition focuses on th	ne meaning of Magistrate Judge Cooke's
23	prior order, but the reasons for grantin	
2.4		5

25

26

27

28

Barrick has already disclosed that it maintains the very records Bullion seeks, and sharing them would help mediate the distrust and lack of information that has so far precluded settlement. Barrick, moreover, has a duty to supplement the responses it already provided. Given Barrick's shifting views on what constitutes "liability" and "damages," denying Bullion the information it may need

Lewis Roca ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE

to establish liability would be fundamentally unfair.

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

14 15

13

16 17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

.ewis Roca

I.

## THIS COURT SHOULD LIFT THE STAY ON DAMAGES DISCOVERY

There is good cause to lift the stay, whether as an interpretation of Magistrate Judge Cooke's order or as an independent order now.

#### The Prior Order Can Reasonably Be Read Α. to Require the Additional Discovery Now

#### It is Incoherent to Say that the Discovery is "Deferred" 1. until a Dismissal of the Accounting Claim

The portion of the Court's prior order "deferr[ing]" further discovery "until such time as the District Court denies the accounting claim in a summary judgment motion" has caused confusion. Barrick reads the clause to refer to a hypothetical, successful motion by Barrick to dismiss Bullion's request for an accounting. But since Barrick also sees the accounting as the means of establishing the damages element of Bullion's claims (Doc. 248, Opp. 10:13–21), that claim would be dismissed only if the entire complaint were dismissed. That would not be a trigger to reopen discovery. (Contra Doc. 87, Tr. at 19:1–5 ("that is when the Court feels it would be appropriate to reopen expert discovery").) So it is incoherent to say that discovery is merely "deferred" until such a dismissal.

#### 2. The Order Can be Read to Defer Discovery until Summary Judgment on the Accounting Claim is Denied

Bullion, by contrast, understands the order to allow discovery to resume if the Court "denies the accounting claim [part of] a summary judgment motion"i.e., if a summary-judgment motion challenging Bullion's accounting claim were unsuccessful. That means that upon the occurrence of either condition—denial of summary judgment or, if no summary-judgment motion were filed, an order of accounting at trial—the "deferred" discovery would actually resume. Bullion

acknowledges that at the hearing, it offered to pursue its claims on liability to trial in lieu of completing damages discovery for its experts' reports. (See also Doc. 31 (arguing that Bullion's experts "must first be furnished with sufficient production information" but as an alternative Bullion was "willing to allow for a continuation of expert discovery regarding damages").) Nonetheless, Bullion believed the language of the Court's minute order controlled.

Under a reasonable reading of that ruling, Barrick's failed attempt to have the accounting claim dismissed in its summary-judgment motion now opens the door for discovery.

## B. Regardless of the Prior Order, there is Good Cause to Lift the Stay

Rather than parse the prior order, however, this Court can and should enter a new order lifting the stay as to discovery on damages. This Court has discretion to do so. *Grammer v. Colo. Hosp. Ass'n Shared Servs., Inc.*, 2:14-CV-1701-RFB, 2015 WL 3938406, at \*2 (D. Nev. June 26, 2015). And Barrick has not given any substantive reason to keep the stay in place.

## 1. Damages Discovery is Not Burdensome

The burden of production would be minimal. Barrick says that "it makes no sense to require Goldstrike to provide extensive production data for properties and for periods that may prove entirely irrelevant" (Doc. 248, Opp. 11:9–10), and that such a pre-accounting disclosure "would be wasteful for all concerned" (Doc. 248, Opp. 2:11–12). Barrick does not explain why this production would be burdensome, however. To the contrary, Barrick asserts that it separately tracks the production data from the area-of-interest properties. (See Amended Resp. to Interrog. 8 ("The production from these properties is tracked separately by Goldstrike, and is commonly referred to as the 'Barrick Fee' open pit production (indicating that Goldstrike does not believe there to be any royal-ties owed on such ounces).").) Now that Barrick assures us there are no other

properties (Doc. 248, Opp. 8:16–9:1), updating the production from 2010 and disclosing the gross smelter returns (the dollar value of production) and proved and probable reserves (a projection of the mine's future capacity) should be straightforward.

## 2. Bullion Seeks the Information to Pursue a Good-Faith Settlement

At the same time, disclosing and updating this information would promote settlement. Barrick says that "[t]he parties are so far apart that further discussions would be a waste of time." (Doc. 248, Opp. 11:20–21.) But that distance is due in part to an information gap that disclosure would help bridge. When the parties agreed to suspend discovery in 2010, neither envisioned that it would take nearly seven years before this matter would be ordered to trial. Now it has become clear that the continuing fight on liability through trial will be so expensive as to make settlement even more remote.

II.

## BARRICK MUST SUPPLEMENT ITS PREVIOUS RESPONSES

Irrespective of the stay on damages discovery, Barrick at least has to update its 2010 discovery responses. Barrick does not dispute its obligations under FRCP 26(e)(1) to supplement its responses "even following the close of discovery." *Star Direct Telecom, Inc. v. Glob. Crossing Bandwidth, Inc.*, 272 F.R.D. 350, 358 (W.D.N.Y. 2011). Barrick's asserted exemption under the discovery stay (Doc. 248, Opp. 9 n.7) misreads the scope of that stay. As Barrick argued in 2010, the purpose of the stay was "to not spend a bunch of time delving into and fighting over . . . production records from 1990 forward." (Doc. 87, Tr. at 17:22–24.) Nonetheless, without a fight Barrick had already "delv[ed] into" the total number of ounces of gold and silver produced from the area-of-interest properties through July 1, 2010. At the time, Barrick withheld only the dollar calculation of gross smelter returns and the proved and probable reserves; the

fight on those damages issues was postponed. But nothing about the stay suspends Barrick's obligation to update the information it did provide, which is now outdated.<sup>1</sup>

### III.

## BULLION IS CONCERNED THAT BARRICK MAY INVOKE THE ABSENCE OF DAMAGES DISCOVERY AS A DEFENSE TO LIABILITY AT TRIAL

Bullion brought this motion in part out of concern that Barrick would try to escape liability at trial by pointing to the lack of evidence on damages. During the hearing on motions for summary judgment, Barrick represented that "there's no evidence that [Barrick or its] predecessors obtained any properties in the area of interest" and that "discovery has long closed in this case on liability." (Tr. 8/30/16 19:4–12.) It seemed that, despite Barrick's disclosures of two such mines—Betze Post AOI and Miekle AOI—Barrick was exploiting the absence of discovery on damages to say that Bullion could not meet its prima facie case on liability.

Barrick now concedes that those mines constitute properties Barrick or its predecessors acquired in the area of interest. (Doc. 248, Opp. 8:13–9:3.) And Barrick represents that those responses are "complete" even now. (*Id.*) Barrick even goes so far as to say that the stay order effectively bifurcates the trial, excusing Bullion from gathering or presenting any evidence of damages from unpaid royalties until the jury's determination of liability. (Doc. 248, Opp. 10:16–18.)

None of Barrick's concessions obviate the need for Barrick's discovery responses here, though. Bullion is still concerned about moving goalposts on "liability." Bullion has been repeatedly assured, including in Barrick's opposition

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> If this Court excuses Barrick from supplementing its responses on grounds that it falls under the stay of damages discovery, Bullion reserves the right to challenge the sufficiency and accuracy of those responses when the damages-discovery phase commences.



here, that Barrick produced "complete" responses to Bullion's requests relevant to liability and that Bullion could not compel any further production because of the stay on damages discovery. (See Doc. 248, Opp. 5:1–2 (seeming to acknowledge that "reserve/production data" is still necessary for the calculation of damages).) Yet comments like those in the summary-judgment hearing suggest that Barrick may argue that unproduced information about Barrick's area-of-interest holdings is critical to Bullion's case on liability. As a matter of due process and fundamental fairness, Bullion must be permitted to compel Barrick's responses on that production information.

## CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, this Court should grant Bullion's motion.

Dated this 13th day of January, 2017.

LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE LLP

By: /s/ Abraham G. Smith

Daniel F. Polsenberg Nevada Bar No. 2376 Joel D. Henriod Nevada Bar No. 8492 Abraham G. Smith Nevada Bar No. 13,250 3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

THOMAS L. BELAUSTEGUI Nevada Bar No. 732 CLAYTON P. BRUST Nevada Bar No. 5234 ROBISON, BELAUSTEGUI, SHARP & LOW 71 Washington Street Reno, Nevada 89503

Attorneys for Plaintiff

28 Lewis Roca ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE

24

25

26

Lewis Roca ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 and Local Rule 5-4, I certify that I served the foregoing "Motion to Compel Discovery" through the United States District Court's CM/ECF system electronic mail.

Dated this 13th day of January, 2017.

/s/ Jessie M. Helm

An Employee of Lewis Roca Rothgerber Christie LLP