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| 1 | Q And then you have the March 16, 2018, second |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | rebuttal report? |
| 3 | A Yes. |
| 4 | Q All right. And then your final one is the |
| 5 | December 14 th Ms. Goldstein's report? |
| 6 | A Yes. |
| 7 | Q So Ms. Goldstein's report supplements the |
| 8 | original report, then they -- |
| 9 | MR. DUSHOFF: Arbitrator Baker, do you want |
| 10 | me to refer to them as the dates of the report? Which |
| 11 | is easier for you? |
| 12 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: Maybe if you can just |
| 13 | refer to them by tabs, that might be easier to follow |
| 14 | along -- |
| 15 | MR. DUSHOFF: Okay. |
| 16 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: -- since we all have the |
| 17 | same binder. |
| 18 | BY MR. DUSHOFF: |
| 19 | Q So, Ms. Goldstein's report, tab 11, |
| 20 | supplements the original report, which is tab 1; |
| 21 | right? |
| 22 | A Not necessarily, no. Ms. Goldstein's report |
| 23 | is a supplement to Mr. Terry's last supplemented |
| 24 | report, for use of a different percentage ownership. |
| 25 | Q All right. I'd like you to turn, then, |
|  | Page 175 |

Ms. Goldstein's report, page 1 , which would be page 1 of your report --

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Tab 11.
BY MR. DUSHOFF:
Q The one -- tab 11 -- but it's marked as page 1 of a two-page report.

A Not --
Q Yeah, right there. You got it.
A Okay.
Q And you prepared this; correct?
A Yes.
Q You prepared this report?
And under "Supplemental Analysis" it states, "This supplemental report references and updates the information provided in two previous reports: The business valuation report made May 25, 2016" -- that is tab 1, the original report; correct?

A That's what it's referring to, yes.
Q -- "produced by Gryphon, and the supplemental business report on February 3, 2018." That is the other report we just talked about, the February 3rd report, which is tab 8; correct?

A Yes.
Q Now, Goldstein's report also incorporates the findings in the original report, tab 1, as well as
tab 8, the supplemental report. Is that accurate?
A No, it doesn't necessarily incorporate the findings. It incorporates the report because it refers to some calculations and information provided in that report.

Q Okay. Incorporates some numbers and values that are in the first two reports; correct?

A Yes.
Q And if we can turn, tab 11, to page 6. Tab 11.

And I brought this up a little earlier, but in the -- in the -- there's only one paragraph there. You have it there at 28 -- in 28 percent discount for lack of control and lack of marketability; correct?

A That's correct.
Q All right. And the only time -- and you use that, that would be appendix A of the original report, tab 1 ; is that accurate?

A Yes.
Q All right. So let's go back to tab 1. Now, let's -- before we go there, that 28 percent is a number that you verified, that you put in, and based it on Exhibit K; correct? Nobody else did that?

A That's correct.
Q So if we could go to K -- and that's
appendix K , which would be RESP 57754, is the start of it. But $I$ want to head you down to page --

A Excuse me. Do you know what page of the report that is?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: 139.
BY MR. DUSHOFF:
Q $\quad 139$.
A Okay. Thank you.
Q Do you not have Bates numbers on the bottom of that? I apologize.

A I do, but $I$ just didn't hear what you said.
Q Okay. Page 139. All right. That -- from this document right here, this appendix, is where you -- you came to the 28 percent; correct?

A That is correct.
Q So let's turn to page 144 of that.
All right. Are we there?
A Yes.
Q And in this -- you have a graph -- you have a little table here. It says, "For discount for lack of marketability weighted average"; correct?

A Yes.
Q And in this section it says the weighted average for discount of marketability is 26.5 ; is that accurate?

| 1 | A Yes. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q But, however, in -- when you used it in |
| 3 | Ms. Goldstein's, you have it at 28 percent, not 26.5 ; |
| 4 | is that accurate? |
| 5 | A No. They're not the same number. |
| 6 | Q You have 28 percent for discount for lack of |
| 7 | rounding. You said that's in appendix K; correct? |
| 8 | That's what you said in -- when we read it in -- |
| 9 | A Yes. |
| 10 | Q -- tab 11? |
| 11 | A That's correct, yes. |
| 12 | Q Can you show me, then, is it the 20 average |
| 13 | weighted marketable discount, is that what you're |
| 14 | talking about, the summary of restricted stock |
| 15 | studies? Is that where you're talking about the |
| 16 | 28.7? |
| 17 | A Well, there are two discounts that we're |
| 18 | talking about here. |
| 19 | Q The only discount I'm talking about -- so is |
| 20 | there a discount for lack of control and lack of |
| 21 | marketability? |
| 22 | A Yes, there is. |
| 23 | Q So where is the discount for lack of |
| 24 | control? |
| 25 | A Discount for lack of control is page 141. |
|  | Page 179 |

Q And which one?
A Which, which one?
Q What number are we looking at? I see it says, "US equity stock closed end funds"?

A That's correct.
Q Okay.
A And so we used closed end -- if I could just explain for a second, it may just --

Q No. What I want to ask you is, you said that there is a number for lack of control -- discount for lack of control.

Which number -- because $I$ have a lot of numbers here -- which number are we using for the number for lack of control?

A Okay. If you turn to page 142 , in the top three paragraphs there explain what numbers we look at.

And in the third paragraph down, "We note that the third quartile is priced to NAD ratio for February 2016, 12-month trailing period, was deemed to be the most appropriate; therefore, a discount for lack of control of 10 percent was applied to that portion of the company's value represented by the interest."

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Mr. Parker, I would just ask

Page 180
the defendant for the court reporter, when reading your report, $I$ know you know it, but --

THE WITNESS: Oh.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: -- she doesn't. If you
could slow down, so she --
THE WITNESS: My apologies.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: -- can get it, that would be
helpful.
BY MR. DUSHOFF:
Q So the discount for lack of control is 10 percent of what?

A It's 10 percent. It hasn't been applied at this point yet.

Q So the discount for -- weighted average discount for lack of marketability is 26 and a half percent; correct?

A No, I actually boil that down to 20 percent, as explained in the paragraph on the bottom of page 144.

Q "As a result, the reason that the DLON of 20 cents more appropriately reflects the impaired market and its characteristics, the interest"?

A That's correct.
Q However, on -- for her report, you put 28 percent; correct?

A As a combined discount.
Q Right. So you're saying the 20 plus the 10 would be 30 percent; right?

A No. They have to be linked differently because the 10 percent is applied first; and then the balance, the 20 percent, is applied.

Q Ten percent is applied to what?
A To the final value.
Q Final value of what? You have a number here that discounted -- you have a number in her -- in Ms. Goldstein's report, that says -- you have a discounted -- you have a less combined adjustment of 28 percent.

What I'm trying to find out is how you got to 28 percent.

A It's going to be in the body of the original report.

Q No, it refers to Exhibit K. You specifically reserve -- say, "See Appendix $K$ of the BV report."

So I'm in Exhibit $K$ of the BV report. Where in Exhibit $K$ of the $B V$ report does it say that there is a less combined adjustment of 28 percent?

A That's why I incorporated the prior reports, because it's explained in the first report. If you had a 20 percent and a 10 percent, if you link 20
percent and 10 percent, you will come up with 28 percent.

Q Wait a minute. Okay. I want you to go to page 2 of your original report.

A Page 2?
Q Page 2 of your original report, if you would.
A You don't want me to --
Q Tab 1.
A You don't want me to clarify how I got to 28 percent?

Q No.
A Okay. It's on page 42, for the record.
Q It will be 57617. If you look at the bottom, given the page numbers on the bottom.

A Got you.
Q And specifically under scope of limitation, I'll read it out loud, then ask you a question about it.

It says, "This report is not intended to serve as a basis for expert testimony in a court of law or other government agency without further analysis and resulting documentation."
(Court reporter requests clarification.)
MR. DUSHOFF: Sorry. I'll read it again. I speak way too quickly.
Q "This report is not intended to serve as a basis for expert testimony in a court of law or other governmental agency without further analysis and any resulting documentation."

So this original report, as written by you, is not to be considered an expert report in your own language; correct?

A Without further analysis in any resulting documentation.

Q Right. But at the time you wrote this, you didn't have any further analysis. So at the time you wrote this, the very first one, the original one, this document in and of itself is not to be considered an expert report?

A That's a standard disclaimer that we put in all of our valuation reports.

Q Okay. But that is not the question I asked you. I asked you, as of this report in your own language, this report is not to be used as an expert report?

A This report was written as a business valuation report.

Q Okay. So I'm going to -- I'm going to ask it again until you answer my question. This report in your own language, "This report is not intended to
serve as a basis for expert testimony in a court of law, other government agency, without further analysis and resulting documentation"; is that correct? Did you put that in, and is that accurate?

A That is the language.
Q And did you put in that language?
A Yes.
Q Do you agree with that language?
A In terms of this being a business valuation report --

Q I didn't say --
A -- yes.
Q -- business valuation. I said, "expert report to be used in a court of law."

A This is written as a business valuation report for purposes of a failed, apparently, settlement.

Q Right.
MR. DUSHOFF: Arbitrator Baker, I --
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Let's move on.
MR. DUSHOFF: Okay. You got it?
ARBITRATOR BAKER: I see the point that
you're making. Yes.
BY MR. DUSHOFF:
Q Let me ask you, did Ms. Goldstein retain --
sign a litigation consulting and expert service agreement with you?

A Yes.
Q And that was for her report?
A Yes. Let me clarify, I don't know if she signed it or if it was signed by a representative of the law firm.

Q And for that purpose, that would be considered an expert -- all right. "Such services require separate litigation consulting and expert service agreement, and Gryphon is under no obligation to enter into such agreement" at the time of your original one, but you're saying Ms. Goldstein did sign one?

A Yes.
Q So then Ms. Goldstein's report, pursuant to your language, would be considered an expert report; correct?

A And expert report that ...
Q That would be used in court?
A That could be used in court, that incorporates part -- very small part of the original valuation report.

Q Yes, exactly.
Do you have -- let's turn to Exhibit 11.

You stated that your language that you put under "Scope of Limitation" is standard language that you put in all your reports.

Is that standard language regarding "This report is not intended to serve as an expert witness," is that in -- anywhere in the December 14 th report?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Objection. I think it misstates the testimony.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Sustained.
BY MR. DUSHOFF:
Q Do you see anywhere in the December 14, 2018, report, where you state, "This report is not intended to serve as expert testimony"?

A That language is not in that report.
Q You valued NuVeda in this case with all six licenses. Is that accurate?

A That was the assumption, yes, sir.
Q And you would agree with me that you're only as good as the information you receive; right? As an expert valuator, if you're given certain numbers, you know, determine -- withdraw the question.

Garbage in/garbage out. As an expert witness, what does that mean to you?

A Your final conclusions are always based on certain assumptions.

Q Right. And if the numbers that they're given to you are faulty numbers, then your conclusion -doesn't matter how good your formula is, of course, it's not going to be accurate. Is that fair to say?

A I think that's fair.
Q So if the numbers that you used in
Ms. Goldstein's report to determine the value in NuVeda were inaccurate, then the numbers you have for her value would also be inaccurate. Is that a fair statement?

A It's a hypothetical situation.
Q It's not a hypothetical situation. I'm asking you, if the numbers that you're using -- that you used in Ms. Goldstein's report to determine her value in NuVeda were inaccurate, then the numbers you have for the value would also be inaccurate?

A If you changed all the 9s to a 6, then you would come up with a different conclusion.

Q Okay. If you changed a hundred to 84; right, you'd come up with a different conclusion?

A Correct.
Q In the numbers that you use for Ms. Goldstein's, that's the numbers you incorporated in tab 8; correct, which is the business -supplemental business valuation report that you did

| 1 | for Mr. Terry? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A That is correct. |
| 3 | Q Who provided -- you said management provided |
| 4 | you those numbers. Who provided you those numbers? |
| 5 | A I don't recall the exact source. It was all |
| 6 | part of discovery. |
| 7 | Q All right. Do you -- was that given to you |
| 8 | by Ms. Turner or Mr. Terry? |
| 9 | A It would be one or the other. |
| 10 | Q Okay. Because it wasn't given to you by |
| 11 | Dr. Bady, Dr. Mohajer, or Mr. Kennedy, was it, |
| 12 | directly? |
| 13 | A Not to my knowledge. |
| 14 | Q Have you ever talked with Dr. Bady? |
| 15 | A I have not. |
| 16 | Q Dr. Mohajer? |
| 17 | A I have not. |
| 18 | Q And Dr. Kennedy? |
| 19 | A No. |
| 20 | MR. KENNEDY: I'm not a doctor. |
| 21 | MR. DUSHOFF: I'm going to make you a doctor, |
| 22 | honorary. I'm just on a roll. |
| 23 | Q And the only people you spoke with about |
| 24 | doing valuations in the case that involved NuVeda, at |
| 25 | that time when you were doing this report, were |
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Ms. Turner, who was Terry's -- Terry's attorney - - and Shane Terry. Is that accurate?

A I can't recall if those are the only people I spoke to, but those would have been the main sources of my information.

Q So it's your belief -- because you said management, so it's your belief that the numbers that you have here on appendix $A$ and $B$ were numbers that were given to you by shane Terry or Ms. Turner during discovery?

A Well, the -- just a point of clarification, that the Exhibit $A$ - - or excuse me, this is appendix $A$-- was sourced from a specific file. It's Exhibit 247 ; and the file, CWNV Forecast 2.

Q Uh-huh. And who provided that to you?
A I don't recall the specific source of that particular exhibit.

Q But you weren't -- but again, you weren't provided that -- you never received any documents directly from Dr. Bady, Dr. Mohajer, and Mr. Kennedy; right?

The documents you received here in this case were brought, either Ms. Turner or Mr. Terry, in personally?

A Yes.

| 1 | Q Okay. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A It was my understanding that they were |
| 3 | generated, though, by the management of the company. |
| 4 | Q Okay. |
| 5 | A That's my understanding. |
| 6 | Q At the time that you're doing the evaluation, |
| 7 | or even now, how many licenses does NuVeda have? |
| 8 | A I'm sorry? |
| 9 | Q How many licenses does NuVeda have? |
| 10 | A As we sit here today? |
| 11 | Q Yep. Or as you -- let me try -- let's go |
| 12 | back. |
| 13 | As you did the evaluation for Ms. Goldstein, |
| 14 | way back -- let's go back to August of 2017, the date |
| 15 | of evaluation, how many licenses did they have? |
| 16 | A The assumption was that they had all six |
| 17 | licenses. |
| 18 | Q Okay. And what licenses were those? What |
| 19 | types of licenses? |
| 20 | A They were dispensary licenses, cultivation |
| 21 | licenses, and production licenses. |
| 22 | Q Do you know how many of each? |
| 23 | A Not off the top of my head. |
| 24 | Q Fair to say that there were two? Would you |
| 25 | agree with me that there were two of each? |
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| 1 | A There were two of each, yes. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q Okay. |
| 3 | A It's on page 5 of the original report. |
| 4 | Q Do you know who CWNV -- or what is CWNV? |
| 5 | What entity it is? |
| 6 | A I don't understand the question. |
| 7 | Q All right. You've heard of CW in this? |
| 8 | A Yes. |
| 9 | Q And you've heard of NuVeda? |
| 10 | A Yes. |
| 11 | Q Have you ever heard of CWNV? |
| 12 | A Yes. |
| 13 | Q Who is CWNV? |
| 14 | A It's my recollection that CWNV held the |
| 15 | $65-$-- was originally intended to hold the 65 percent |
| 16 | of four licenses. |
| 17 | Q Do you know who comprised CWNV? What |
| 18 | entities comprise CWNV? |
| 19 | A What are the entities that comprise it? |
| 20 | Q That comprise it? |
| 21 | A Not off the top of my head. |
| 22 | Q You said 65 percent. Are you aware that |
| 23 | NuVeda had 35 percent and CW had 65 percent? |
| 24 | A I don't recall the specifics. It was all |
| 25 | spelled out in the letter of intent, which I believe |
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was part of the original report.
Q Well, do you want to look at your original report to make sure you have -- you know what this is, because I'm going to ask you some questions regarding it.

A You're going to ask me questions regarding CWNV?

Q Yes, I am. (Witness reviewing document.)

A Okay.
Q Okay? Did you have an opportunity to review?

A I'm going to find it in here.
Q Take your time. I don't want to rush you. (Witness reviewing document.)

A I'm not finding anything on that.
Q So did anybody, did Mr. Terry or Ms. Goldstein ever explain to you the difference between CWNV and NuVeda?

A I know Ms. Goldstein didn't. I'm not sure if Mr. Terry did or not.

Q If Mr. Terry did that, that would be your original report?

A If it was relevant to the determination of the value for his shares in NuVeda.

Q As you sit here today, as we're talking right now, you don't know what CWNV is?

A No, I'm not clear on what CWNV is, as I sit here today.

Q I want you -- can you go to tab 11, please. And page 4 of tab $11, p l e a s e$.

You got that?
A Yep. Yes.
Q All right. It says, "Most recent projections using the most recent data projected NuVeda revenues." You see that, year $1,2,3,4,5 ?$

A Yes.
Q All right. And that is per Exhibit 247 is that correct?

A That is correct.
Q All right. And 247 would be in tab 8 ; correct, where we just were? That you just read off before; correct?

A Yes.
Q All right. Now, let me ask you this question. Just keep back on page 4. Are you sure, as you sit here today, that those are the projected NuVeda revenues that you have on your Ms. Goldstein exhibit -- Ms. Goldstein opinion, page 4?

You can go to page -- you can go to

Ms. Goldstein's exhibit -- the tab 11. I'm going to ask you a question about tab 11. You see tab 11?

A Yeah, I see tab 11. I'm at tab 11.
Q Okay. Tab 11, are you sure those are projected NuVeda revenues that you used, as you sit here today?

A Those are the revenues in million of dollars, as purported on appendix $A$ of tab 8.

Q So let's turn to appendix A, please, of tab 8, if you can, please.

Are you there?
A I am.
Q These aren't the projected revenues for NuVeda, are they?

A No, I believe what we were doing is using CWNV, or at least what -- what the discussion was -as a proxy for what NuVeda would have done had they retained control of all six licenses.

Q Okay. My question to you is, this -- this document, Exhibit 247 , is not the forecast of NuVeda's profit-and-loss projection, but of CWNV; isn't that correct?

A That is correct, using them as a proxy for what NuVeda would have done having had --

Q You just testified earlier that you don't
know what CWNV is or what it's made of, the entities, or anything about it; isn't that correct?

A I know that they had similar licenses to NuVeda.

Q You only know what you've been told. And you just testified under oath that you don't know what makes up CWNV, you don't know the entities. And that's okay if you don't. Nobody ever explained it to you?

A That is correct --
Q Okay.
A -- so my testimony stands.
Q So the numbers -- the CWNV numbers that you used in -- from Appendix A, are the numbers you used to determine the -- if you look at page 4 of your expert report -- the projected NuVeda revenues; is that correct? Those are the same numbers you used?

A What page are you on, sir?
Q Sure. Page 4 of tab 11. Appendix A, and that, that will match up your 1, 2, and 3--

A Yes, it --
Q -- 4 and 5?
A No doubt about it, it does say "Projected NuVeda revenue."

Q All right.

A We were using CWNV as a proxy for what NuVeda's revenues would have been, so they were still projected revenues via proxy for NuVeda.

Q Does it say "via proxy" anywhere on here?
A I don't know.
Q Are you aware that CWNV doesn't have two of the licenses? The other licenses are somewhere else? That CWNV only has four licenses?

A That's why we err to a conservative. There was no proxy for the other two licenses.

Q You didn't even know what CWNV was until we spoke today, so how can you say it's being used as a proxy?

A It was represented to me that those projections could be used as a proxy for NuVeda's, just for licenses. And as we speak, some memory is coming back, so ...

Q Isn't it more true that Mr. Terry just gave you the wrong information and you plugged in those as CWNV is NuVeda, and you just interchanged those names? Isn't that more true?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Objection to the form of the question, "more true."

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Can you just rephrase it?
MR. DUSHOFF: Sure.

Q Isn't it more likely, instead of using it as a proxy, as you say, although it's nowhere in here, that Mr. Terry just gave you the wrong information and you used those numbers to determine -- you used CWNV numbers to determine NuVeda's revenue?

A No.
Q So Ms. -- you told me, no, that Mr. Terry did not give you the inaccurate numbers?

A No, I specifically remember our conversation of using those numbers as a proxy for NuVeda.

Q Anywhere in your report -- and I want you to really super take time in this report --in Exhibit 8 -- or in tab 8 of tab 11, show me where you even used the word proxy.

A It doesn't appear to be explicitly spelled out.

Q Not just explicitly spelled out. Is it even implicitly spelled out?

A No.
Q Do you know when NuVeda started to receive revenues from its two operating dispensaries? Or are you even aware -- let me lay some foundation.

Are you aware that NuVeda, at the time that you were -- at the time that you did Ms. Goldstein's report, are you aware that there were two dispensaries
that were open for NuVeda?
A I may have been tangentially aware, but I wasn't concerned because we were doing the valuation as of August 2017 --

Q Right. And --
A -- based on -- based on the original business plan.

Q Yeah. The question -- but the question I asked you is, were you aware that as of August 8, 2017, NuVeda started to receive revenue from two operating dispensaries?

A I may have been. It did not factor into my report.

Q When you say you may have been, who would have provided you that information?

A I may have been aware of it just tangentially. I have no specific source for that. It did not factor into the report.

Q Okay.
A That was not the original business plan.
Q So nobody, no -- neither Ms. Goldstein nor Mr. Terry ever gave you any of the revenue from the two dispensaries? You never had that information?

A It's my understanding because of the alleged bad acts of certain individuals with NuVeda, that they
were unable to follow the original business plan and that their operations were delayed.

Q You're not an attorney, are you?
A I forgot to go to law school.
Q Yeah, so did I. But you're also not a trier of fact, are you?

A No, I am not.
Q So it's -- in your mind, you believe that there were alleged bad acts; and therefore, because of my clients' alleged bad acts, a lawsuit had to be filed. Is that your testimony?

A Could you repeat that.
Q Sure. Is it your testimony that my clients' alleged -- withdrawn.

Let's start with this: If there's litigation on a company and -- regarding especially closely-held company involving shareholders -- is it your testimony that any types of litigation regarding -- even Ms. Goldstein's -- would have an effect on the value of the company and the value of her shares?

A I'm still lost. I'm sorry.
Q Okay. Would litigation, like the litigation in this matter determining the value of her shares or determining alleged bad acts in a closely-held company -- would that type of litigation have any

| 1 | effect on the value of the company? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A It's a circular question. |
| 3 | Q Okay. So explain. |
| 4 | A But for the alleged bad acts, there wouldn't |
| 5 | be any litigation. |
| 6 | Q So, okay, let's -- so does litigation -- let |
| 7 | me ask you, does litigation -- any litigation -- |
| 8 | effect the value of a company; or it shouldn't even |
| 9 | come into play? |
| 10 | A Depends on what the fact set is. |
| 11 | Q Okay. All right. Good. So I want to say, |
| 12 | so it depends on the facts. |
| 13 | In this case you're alleging that my clients |
| 14 | committed bad acts; therefore, you can't take the |
| 15 | litigation into account when you're determining the |
| 16 | value of NuVeda; is that accurate? |
| 17 | A Yeah. |
| 18 | Q All right. However, are you -- |
| 19 | A Yes. |
| 20 | Q -- are you aware that all the causes of |
| 21 | action against my clients in this case with alleged |
| 22 | bad acts have been dismissed? Are you aware of |
| 23 | that? |
| 24 | A I'm not aware of that. |
| 25 | Q Does that change your mind, the new |
|  | Page 201 |

information that you base your -- you base all your reports -- if I get new information, based on that, that my clients' actions were dismissed; so, therefore, there are no bad acts that my clients committed, no evidence of bad acts that my clients committed, would that change your mind regarding litigation having the effect, in this case, on the value?

A No.
Q And just for the mere fact that since my clients were alleged to have bad acts; therefore, that caused the litigation; and, therefore, since my clients were alleged to do that, therefore, you can't take into account the litigation for the value?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Objection.
MR. DUSHOFF: I'll withdraw the question, because I think I already got my answer. And that was a very poorly phrased question.

Q So you did the value in Exhibit 8 and Exhibit 12 based on the market approach; correct? Not income approach.

A Exhibit A and --
Q Well, exhibit -- no, exhibit -- tab 11 and tab 8. You used the market approach, not the income approach; correct?

A That is correct.
Q And that's to determine the specific value of NuVeda; is that accurate?

A It's to determine a value for an interest in NuVeda had the original business plan been executed as originally laid out, for lack of a better term.

Q Right. So you were there to determine the value of NuVeda at the time of -- in this case, as of August 8, 2017; correct?

A With respect to Ms. Goldstein's --
Q With respect to Ms. Goldstein.
And at that point, if you had an actual sales number from the two dispensaries, wouldn't it be -would it be fair to say that would be a more accurate determination of the value of NuVeda, with their actual sales instead of just projected sales?

A No, because that -- that wasn't any of -- let me back up. That was not the underlying assumption of the report.

Q That was not the underlying assumption that you used in your valuation for market valuation; correct?

A That's correct.
Q But would you say if you did have the income -- let me ask this. If you did have --
they handed you a -- You know what? Here they are. Here are the revenues for the two dispensaries. Would you have taken that into consideration for the income approach?

A The underlying assumption in these two reports that we're talking about was NuVeda has all six licenses, and they executed the business plan as originally constructed.

Q So is the answer to that, no, you would not have used those numbers and tried an income approach?

A No.
Q You stated on direct, when you said you used the multiplier, you used -- and thank you for putting this in simple terms, because I would not have gotten it -- you said if sales were a hundred dollars, you'd times it by the multiplier, which is 13.2; correct?

A That's correct.
Q And then you would get 1,320 --
A Right.
Q -- at least under that example?
So isn't it fair to say if you had actual sales, wouldn't that make sense to put that in front of that number, times it by 13.2 , then get the actual value?

A Violate the underlying assumptions of what I was tasked and asked to do.

Q So you weren't tasked and asked to do an income approach in this, it was just a market-value approach?

A I don't believe I was asked to use any specific approach.

Q You testified on direct examination that you looked at all the approaches in any valuation you do and then you say, Nope, can't do this one. Nope, can't do this one. But, yes, I can do this one. You look at all the alternatives; correct?

A That's correct.
Q And a matter of fact, if you look at Exhibit -- sorry, tab 1 -- I keep saying Exhibit 1 , I apologize -- and you look at -- you can even look at almost -- just turn the page, the very first page, after the "Confidential" on the other side where it says "Executive summary data sheet," you see that? You're going a little too far. Even before that.

A I see it.
Q Okay.
A Yes.
Q It says you considered and rejected assets, which is the liquidation value, historic, and adjusted
book value; correct?
A Correct.
Q Okay. The liquidation value is the one that you've testified to that that's what Mr. Clauretie did, this liquidation value?

A I believe that terminology is used in his report.

Q Okay. And you disregarded market guideline, public company, and comparable transactions; correct?

A Yes.
Q All right. And also the income capitalization of earnings?

A Yes.
Q Okay. So you went to income discounted multi-stage growth model.

And you testified on direct that you used that model because you had the -- you believed you had all the information from Mr. Terry, that -- and that's the best approach, you felt, under those projections; correct?

A We didn't have the necessary market information at that time to use the market approach, as well. If we had, I would have used both.

Q Now, you've also testified that, again -- we
just went over -- you look at other, you say, Discounted, nope, not going to do it. Not going to do it.

But you did not do that in Ms. Goldstein's, did you? You didn't take any other approach. You specifically adopted the market approach in Ms. Goldstein's report; correct?

A That is correct.
Q And specifically you use the guideline for public company method; is that accurate?

A Yes.
Q Did you even consider any other approach?
A The information was not available to use any other approach. I had already discounted the asset-based approach.

Q Did it say you discounted the asset approach in Ms. Goldstein's report? Because I didn't see it.

A I don't know if it specifically says that, that's why we incorporated into that report all prior reports.

Q But in the first report you use the income method; right?

A Yes.
Q And basically you have projections that did it very much differently, and so -- but you decided in
this one not to use the income approach; although, you have very similar numbers, if you look at exhibit -attachment $A$ and $B--$ appendix $A$ and $B$ in tab 8 . They're both projections; right? Just the numbers are different?

A That's correct.
Q But -- and so you -- even though you had the numbers -- these are the same numbers -- appendix B is the same numbers you had in your original tab 1 ; correct? Same numbers you used?

A $\quad$ No.
Q Appendix B, it says the original five-year profit-and-loss projections?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'm sorry, Matt, where are you?

MR. DUSHOFF: I'm on page -- I'm on tab 8, page 9 , appendix $B$.

THE WITNESS: And, I'm sorry, you're comparing those numbers to the original report -BY MR. DUSHOFF:

Q Right, the original report -- the numbers you had in the original report.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: You're referring to page 15 -- you were referring to page 15 in the original report?

tell you. That is what it implies there --
Q Okay.
A -- but I don't want to say yes --
Q All right. So, well, if you look at the other numbers, you look at exhibit -- appendix -appendix $A$, compare them to appendix $B$. All right. Except for the amounts -- right -- except for the amounts, it is -- this is the exact same report?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Now we're comparing appendix $A$ and appendix $B$ ?

MR. DUSHOFF: Yeah.
THE WITNESS: And your question -- I'm sorry, your question is, except for all the amounts that are the same? BY MR. DUSHOFF:

Q The question is, the numbers are -- the numbers are the same? You have -- you have "Cultivation", you have certain numbers in appendix A. You have "Cultivation, Year 2," you have a certain number. "Cultivation, Year 2," in appendix B is 10,600,000. "Cultivation, Year 2" in appendix A is 4,151,000. Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q Do you agree --
MR. FEUERSTEIN: He's looking at --

ARBITRATOR BAKER: What tab are you on?
MR. DUSHOFF: I'm on tab -- I'm on tab 8. ARBITRATOR BAKER: 8?

MR. DUSHOFF: Yeah, appendix $A$ and $B$.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Pages 8 and 9.
MR. DUSHOFF: Pages 8 and 9.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: And what's your question?
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Except for the numbers it's the same. BY MR. DUSHOFF:

Q Yeah, do you agree with the numbers?
Not the numbers are the same.
My contentions are, both of these are five-year projections; correct? One was from the original, and one was from other information -appendix A was other information you received, from Exhibit 247.

But both of these are projections, five years out; correct?

A Yes. I'm still not sure if those are the originals or if that's a mistake. That's what I'm checking right now.

Yeah, I can't, with certainty, say that.
Q Okay. But you would agree with me that appendix $A$ and appendix $B$ are projected by your
projection numbers; correct?
A Yes.
Q Now, with the five-year projection numbers you used, whether the numbers are correct or not -but if you had a five-year projection in the original one, and there you said that $I$ can use the income approach, why is it now, then, you have another projection that you can't use the income approach here and just use the market approach?

A I'm not sure those are the original numbers, but let me explain. It's going to sound like I'm reversing testimony in something else, but I'm really not.

As we sit here today, my memory is coming back, and I wasn't prepared to speak about this CWNV thing.

Q I'm not asking you about that.
A Yeah, I know --
Q I'm asking about --
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Let him finish his answer.
MR. DUSHOFF: Okay.
THE WITNESS: Yeah. We could use the original projections because they were specifically for NuVeda.

We used the total revenue protections when we
were using CWNV as a proxy for NuVeda because we didn't have any upgraded numbers for NuVeda itself.

And the reason I used total revenue is because the industry -- the cannabis industry is so massive that there aren't many companies that are making positive bottom-line numbers.

So the way the cannabis industry is being valued today and in -- during the time frame when this was relevant, was by looking at top-line numbers, total sales.

So I don't know if I just totally confused everything or whatnot. BY MR. DUSHOFF:

Q Let me ask you this question because we went over proxies and I really don't want to go over that again.

Why didn't you use the income approach when you have projections out five years for Ms. Goldstein's report? Why did you discount it?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Object to the classification, the word "discount." But I think the witness understands the question.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: I did, until you objected.

BY MR. DUSHOFF:
Q Why did you -- why did you consider --
A Yeah --
Q -- why did you reject the income approach?
I'll use your language.
A I rejected the income approach in the supplemental reports because we had -- we had market data that was available for us, so that we could identify or at least develop revenue multipliers. It's a more accurate way to value cannabis companies because so much can happen between the top line and the bottom line.

I used the income approach in the original valuation because we had actual NuVeda projected numbers, which is why we updated them with other numbers using a proxy -- I know you don't want to hear it anymore, but that's what it is -- using a proxy for that, because we didn't have updated numbers.

By the way, if we had stuck with the original numbers, the value would be a heck of a lot higher. These numbers are reduced from the original.

Q Right. But you didn't -- okay. So you said you took into account -- you said the market -- let me rephrase this.

You said the market approach is a better way,

| 1 | at least from the information you have now, to |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | evaluate or to value NuVeda in Ms. Goldstein's; |
| 3 | correct? |
| 4 | A And Terry's. |
| 5 | Q Okay. And in -- and in 8, as well -- tab 8? |
| 6 | A Yes. |
| 7 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: Mr. Dushoff, if you're |
| 8 | getting at a point where you're sort of tacked for a |
| 9 | moment -- |
| 10 | MR. DUSHOFF: The court reporter? |
| 11 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: -- I think the court |
| 12 | reporter could use a rest for a second -- |
| 13 | MR. DUSHOFF: Okay, I don't have a problem. |
| 14 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: -- and we could give her a |
| 15 | break. |
| 16 | MR. DUSHOFF: I have no problem with that. I |
| 17 | think it's a good idea. |
| 18 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: All right. Let's take a |
| 19 | quick break. Go off the record. |
| 20 | (Break taken.) |
| 21 | BY MR. DUSHOFF: |
| 22 | Q Mr. Parker, can you turn to page 4 of tab 1. |
| 23 | And then we'll start questioning once you get there. |
| 24 | A Report page 4; correct? |
| 25 | Q Your -- yeah, your page 4. I guess it would |
|  | Page 215 |

be RESP 57619. Do you see that on the bottom?
A Yes, I do.
Q Now, you would agree with me that the -- this is the guideline public -- I'm going to talk about the guideline public company method.

MR. DUSHOFF: Can we just use GPCM, is that -- is that okay with everybody as the acronym, or use the word guideline?

Q The guideline involves identifying publicly-traded companies similar to the subject company; is that accurate statement?

A Yes.
Q And that the valuation ratio, such as multiples of revenue or earnings, are calculated from guideline companies and then applied to the subject company; is that right?

A Yes.
Q Okay.
A That's what it says.
Q Right. And is it also fair to say that -that GPCM relies on the theory of an open and unrestricted market that is perfectly competitive?

I know it might not say it in there, but from your knowledge?

A Can you repeat that again.

| 1 | Q Sure. That GPCM relies on the theory of an |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | open and unrestricted market that is perfectly |
| 3 | competitive? |
| 4 | A I would say not necessarily so. |
| 5 | Q Well, if it relies on publicly-traded |
| 6 | companies, then, right -- |
| 7 | A Yes. |
| 8 | Q -- you're talking about GPCM? |
| 9 | A Yes. |
| 10 | Q And these publicly-traded companies are |
| 11 | traded on the stock markets, whether it's Canadian or |
| 12 | OPC or on the U.S. market; correct? |
| 13 | A Yes. |
| 14 | Q And isn't it fair to say -- so when you're |
| 15 | comparing public companies, you want to make sure that |
| 16 | they are actively -- being actively traded; is that |
| 17 | accurate? |
| 18 | A You want to make sure that they have -- yes, |
| 19 | that's accurate. |
| 20 | Q And actively -- is actively as opposed to |
| 21 | thinly traded? Is that an antonym? |
| 22 | A No, not necessarily. |
| 23 | Q What's thinly traded mean to you? |
| 24 | A Thinly traded would be very little volume, |
| 25 | very little transactions. |
|  | Page 217 |

Q So if there was little volume and little transaction, would that be a company you would use in a guideline public company method?

A It depends on the situation at hand.
Q And it's fair to say you also admit in here, in your guideline, in the GPCM on page 4, that however using the GP -- the reason why you didn't use it in Mr. Terry's original is that "the GPCM method can be often difficult to find publicly-traded companies which are truly compatible to the subject business"; correct?

A Yes.
Q And then you follow it up, "This is especially true in the case of mid-size or smaller, privately held companies."

What would you call mid-size or small, privately held companies?

A Where were you reading at, I'm sorry?
MR. FEUERSTEIN: It's four lines down in that paragraph.

THE WITNESS: Got you.
(Witness reviewing document.)
THE WITNESS: I don't think there's any bright-line definition of what a mid-size company is. I mean, there are a few certain publications.

BY MR. DUSHOFF:
Q But you stated that one of the problems is, "and this is especially true in the case of mid-sized or small, privately held companies."

Would NuVeda be considered a small, privately held -- smaller, privately held company in that definition?

A Yes.
Q And you have here, "Another difficulty, particularly in the case of early-stage enterprises" -- let me ask you a question. Would you consider NuVeda an early-stage enterprise?

A Yes.
Q -- "is that the subject business may not have a meaningful amount of revenue or earnings or may have negative earnings"; is that accurate?

A Yes.
Q And finally, another reason why you didn't use the GPCM method in the original is that, "In addition, the performance indicators from publicly-traded companies may be difficult to apply directly to closely held enterprises, because public companies are typically further along in their development cycle and are often more broadly diversified in terms of their lines of business and
products and services offered"; correct?
A Yes.
Q I'm sorry?
A Good general statement. Doesn't apply in all cases, but --

Q I'm sorry?
A It's a general statement.
Q And it's -- and this is the reason why -- the reasons that $I$ just went over are reasons why you did not use the GPCM in the original -- in the original opinion; correct?

A No, the reason I didn't use it in the original opinion is because we couldn't identify publicly-traded, comparable companies.

Q Right. You -- you put actually in here, this is -- on page 4, you said, "Guideline public method," and you actually identified why you did not use this. This is the reason why you did not use it. And that's your reason why you did not use it; correct?

A It's a general statement regarding the different types of approaches to business valuation. It's not necessarily meant to be applicable to the subject company.

Q On page -- when we went over this before, you said you considered and rejected. And one of things
you rejected, approaches, was the market guideline public company approach.

Then you list in here why -- on page 4 , why you did not use it -- and why you did not use it. And this is the section where it says why you did not use the guideline public company method.

So are you telling me that this is just a general statement and does not apply to this particular opinion?

A It's a general informative statement. If you look in the valuation section that starts on page 19, it will provide a specific reason why the guideline company -- guideline public company method was not used.

Q Valuation analysis. Okay. Where on 19 --
A 21 -- page 21.
Q $\quad 21$.
A Yes, sir.
Q "This method involve" -- okay. One moment.
So the only -- is it your testimony that the only reason you didn't use the guideline public company method is that "The levels of comparability were deemed not to be sufficient enough, such that a reasonable indication of value could be inferred"?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Object to the -- it wasn't
read accurately; but otherwise, the witness can answer.

THE WITNESS: Yes, it doesn't specifically spell out factors; but, yes, that's why. BY MR. DUSHOFF:

Q Is that the only reason why?
A Is what the only reason why?
Q Is the only reason why, because you -- is the only reason why you didn't use the general public company method is because you couldn't find -- you couldn't find comparable companies -- publicly-traded companies to compare to use the valuation?

A Well, I couldn't find companies that had matured to the point where $I$ was comfortable, using professional judgment, in using them in 2016.

Q So let's go over -- I'm going to go over -first, you have in your definition of fair market value -- let me ask you this. This was in one of your reports to Ms. Goldstein, and tell me if this is accurate.
"Fair market value is defined as the price at which the property would change hands between a willing buyer and a willing seller, neither being under any compulsion to buy or to sell and both having reasonable knowledge of relevant facts."

Is that an accurate statement of your definition of fair market value?

A Where were you reading that from?
MR. DUSHOFF: I think, Mr. Feuerstein, you had it in his Goldstein report; you put it in your brief.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: I'd say page 1 --
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Yeah, I think it's page 1 of the --

ARBITRATOR BAKER: -- of the tab 1.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Yeah, under "Standard of Value."

THE WITNESS: Tab 1. I don't think I --
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Oh, okay.
THE WITNESS: Yes, with the exception that that -- that's not my definition, that's ... BY MR. DUSHOFF:

Q Do you agree with that definition?
A Yes, sir.
Q So basically fair market value is when you have a willing buyer and a willing seller in a transaction; correct? Somebody is willing to buy something and somebody is willing to sell something?

A Yes, that's -- that's the ...
Q Well, there are two market approaches, are
there not? There's the one you used, GPCM approach; and there's a comparable transaction method; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q And the comparable transaction method is where you would use comp transactions. So if there was somebody else who purchased a -- here, a distrib- -- any one of these licenses, the -- so if somebody would purchase a marijuana business or a marijuana license and then you had one of those sales, that would be considered a comp sale, potentially; correct? Somebody bought a distribution --

A If it was comparable to your subject company, that would be one data point in there.

Q Right. That would be a data point.
(Court reporter requests clarification.) MR. DUSHOFF: Sorry. (Court reporter requests clarification.) BY MR. DUSHOFF:

Q I think you said that would be one data point.

A That would be one data point in that particular approach.

Q So -- and in those situations when you have somebody selling something to somebody else, have you
checked -- did you check at any point in time during -- when you were doing the report for Ms. Goldstein, if there were any comp sales at that time, in August of 2017?

A Yes.
Q Did you find them?
A Unfortunately, there is not a current database of sales amongst cannabis companies or their licenses.

Q But there are for publicly-traded companies, are there not? Don't they have to report that? They have to report purchases and sales, if they're publicly-traded, to the SEC, because they're a publicly-traded company; isn't that fair to say?

A If they're a reporting company, yes.
Q And did you check to see if there are any reporting companies -- publicly-traded companies -that had any transactions at that time? Did you even look at it?

A Transactions in respect to?
Q Purchasing of a license, sale of a license, during that period of time. Did you even look at any comp purchases or sales?

A That information is generally not available.

Q I didn't ask you if it wasn't available. Did you even look? Did you research it?

A Yes, I did research it.
Q And you didn't find anything?
A No.
Q And isn't it fair to say that comp
transaction method is more akin, more alike, to your fair market value, having a willing buyer and willing seller, than would be the GPCM method?

A No.
Q Well, the -- the comp transaction method is in regards to you have a willing buyer and a willing seller; correct -- I mean, a sales transaction?

A The valuation methods don't have anything do with the premise of value. The premise of value can be different and you still use the appropriate valuation approach. In other words, one thing has nothing to do with the other.

Q All right. So if I'm willing to buy something -- if a buyer is willing to buy NuVeda at \$5 million -- a willing buyer, and they're willing to sell -- fair market value for then, under your fair market value definition, would be $\$ 5$ million; is that accurate?

A That would define fair market value in that
particular instance.
Q And in order to do the GPCM method, you had to find valuation -- you had to find public companies that are comparable to NuVeda; is that correct?

A Or as comparable as possible in the cannabis field, yes -- or arena.

Q And you know how many cannabis companies there are in the United States?

A Not specifically.
Q Would 20,000 be a number that would be out of the realm of possibility, in your mind, for doing your research?

A In terms of utilizing that approach, yeah, that's a crazy number.

Q No, no, I said marijuana companies. How many companies are -- marijuana companies are there in the United States?

A Out of a -- I don't know the specifics.
Q How many publicly-traded marijuana companies are there in the United states?

A In the United States?
Q Yeah.
A Oh, about nine or ten --
Q How many --
A -- that qualify.

| 1 | Q -- in Canada? I didn't say qualified. How |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | many are there? And it's qualified under your -- what |
| 3 | you wanted to do. But I'm asking how many |
| 4 | publicly-traded companies are there in the United |
| 5 | States in the marijuana field? |
| 6 | A It would be a guess. These are companies |
| 7 | identified as being the most comparable to NuVeda. |
| 8 | They are more in Canada, to answer your last |
| 9 | question, than there are in the U.S., because |
| 10 | marijuana is nationally legal in Canada. |
| 11 | Q Hundreds, is that your guess? Hundreds in |
| 12 | the United States, publicly-traded marijuana |
| 13 | companies? |
| 14 | A No. |
| 15 | Q Over 10? |
| 16 | A I'm not sure. |
| 17 | Q Over a hundred? |
| 18 | A Definitely not over a hundred. |
| 19 | Q How about in Canada, over a hundred? |
| 20 | A No. |
| 21 | Q Over 20? |
| 22 | A That would qualify as being -- |
| 23 | Q Is it -- I'm talking about publicly-traded |
| 24 | marijuana companies. |
| 25 | A There are different levels -- |
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MR. FEUERSTEIN: Can I just -- can I get a moment of clarification, Mr. Dushoff?

You're talking about any company -- like a marijuana company, so if it's involved at all in cannabis, you're talking about similar companies such as license-holding companies?

MR. DUSHOFF: I'm not talking about the similar companies right now.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: You're talking any companies --

MR. DUSHOFF: Any company involved with -MR. FEUERSTEIN: It can be a brand - -

MR. DUSHOFF: Yeah --
MR. FEUERSTEIN: It could be a brand. It could be any --

MR. DUSHOFF: Yes.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Okay. I just want to be sure there's clarity.

THE WITNESS: What was the standing question? I just want to --

BY MR. DUSHOFF:
Q Sure. The question is, any company that's involved in the marijuana industry, whether they hold a license or not, how many publicly-traded companies would you say there are in Canada and the United

| 1 | States together? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A Again, it would be a guess. There are |
| 3 | different levels of publicly -- |
| 4 | Q All right. |
| 5 | A -- of public registration. |
| 6 | Q So then, give me your educated guess. |
| 7 | A I don't have an educated guess. I just know |
| 8 | that those are the companies that I identified as |
| 9 | being comparable to NuVeda or CWNV. |
| 10 | Q You didn't compare them to CWNV -- withdrawn. |
| 11 | So I'm going to turn to Ms. Goldstein's |
| 12 | report, which is Exhibit 11, page 3. |
| 13 | You there? |
| 14 | A What page? |
| 15 | Q Page 3. |
| 16 | A Yes. |
| 17 | Q And on page 3, you have listed here the |
| 18 | public companies you used to compare with NuVeda was |
| 19 | Terra Tech, Golden Leaf, 1933 Industries, and is it |
| 20 | either "Lit" or "Lite" Cannabis Corp.; is that |
| 21 | correct? |
| 22 | A Yes, I'm not sure how you pronounce it. |
| 23 | Q We'll call it -- for our purposes, we'll call |
| 24 | it "Lit." |
| 25 | What were the criterias for picking these |
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companies -- these four companies?
A I wanted companies that had operations in Nevada.

Q What else?
A I wanted companies that had a decent market cap, you know, preferably over 50 million.

Q What else?
A I wanted companies that had a good amount of revenues.

Q Because you know that NuVeda had good revenues?

A It has nothing to do with it.
Q Well, you said you needed to get companies that were similarly situated -- we just went over that -- to NuVeda. So you were looking at companies with good revenue, so $I$ would assume that -- that good revenues would also be for NuVeda; right? Because that would make them similarly situated, wouldn't it?

A If you go back to the original projections, the original business plan, the assumption is that the original business plan was executed appropriately, then NuVeda would have had significant revenues.

Q In Terra Tech's, the number that you got for the revenues, was that an assumption or was that an
actual number?
A Those are actual numbers pulled from Yahoo Finance.

Q So that's for Terra Tech, Golden Leaf, 1933, and Lit, you didn't use projections; you used actual numbers?

A Yes.
(Court reporter requests clarification.) MR. DUSHOFF: Sure.

Q That was for Terra Tech, Golden Leaf, 1933, and Lit Cannabis Corp., those are actual numbers and not projections?

A That is correct.
Q So we have operations in Nevada, decent market cap, good revenues, what other criteria?

A Quite frankly, there weren't that many to pick from. That pretty much comprises it. The largest criteria I wanted, I wanted firms with business -- cannabis business in Nevada.

Q What research did you do -- let's start with Terra Tech, what research did you do on Terra Tech, before you listed them here?

A I researched the information that was provided by Yahoo Finance.

Q Okay.


Q Would you like to look at some information to -- would anything refresh your recollection about what --

A It wouldn't matter. At the time that $I$ picked those four companies, they met the criteria involved. I don't remember the details on each and every one of those companies.

Q Who -- what's Edible Gardens? Do you know Edible Gardens?

A I -- it rings a bell. I couldn't tell you anything specific about it.

Q Okay. Are you aware that Edible Gardens is a wholly owned subsidiary of Terra Tech?

A Terra Tech is buying companies every day. Maybe not every day, but a lot.

Q Do you know what - - do you know what Edible Gardens is? You don't know? I don't know if $I$ asked you that.

MR. DUSHOFF: Can $I$ have this marked as - what number are we at?

ARBITRATOR BAKER: 151?
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Well, you're marking this for identification?

MR. DUSHOFF: Yeah, marking for identification purposes only.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: We're at 151.
MR. DUSHOFF: Yes, please.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Do you have any objections? Are you admitting it or ... before I look at it?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'd like an explanation of what this document is before we ...

MR. DUSHOFF: Sure. The explanation of what this document is, it's printed off, this is Terra Tech and what Terra Tech is and what they do.

He's testifying that this is a comp company to NuVeda. We already know that they do business in California, which NuVeda clearly only deals with Clark County.

We also find out here that this place, Terra Tech, has over 300 employees, which is not even close to what NuVeda has.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'm sorry, Mr. Dushoff, I'm not asking you for the argument --

MR. DUSHOFF: Oh.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: -- of what you're going to question him.

I'm asking what the document -- the document looks to me --

MR. DUSHOFF: The document -- I'm sorry.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: -- the first three pages are a Form 10-Q --

MR. DUSHOFF: Right.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Right.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: -- that were filed in or about September OF 2018.

MR. DUSHOFF: That has a December 31, 2017, numbers on them.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Yeah, they do that.
But then the next pages seem to be selective excerpts of something, like maybe a Terra Tech dec or something.

MR. DUSHOFF: Yeah, they're printed off from Terra -- they're printed off from Terra Tech's website, of what Terra Tech does and who they are. This is information, as Mr. Parker readily has testified, that is readily available on -- from Google, where you can find all this information.

So I'm asking him what he looked at, what they provide, and to see if this is information that he's aware of.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: This is a new document; right? Hasn't been produced?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Yeah, it's not produced. This is the first time it's being shown to me, but --

MR. DUSHOFF: Well, the same thing the other document that Terra Tech -- other document was also not produced in this matter.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: What I'd ask is, I have no problem with the representation of Mr. Dushoff with respect to the first three pages. I think that's clearly what it purports to be is a Form 10-Q.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Okay.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: I do have a problem with what this document is, in fact, when it's been created, you know --

MR. DUSHOFF: I -- I --
MR. FEUERSTEIN: -- the authenticity of it. So with -- respectfully, asking him -- asking the witness questions about what Terra Tech does and what these items are, you know, as of today may or may not be relevant to what his opinion was for valuation in 2017.

So $I$ don't know if it's fair to ask him questions, to say, Well, you picked Terra Tech as a company, and you used these numbers. Is -- did you know Edible Garden? When was Edible Garden acquired? I mean, you haven't laid --

MR. DUSHOFF: I'm -- I'm --
MR. FEUERSTEIN: -- that foundation, and I --

MR. DUSHOFF: But that's what $I$-- that's what $I$ want to ask him.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: But this document is - - as it is, I'm objecting to it.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Okay. Well, what I'm going to allow is -- was the first three pages.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: I think it's the first three pages.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: And then that's it for the exhibit.

MR. DUSHOFF: Okay.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: You can ask him questions about that one.

MR. DUSHOFF: Okay. I'd like to ask him questions about the other one; just, if he doesn't know, he doesn't know.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: That's fair.
MR. DUSHOFF: Okay.
Q So I'm going to show you the first three pages here, it's the Form 10-Q for Terra Tech. Do you know what a Form --

ARBITRATOR BAKER: I need a copy, please.
MR. DUSHOFF: Okay.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Well, you need a copy.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: So we're deeming the first
three pages as Joint Exhibit 260?
MR. DUSHOFF: Yeah.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Right. 260? Is that
where we're at?
(Joint Exhibit 260 was marked for
identification.)
ARBITRATOR BAKER: All right.
BY MR. DUSHOFF:
Q What you have here -- I'm going to look at your -- what's a Form 10-Q?

A It's a form that's filed with the appropriate governing bodies.

Q What's it for?
A A quarterly form. It could be -- it can -it could contain any number of types of information.

Q And if you turn to page 3 of this document, please?

A Sure.
Q Page 3 says, "Total assets as of December 31, 2017," which is four months after your valuation -four months after your valuation of -- for Ms. Goldstein's expulsion, was valued at $\$ 98$ million.

Are you -- do you know whether -- what the revenues are or what the assets are worth for NuVeda at that time?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Talking about December of 2017?

MR. DUSHOFF: Yeah, he did March 1st to August 1st, so March 2016 to August 2017. So I think I'm going to have a -- but I'll withdraw that question for right now. And I'm going to go into this question.

Q You have Terra Tech having revenues in your -- here -- of, it says 32- -- would that be 32,428,000?

A Yes.
Q Are you aware if NuVeda ever had revenues in even close to $\$ 32$ million?

A I'm not aware, and I don't care.
Q Well, I'm just saying -- you say you don't care, but it's also agreed -- and you agree that under this rule of GPCM, that you're supposed to find companies that are like businesses, similar companies; correct?

A Mr. Dushoff, you could go through each one of those companies that $I$ used my professional judgment on to determine they were comparable enough to perform this exercise, and you could exclude each and every one of them in every GPMC -- whatever we're calling it -- exercise. For every comparable company, you can find differences.

Q Yeah, I agree with you, you could find differences. But also under the definition of GPCM, right -- one of the -- one of the definitions of GPCM is that you have to try and find public companies that are of like companies; isn't that correct?

A Of like companies in my professional
judgment, yes.
Q And --
A As like as possible. Sorry.
Q Right. And one of the problems is -- one of the big problems is you have a difficulty, especially in early-stage enterprise companies, to find -because the subject might not have meaningful amount of revenue or earning, or may have negative earnings; correct?

A Again, you could exclude each and every one of those on any number of factors.

Q I'm not talking about each and every one. You specifically spoke -- took out Terra Tech, and said, Well, that's similar enough to NuVeda; correct, to be used in this method?

A In my professional judgment, yes.
Q Right. And so in one of three -- one of the three aspects you chose is that they have good
revenues; correct?
A Yes.
Q So are you saying that one of three -- the third of your criteria is that Terra Tech and NuVeda have a similar revenue stream of $32,428,000$, or in the ballpark?

A No, I'm not saying that; and that's not what I'm even meaning to say.

Q So you also say that they operate -- that you wanted public companies that operated in Nevada; correct?

A Correct.
Q All right. But as we found out, as you know, Terra Tech doesn't just operate in Nevada, they also operate in California; is that accurate?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Arbitrator Baker, I'm just going to lodge an objection, because it seems like we're repeating the same questions over and over again. It's getting late in the day and I'd like to let the court reporter go home.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: I understand. I'm letting you do your cross. My question is, I think we're all getting tired. Do you have enough --

MR. DUSHOFF: I don't have --
ARBITRATOR BAKER: And again, $I$ don't mean

| 1 | to, you know, put your schedule -- create your |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | schedule for tomorrow. But is it worthwhile at some |
| 3 | point to take a break, and we can bring him -- you |
| 4 | know, bring him back tomorrow morning? |
| 5 | MR. DUSHOFF: I'd rather not. I think I want |
| 6 | to finish. I've only got about 10 minutes left, so |
| 7 | then I'm -- |
| 8 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: I will -- I will have |
| 9 | minimal rebuttal. |
| 10 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: Okay. |
| 11 | MR. DUSHOFF: And, a matter of fact, I'll |
| 12 | keep it to seven minutes. |
| 13 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: And just go over all my |
| 14 | topics. |
| 15 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: Okay. |
| 16 | MR. DUSHOFF: So I'll do seven minutes. |
| 17 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: Are you agreeable to |
| 18 | coming back in the morning? |
| 19 | THE WITNESS: I thought we -- |
| 20 | MR. DUSHOFF: Can we finish -- |
| 21 | THE WITNESS: -- agreed to finish up. |
| 22 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: Well, l don't know how |
| 23 | long his is going to be. |
| 24 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: I can match seven minutes. |
| 25 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: All right. |


| 1 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: I think. But, Arbitrator |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Baker, if your schedule requires you to -- |
| 3 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: No, I'm fine. |
| 4 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: Okay. |
| 5 | MR. DUSHOFF: I will -- I will keep it to |
| 6 | seven -- |
| 7 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: This is a night I can go |
| 8 | late. |
| 9 | MR. DUSHOFF: At seven minutes, you cut me |
| 10 | off, you give me the light and go to the -- give me |
| 11 | the light, and I'm done. |
| 12 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: Yeah, I need |
| 13 | Judge Gonzalez's little -- |
| 14 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: Egg-timer? |
| 15 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: -- timer. |
| 16 | MR. DUSHOFF: Oh, yeah, you mean -- yeah, the |
| 17 | Dushoff-Peek -- |
| 18 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: You know who that's named |
| 19 | after; right? |
| 20 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: Yeah, it's like Peek and |
| 21 | who else? |
| 22 | MR. DUSHOFF: We put the -- |
| 23 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: Yeah. |
| 24 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: It's you, too? I know |
| 25 | it's Steve Peek -- |
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MR. DUSHOFF: Yeah. Yeah.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: -- has to do with him as well, but --

MR. DUSHOFF: Honored.
All right. So I'll -- if $I$ may --
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Yes.
MR. DUSHOFF: -- it'll be real quickly.
Q What research did you do with Golden Leaf that -- in regard to its similarity?

A It's the same basic research into each one of these companies.

Q All right. And you're aware that Golden Leaf is a Canadian company; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q And Golden Leaf has practices in Canada and where else, do you know?

A I don't remember specifically. It changed names recently. I don't know specifically if they had a current practice in Nevada, or they had a practice in Nevada; but they passed my criteria at the time I did the analysis.

And I didn't say -- I never said that I was looking for companies that only had operations in Nevada. Again, we can go through and eliminate every one of these companies, as you could in any process
using this particular method; because the only way to find a company that's exactly like another company is if it's the same company.

Q I'm not asking you to find exactly. I'm asking -- I'm going to ask you these questions.

Do you know what licenses Golden Leaf
Holdings has in Nevada?
A Not specifically, no.
Q And for 1933 Industries, what research did you do on 1933 Industries, except for the fact that they are a company that does business here in Nevada?

A I could tell by the Yahoo Finance research, which though it sounds like a hokey source, it's really used in investment industries; and it's one of the best sources there is. And I know from there I can see the market cap and I can see the revenues. So your market cap, revenue, do business in Nevada. And anywhere else they do business --

Q Do you know why -- yeah, but I understand that. You got market cap. You look at revenue.

Do you ever find out do they have -- what type of licenses do they have? What types of cannabis licenses do they have?

A I'm not sure, off the top of my head, as I
sit here today.
Q Did you put that in your report anywhere, what type of licenses they have?

A No, I do not.
Q And do you put that in -- you also list the same companies in tab 8, which is the supplement; right? It's the same companies you used; right?

A I used the same companies for continuity --
Q Right.
A -- between the two reports.
Q Right. Did you list anywhere in there the -what these companies did? The research you did on these companies?

A No.
Q In other words, you never -- nothing in there about what licenses they hold --

A There is nothing --
Q -- in Nevada?
A There is nothing in the report that speaks to the specific characteristics of each company.

Q And that would also go for Lit Cannabis, as well; is that correct?

A It would.
MR. DUSHOFF: Okay. I'm done.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Terrific. Well --

MR. DUSHOFF: Under seven.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Yeah, that rarely happens.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: I hope that doesn't limit my
time.
MR. DUSHOFF: Well, again, let me ask -- no, I'm just kidding. I mean, I have more, but I am --

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Okay.
MR. DUSHOFF: -- I'm cutting it off.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Thank you.
Mr. Feuerstein, you have your seven minutes.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Very briefly.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q Mr. Parker, Mr. Dushoff asked you a number of questions about using actual revenues versus projected revenues, and I won't characterize how he presented it or how times, but you recall those questions; correct?

A Yes, sir.
Q Now, I'd like you to open up, if you will, in front of you, on the computer, exhibit -- Joint Exhibit 249. Let me make sure that you can -- you're on the same document.

It should say Exhibit 249 on the top,
"CWNevada Sales Totals." Do you see that?
MR. WILEY: Hang on. I think you're going to have to go into the little folder thing there.

THE WITNESS: Could somebody -- you guys --
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Jason, could you help him? I'm sorry.

THE WITNESS: -- are great letting me use your computer, to begin with.

MR. WILEY: 249er.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: 249. It should say, "CWNevada sales total." And on the left-hand side it should say "CWNevada, LLC, sales by month."

I don't want this to be counting like talking to Jason.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: He's purposely going slow so that ...

MR. WILEY: For whatever reason, Excel's not on that one. If $I$ make the representation and I pull it up on mine, are you good with it?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Let me just -- you know what, can I --

MR. DUSHOFF: He's just going to pull up 249 on his.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'm going to give -- I'm going to give him -- I'll give him ...

MR. DUSHOFF: Because he doesn't think we're going to show him 249?

ARBITRATOR BAKER: I don't think he means that.

MR. WILEY: No, he does.
MR. DUSHOFF: No, he does.
MR. WILEY: He does.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'm trying to save time.
Q Now, Mr. Parker, take a look at the columns going at the top of this, which talks about different entities. And you'll see in column $F$, you have retail medical, Third Street; in column $G$, it's retail rec, Third Street; in column $H$, it's retail medical, North Las Vegas Boulevard; and column I is retail rec, North Las Vegas Boulevard. You there?

A Yes.
Q Now, if you could, I'd like you to go down to row 18, which is July of 2017 . You see that?

A Yes.
Q And if $I$-- and you can do the same thing. If you -- sort of bold, cells F-18, G-18, H-18, and I-18, that will give you the sum of those four -- of those four cells. Do you see that?

MR. DUSHOFF: I'm going to object to relevance. There's only two dispensaries.

| 1 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: Those are the -- those are |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | the -- this is the information you provided. This is |
| 3 | not -- |
| 4 | MR. DUSHOFF: But we know that there's |
| 5 | only -- it's just the Third Street and North |
| 6 | Las Vegas -- |
| 7 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: Overruled. |
| 8 | MR. DUSHOFF: -- that are dispensaries. |
| 9 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: Okay. |
| 10 | MR. WILEY: And hang on, Dave. He's actually |
| 11 | using mine, because yours was too small. |
| 12 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: I'm looking at yours right |
| 13 | now. |
| 14 | MR. WILEY: It's not doing the auto sum. I |
| 15 | don't know if you have an auto sum -- |
| 16 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: Okay. So I'll - can I -- |
| 17 | THE WITNESS: It's down here. |
| 18 | BY MR. FEUERSTEIN: |
| 19 | Q Okay. Can you read what the sum of those |
| 20 | four sales are? |
| 21 | A All right. 6,225-- excuse me -- \$625,800 -- |
| 22 | (Court reporter requests clarification.) |
| 23 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: 625,810.97. |
| 24 | THE WITNESS: Yes, sorry. |
| 25 | / / / |
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BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q Now, that's one month of sales at the Third Street dispensary and the North Las Vegas dispensary. Is that how you understand that?

A Yes.
Q And if I multiply --
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Just real quick, on this, I don't have any -- I have a blank for the medical. Is that supposed to be blank?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Uh-oh. No.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: I didn't touch anything. I didn't do it. Okay. Take that back. I have -yes, please take that back. It was blank, so ... BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:

Q So, Mr. Parker, you get that number, 625,810.97?

A Yes.
Q I'd like you to take my calculator, and if $I$ was going to annualize that number, tell me what number I get?

A Seven and a half million.
Q Can you give me the exact number for the record, just without millions and stuff? Just 75- --

A Know that I rounded to 11 cents.
7,509,732.

Q And if we applied your -- and these are top line rev- -- these are top-line sales; correct?

A That's my understanding.
Q And if $I$ multiply that number by 6.6, which was your -- what did you call it -- a factor?

A It's a revenue multiplier.
Q -- revenue multiplier, what's the number?
A $\quad 49,564,231$.
Q And if I take that number and I take seven percent of that number, what is the number?

A $\quad 3,469,496$.
Q Okay. Now, I want you to go to the left, into columns $B$ and $C$ for the same month, July. So you're in row 18. And $I$ want you to sum cell B-18 and C-18?

MR. DUSHOFF: And I'm going to object to this, as these are not NuVeda. These numbers, NuVeda --

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Go ahead.
MR. DUSHOFF: Objection. The retail sales, there is no cultivation right now for NuVeda. It's only two dispensaries right now that are earning money. This is for -- I believe that this money is CW's, if I'm correct; but $C W$ and -- if I'm -- CW and -- sorry -- NuVeda or CWNV does not -- NuVeda does
not have cultivation, production, or retail medical -MR. FEUERSTEIN: Arbitrator Baker, it's been our --

MR. DUSHOFF: -- so they're Blue Diamonds, and --

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Okay.
MR. DUSHOFF: -- hold on a second --
MR. FEUERSTEIN: It's my pleasure.
MR. DUSHOFF: -- and I think Mr. Feuerstein is aware of this because he knows the numbers that CW has, and knows it's not Blue Diamond and so forth. We only have six licenses. You add all these up, there's six, seven -- that's eight; and clearly only two of those are the ones that are involved in NuVeda, and that's the Third Street and North Las Vegas.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Okay.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: So to be clear, Arbitrator Baker, first of all, the four columns that we just did represented medical and rec and they were divvied out; that's how it was presented to us. It says it's the same dispensary; it's been our assumption it's the same dispensary.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Okay.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Secondly, it's been our position throughout this case, and really through the
whole litigation, that the MIPA was either -- it's unclear what the MIPA is. Whether it's been honored, dishonored, $I$ think we have to -- we're certainly going to argue that if there is a decision to honor the MIPA, then you have to apply it throughout.

And we intend to show that there was profits and revenues that weren't honored; and, therefore, that depleted the valuation. And it would be unfair, just as a general rule, to factor that into the valuation.

So we're -- what I'm trying to propose simply now is using -- to use Mr. Parker's words -- the production and cultivation facilities at CWNevada as a proxy, so that we can talk about top-line revenues, had the licenses never been transferred. That's all I'm trying to do.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: All right. Your objection is noted. I think this is something we should argue about later.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Okay.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: So let's go ahead and proceed with whatever the rest of your questions. I think you have a couple minutes.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'm going to get there.
Q So columns, again, the cells $\mathrm{B}-18$ and $\mathrm{C}-18$,
which were cultivation and production facilities, if you sum those up, Mr. Parker, what do you get?

A 406,319 .
Q And if I multiply 406,319 and annualize it, what do I get?

A $\quad 4,875,828$.
Q And if $I$ apply your factor, or your revenue multiplier of 6.6 , what do $I$ get?

A $\quad 32,180,465$.
Q And if I take point -- if I multiply that by .07 , what do $I$ get?

A $\quad 2,252,633$.
Q And I'll represent to you -- or I want you to assume for the moment that the other two licenses held by NuVeda were contributed as part of a joint venture or a deal where $\$ 6$ million was contributed by one party for 60 percent. You with me so far?

A I am.
Q What would be the value of NuVeda's portion of the 40 percent remaining?

MR. DUSHOFF: Objection. Improper hypothetical.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: If I did that math in my head correctly, 4 million.

| 1 | BY MR. FEUERSTEIN: |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q And if I multiplied 4 million times . 07 , what |
| 3 | do I get? |
| 4 | A Yes, you would think I could do this without |
| 5 | using a calculate, but I can't. Sorry. |
| 6 | Q It's okay. |
| 7 | A $280,000$. |
| 8 | Q All right. And if I add 280,000 to |
| 9 | 2.252 million, and I add 3.469 million, what's the |
| 10 | number I get? |
| 11 | A $3469 \mathrm{million?}$ |
| 12 | Q Yep. |
| 13 | A I get $\$ 6$ million. |
| 14 | Did I pass? |
| 15 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: No further questions. |
| 16 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: Thank you. |
| 17 | (TIME NOTED: 5:55 p.m.) |
| 18 |  |
| 19 |  |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
| 22 |  |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |
|  | Page 257 |
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| 83:25 84:2 88:9 | 139:17 | 18:17,23 19:4,11 | 192:22 197:6 |
| 111:9 133:14 | association 1:1 2:1 | 19:21 20:1,9,13,17 | 198:22,23,25 |
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| 51:5 83:14 97:6 | assumed 8:24 85 | 112:5,21 | b |
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| 118:14,14 119:8 | assuming 9:11 | 48:17 86:3 98:10 | 08:17 209:2,7,8 |
| 119:24 120:8,10 | 44:19 47:22,25 | 107:20 108:14 | 9:13 210:6,10 |
| 123:6 127:23 | 64:12 83:11 101:2 | 116:9 118:5 | $10: 20211: 4,25$ |
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| $60: 2175: 2281: 1$ | baker $1: 153: 2,3$ | $243: 17,22,25$ | bay $81: 1$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| $81: 2085: 7,25$ | $5: 177: 4,258: 21$ | $244: 2,3,7,12,15,20$ | baynard $3: 167: 13$ |
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| $191: 14194: 21$ | $31: 1532: 9,13$ | balked $84: 8$ | behalf $7: 11,14,24$ |
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| $99: 18171: 18,18$ | $109: 21111: 14$ | $202: 1209: 19$ | $102: 9,10106: 5$ |
| $171: 22199: 25$ | $117: 21122: 15$ | based $11: 1243: 4$ | $107: 23113: 11$ |
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| $82: 885: 1389: 20$ | $185: 19,20,22$ | basic $148: 2245: 10$ | $253: 23$ |
| $89: 2390: 24$ | $187: 9197: 24$ | basically $12: 14$ | believed $68: 17$ |
| $173: 14189: 11,14$ | $211: 1,3,7212: 20$ | $40: 6207: 24$ | $69: 17103: 19$ |
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| 240:1 241:19 | 141:7 153:15 | terry 5:7 33:18 | 25:10 70:24 81:11 |
| 249:13 | 163:10 171:10 | 34:3,6,11 39:10 | 82:22 111:13 |
| talks 29:18 77:17 | 210:1 222:19 | 41:7,24 42:7,13,25 | testifying 45:11 |
| 250:10 | 234:10 246:13 | 44:17,21,23 47:6 | 94:5 97:9 133:13 |

[testifying - timer]

| $141: 17,22235: 11$ | things $55: 11$ | $237: 6238: 7240: 4$ | till $56: 20$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| $258: 8$ | $121: 16,18129: 19$ | $242: 22243: 5$ | time $7: 418: 18,20$ |
| testimony $13: 25$ | $220: 25$ | $244: 1249: 2250: 1$ | $18: 2424: 18,20$ |
| $33: 7,2334: 14$ | think 9:4,9 10:23 | $250: 3254: 9255: 3$ | $26: 1527: 1530: 1$ |
| $45: 1546: 1653: 19$ | $13: 19,2114: 3,11$ | $255: 18,23257: 4$ | $35: 1336: 14,22$ |
| $54: 170: 2098: 2,8$ | $15: 2,3,617: 8$ | thinking $81: 20,21$ | $37: 1738: 2239: 16$ |
| $110: 5,16111: 23$ | $20: 2521: 1322: 22$ | $82: 7$ | $40: 1441: 643: 15$ |
| $116: 6,15,19117: 9$ | $24: 330: 1131: 7$ | thinly $150: 2$ | $44: 9,1045: 22$ |
| $127: 3,9130: 17$ | $33: 11,11,1934: 14$ | $217: 21,23,24$ | $49: 1750: 3,23$ |
| $141: 22142: 25$ | $37: 2,938: 11$ | third $128: 6,8$ | $51: 5,15,2552: 5,24$ |
| $144: 6145: 10,14$ | $39: 2440: 1441: 3$ | $139: 8146: 24$ | $55: 2258: 1766: 10$ |
| $149: 6183: 20$ | $42: 1743: 10,22$ | $150: 5180: 18,19$ | $72: 1973: 175: 17$ |
| $184: 2185: 1187: 8$ | $46: 848: 2353: 25$ | $242: 4250: 12,13$ | $75: 1976: 1477: 22$ |
| $187: 13196: 12$ | $55: 1657: 1,1,3$ | $251: 5252: 2$ | $77: 2478: 9,12$ |
| $200: 11,13,17$ | $58: 2062: 2,20$ | $254: 15$ | $84: 1785: 19,25$ |
| $212: 12221: 20$ | $63: 2465: 2566: 13$ | thirds $128: 4,8$ | $86: 491: 197: 3,25$ |
| $258: 11$ | $66: 2367: 1,11,23$ | thirty $75: 11$ | $100: 4101: 14$ |
| texas $91: 18$ | $71: 11,2475: 3$ | thoroughly $148: 15$ | $102: 15105: 25$ |
| thank $8: 245: 4$ | $79: 8,9,1980: 5,20$ | $149: 19$ | $106: 11,16109: 20$ |
| $57: 860: 1879: 16$ | $81: 582: 1587: 24$ | thought $14: 25$ | $114: 5,15115: 5,23$ |
| $80: 2,4117: 22$ | $88: 189: 295: 13$ | $17: 16,1829: 15$ | $116: 3,9123: 22$ |
| $124: 14135: 17$ | $95: 1499: 6,16,23$ | $37: 13,1543: 8,8$ | $124: 22126: 12$ |
| $138: 3146: 17$ | $100: 3101: 6,8$ | $54: 23122: 11$ | $140: 6149: 24$ |
| $153: 11,19158: 4$ | $102: 13103: 7$ | $173: 5,6243: 19$ | $150: 15,22151: 21$ |
| $174: 6178: 8$ | $108: 17,19111: 9$ | thoughts $32: 23$ | $157: 24159: 12,14$ |
| $204: 14248: 9$ | $112: 23117: 23$ | $173: 2$ | $160: 5,9161: 4,4$ |
| $257: 16$ | $118: 12119: 25$ | thousand $49: 24$ | $162: 8165: 24,25$ |
| theoretically | $120: 20121: 7$ | three $30: 740: 5,22$ | $170: 4,8,12,20$ |
| $62: 19$ | $122: 4123: 17$ | $49: 178: 16,17,25$ | $174: 4177: 16$ |
| theory $135: 21$ | $124: 24133: 13$ | $82: 2287: 15134: 2$ | $184: 10,11186: 12$ |
| $216: 21217: 1$ | $134: 4135: 2$ | $134: 4135: 2139: 5$ | $189: 25191: 6$ |
| thereof $114: 12$ | $138: 18140: 2$ | $148: 2149: 13$ | $193: 14198: 12,23$ |
| thing $12: 229: 8$ | $145: 12149: 6$ | $155: 7180: 16$ | $198: 24203: 8$ |
| $30: 2432: 5,21$ | $150: 13,13,14$ | $236: 1237: 6238: 6$ | $206: 23213: 8$ |
| $54: 957: 365: 2$ | $152: 5155: 10$ | $238: 7,19239: 1$ | $225: 1,4,18,22$ |
| $121: 17144: 25$ | $164: 19165: 18$ | $241: 24,25242: 3$ | $234: 4236: 25$ |
| $153: 14172: 9$ | $169: 12171: 11$ | thrown $144: 25$ | $239: 25245: 20$ |
| $212: 16226: 17$ | $187: 7188: 5$ | thumbnail $148: 1$ | $248: 4250: 8$ |
| $237: 1249: 3$ | $202: 17213: 21$ | tiered $40: 11$ | $257: 17258: 6$ |
| $250: 20$ | $215: 11,17218: 23$ | tiers $40: 2241: 4$ | timer $244: 14,15$ |
|  | $223: 4,8,13224: 20$ |  |  |

[times - types]

| times 47:3 68:17 | 171:12 180:15 | 77:21 148:8 206:9 | 255:11,16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 68:17,23 69:18,21 | 191:23 192:21 | 217:25 224:6 | tuck 140:20 |
| 88:4 140:10 | 209:13 213:9 | 225:18,20 | tuesday 1:16 2:16 |
| 141:18 146:22 | 214:11 233:6 | transcribed | 7:2 |
| 163:17 169:4 | 246:25 248:25 | 258:10 | tulane 80:19,22 |
| 204:17,24 248:18 | 250:10 253:1,2 | transcript 1:14 | turn 31:17,17 |
| 257:2 | 255:14 | 44:22 117:8 | 48:15,21 93:3,17 |
| timing 114:4 | topics 243 | 258:10,12 | 93:19 106:2 |
| tired 242:23 | total 59:3 71:11 | transcripts 44:19 | 111:16 172:25 |
| title 153:14 | 212:25 213:3,10 | transfer 47:7 | 175:25 177:9 |
| titled 7:5 | 239:19 249:11 | transferred 47:14 | 178:16 180:15 |
| titles 18:5 | totally 29:16 30:6 | 47:19 84:4,12 | 186:25 195:9 |
| today 11:1 30:23 | 213:11 | 255:15 | 205:17 215:22 |
| 32:2,9 39:12 | totals 249:1 | transitioned 35:10 | 230:11 239:16 |
| 41:21 46:11 53:8 | touch 74:1 252:11 | transpired 87:23 | turner 158:18 |
| 69:11 74:19 83:20 | touche 171:4,4 | trial 23:25 | 189:8 190:1,9,23 |
| 84:1,10,16 88:23 | traded 50:16 | tried 204:10 | twice 162:19 |
| 89:10 90:1 93:4 | 150:1,2 159:10 | trier 200:5 | two 9:9 10:9 15:22 |
| 97:9 98:9 111:23 | 161:15 162:6,7 | trigger 35:19 | 22:9 30:22 32:18 |
| 111:24 112:2 | 166:10 216:10 | triggering 103:14 | 41:3,3 46:22 |
| 113:3 127:10 | 217:5,10,11,16,21 | trs 91:20 | 49:23 54:22 62:20 |
| 130:11 132:9 | 217:23,24 218:9 | true 71:972:5 | 65:15 82:21,24 |
| 133:13 137:22 | 219:21 220:14 | 73:2 117:16 127:9 | 108:15 121:10 |
| 151:16,18 155:6 | 222:11 225:10,13 | 130:4 173:20 | 123:3 128:8 |
| 159:9 191:10 | 225:14,17 227:19 | 197:18,21,23 | 131:17 135:2 |
| 194:1,4,22 195:6 | 228:4,12,23 | 218:14 219:3 | 147:6,11 173:22 |
| 197:12 212:14 | 229:24 | 258:10 | 174:19 176:6,15 |
| 213:8 237:16 | traditional 139:6 | truly 21:13 26:19 | 177:7 179:17 |
| 247:1 | 154:3 | 218:10 | 191:24,25 192:1 |
| today's 148:25 | traffic 62:23 | truth 16:11 | 197:6,10 198:21 |
| told 25:13 33:18 | trailing 180:20 | try 18:5 20:11 | 198:25 199:10,23 |
| 47:18 48:3,7 | tranche 85:8 | 118:9 123:11 | 203:13 204:2,5 |
| 74:14 89:23 | transaction 48:25 | 124:4 125:17 | 223:25 247:10 |
| 130:15 196:5 | 49:15 57:14 77:23 | 191:11 241:5 | 250:25 253:22 |
| 198:7 | 78:10 155:2 | trying 26:16 36:1 | 254:13 256:14 |
| tomorrow 32:17 | 173:20 218:2 | 38:2 54:24 67:9 | type 49:8 57:15 |
| 56:20 243:2,4 | 223:22 224:2,5 | 71:3 82:6 86:18 | 65:15 72:24 141:9 |
| ton 233:1 | 226:7,11,13 | 97:23,24 98:5 | 200:25 233:8 |
| tonight 32:21 | transactions 49:7 | 112:16 124:11 | 246:23 247:3 |
| top 45:17 163:24 | 49:11 50:9,22,24 | 165:6 174:24 | types 49:1,18 |
| 163:25 167:15 | 51:15,17 57:11,19 | 182:14 250:8 | 191:19 200:18 |

[types - value]

| $\begin{aligned} & 220: 21 \quad 239: 15 \\ & 246: 23 \\ & \text { typically } \quad 219: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 89: 6,2092: 1,18,20 \\ & 100: 17 \text { 102:13 } \\ & 103: 16 \text { 104:23 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { use } 37: 741: 21 \\ 68: 2070: 285: 20 \\ 98: 19129: 9,9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { valuat } 71: 1 \\ & \text { valuation } 8: 10,15 \\ & 9: 13 \quad 14: 19 \quad 53: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| u | 106:16,23 111: | 130:21 141:11 | 75:12,14 76:13 |
| u.s. 217:12 228:9 | 112:2,19 130:18 | 148:17 149:10 | 79:6 89:22,24 |
| ucla 80:19 | 132:16,17 141:25 | 150:7 153:20 | 107:8 113:9 |
| h 77:19 | 154:6,13 158:2 | 156:8 161:8,10, | 117:17 138:17,23 |
|  | 166:21 170:4,5 | 161:12 164:23 | 139:6,9,15,16,18 |
|  | 191:2,5 199:24 | 171:13 175:24 | 139:21 145:25 |
| $13: 17 \text { 42:23 53:10 }$ | 253:3 | 177:16 188:22 | 146:6,13,19,22 |
|  | understa | 205:6 206:23 | 148:3 150:12 |
|  | - 17 | 207:9,13,21 208:1 | 153:25 154:4 |
|  | un | 209:3,14 212:6,8,9 | 156:5,18 |
|  | 213:22 | 212:22 213:17 | 158:12 159:16 |
|  | understood 12:13 | 214:5 215:12 | 167:20 170:1,4,9 |
|  | 32:12,12 49:17 | 216:6,8 218:2,7 | 172:2,13 176:16 |
| unanimous | 108:11 161:17 | 219:19 220:10,12 | 184:16,22 185:9 |
| unclear 255:2 | undertake 56:5 | 220:17,18,1 | 185:13,15 186:23 |
| uncovered 55:1 | undisclosed 71: | 221:4,4,5,21 222:9 | 188:25 199:3 |
| underlie 108:9 | unfair 2 | 222:12 224 | 203:21,21 205:9 |
| underlying | unfortunately | 226:16 232:5 | 214:14 216:13 |
|  | 32:22 48:24 225:7 | 249:7 255:12 | 220:21 221:11,15 |
|  | unincorporated | users 47:2, | 222:12 226:14,17 |
| $05: 1$ | 38:19 59:11,19 | uses 115:17 | 227:3 237:17 |
| rneath 48 | united 34:19 227:8 | 12,14 | 239:20,21 255 |
| underperform | :17,20,21 | usual 92:1 | 255:10 |
| $5: 22,23$ | 228:4,12 229:25 | usually 139:17 | valuations 53:8 |
| undersigned 258:3 | university 34:22 | utilize 73:13 151: | $1: 288: 3$ 89:8 |
| understand 10:13 | 138:2 | 51:5 156:7 | 11:6 138:25 |
| 19:23 20:6 24:17 | unquote 22:16,19 | utilized 74:7 | 39:4,7 146:18 |
| $26: 1930: 1131: 25$ | 90:3 97:13 132:5 | 170:22 | 47:3,12 162:7 |
| 32:10,13 $33: 9$ | unrestricted | utilizing 227:13 | 189:24 |
| 90:15 112:5,8 | 216:22 217:2 | v | uator 187:20 |
| 155:3,5 163:9 | update 159:16 |  | alue 9:6,10,18 |
| 169:24 192:6 | 170:11 | vaguely 58:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 1411: 1,10,12 \\ & 10 \cdot 46915: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| 242:21 246:20 | updates 176:14 | $81: 17$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 4,6,9,15,17 \\ & 13: 17,1814: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| 252:4 | upgraded 213:2 | valid 160:11 | $\begin{aligned} & 13: 17,1814: 10 \\ & 16: 9,1517: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| understanding | upgraded 213:2 upset 24:3 | validity 93:6 122:6 | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 9,15 \text { 17:23 } \\ & 24: 22 \text { 25:23 } 26: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| 10:21,23 11:25 | upset 24:3 <br> usage 92.19 | $123: 15$ | 24:22 25:23 26:3 |
| 21:17 28:1,9,10 | usage 92:19 | valuable 63:10 | 27:20 28:18,20 |
| 35:21 56:6 76:15 |  | 64:11 | 31:20 43:6,9,14,25 |

[value - way]

| 44:15 46:5,9,14 | 205:4,25 206:1,3,5 | view 20:6 42:25 | walk 124:24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 47:3 48:16 52:21 | 209:23,24 214:10 | 43:6 46:2,3,12 | 127:17 |
| 53:23 58:7 59:1 | 214:20 215:2 | 52:6,17 129:12 | want 9:15 18:2,20 |
| 63:14,19 64:5,15 | 221:24 222:18,21 | 151:16,24 155:6 | 20:5,9,12,13,18,21 |
| 64:16 65:3,13 | 223:2,12,20 226:8 | 162:5 171:8 | 23:4,7,8 25:25 |
| 67:5,9,12,18 68:3 | 226:15,15,22,23 | violate 205:1 | 29:17 32:17 33:7 |
| 73:7 74:8 84:25 | 226:25 256:19 | virtue 21:15 | 36:3 40:3,20 |
| 85:13,18 86:8,11 | valued 66:1 108:2 | void 9:23 | 61:23,23 64:8 |
| 87:1,7,10 88:1 | 133:10 141:2 | voir 142:15,17 | 65:14 66:16 67:17 |
| 95:14,15,17,24 | 150:19 152:12 | volume 1:18 2:15 | 75:22 86:14 93:4 |
| 96:3,5,11,13 98:5 | 155:9,11,12 | 217:24 218:1 | 120:24 139:2 |
| 104:2,14,20 105:2 | 187:15 213:8 | voluntary 31:9 | 140:7,20 141:21 |
| 107:9 108:8 | 239:22 | vote 9:1,12 86:1 | 145:21 159:21 |
| 111:12 112:17,25 | values 16:2 49:1,2 | 122:5,6,20 123:8,9 | 173:24 175:9 |
| 115:19 117:9 | 173:9,20 177:6 | 123:14,15,18 | 178:2 180:9 183:3 |
| 118:10,18,23 | valuing 141:8 | 135:20 | 183:7,9 193:2,14 |
| 119:7,15,24 | variables 62:11 | voted 8:20 85:21 | 194:5 198:11 |
| 120:22 121:3,7,14 | various 88:2 | 118:5,21 123:19 | 201:11 210:3 |
| 121:20,20 122:24 | 141:13 | 124:9 125:9,16 | 213:15 214:16 |
| 122:25 123:3,5 | vegas 1:17 2:19 | votes 98:18 | 217:15,18 229:17 |
| 124:3 125:3 | 3:5 4:8,16 7:1 | voting 22:16,16 | 229:20 238:2 |
| 127:11 136:22 | 49:18 50:25 51:18 | 95:20 96:4,12,21 | 243:5 249:13 |
| 139:23 140:23 | 59:11 62:17,24 | 96:24 97:5,13,20 | 253:12,14 256:13 |
| 143:14,24 148:4,9 | 63:4,5,10 138:24 | 98:3,20,23 99:5,5 | wanted 10:6 36:2 |
| 148:23,24,25 | 139:23 250:14,15 | 99:8,10,14 100:7 | 36:2 37:12 74:8 |
| 149:21 150:7,19 | 251:6 252:3 | 100:10 101:5,21 | 102:16 228:3 |
| 150:21 152:1 | 254:15 | 103:12,24,25 | 231:2,5,8 232:18 |
| 153:2,5,11 154:10 | vehicle 104:6 | 104:10 118:17 | 232:18 242:10 |
| 154:23,25 156:16 | venture 256:15 | 125:5,10,16,19 | ware 81:4 |
| 157:14 159:2 | verified 177:22 | 126:2,8,10,12 | warm 38:2 |
| 161:19,24 162:2,3 | verify 161:18 | 135:4,6,10,17,22 | warming 38:5 |
| 162:17 164:12,24 | versus 7:616:10 | 136:4,9,9,13,19 | washington 46:7 |
| 165:4,17,22 167:3 | 52:19 248:16 | vs $1: 62: 6$ | 69:1,4,5,7 |
| 167:20,23 169:23 | vertical 78:1 | W | waste 18:24 |
| 170:3,8 172:14,16 | 155:1 | wait 33:21 153:2 | wasting 40:14 |
| 180:23 182:8,9 | vertically $52: 9,18$ | 183:3 | watch 126:24 |
| 188:7,9,15,16 | 52:22 147:4,7,12 | waiting 56.20 | way $14: 1215: 20$ |
| 193:25 200:19,20 | 156:9 |  | 18:1 24:15 35:7 |
| 200:23 201:1,8,16 | vetted 148:15 | $31: 15$ | 45:9 54:20 79:7 |
| 202:8,14,19 203:2 | 149:19 | waiving $17 \cdot 13$ | 87:25 106:14 |
| 203:4,8,15 204:25 |  | $97: 16$ | 121:2 128:18 |

[way - wrote]

| 131:21 134:9 | whatsoever 144:6 | win 18:24,24 | words 42:13 99:3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 136:7 141:21 | whereof $258: 17$ | windmill 112:18 | 136:4 151:5 |
| 164:2 174:24 | white $48: 11$ | wished 54:19 | 157:10 167:1 |
| 183:25 191:14 | whittle 21:16 | withdraw 47:24 | 170:2,21 226:17 |
| 213:7 214:10,19 | whoa 122:12 | 76:8 86:4,15,15 | 247:15 255:12 |
| 214:25 246:1 | wholly 234:13 | 156:21 164:18 | work 20:4 35:25 |
| wayside 11:9 16:5 | wild 141:4 | 187:21 202:16 | 50:2 125:17 |
| we've 8:1897:25 | wiley 4:4,5 5:9,14 | 240:5 | 138:10 139:19 |
| 134:22 139:3 | 7:23,23,24 15:5 | withdrawn 112:3 | 140:1,7,9 141:2 |
| 146:25 | 16:21 28:12 29:3 | 200:14 230:10 | 164:3 |
| weak 138:5, | 29:6,13 30:16 | witness 5:634:4,7 | worked 50:6 81:2 |
| website 70:9,1 | 33:16 41:12,15,18 | 46:18 51:19 55:5 | 140:5 |
| 236:15 | 46:15 49:20 53:15 | 57:23 58:14,19 | working 36:12 |
| webster 6:9 9:17 | 53:16 55:6 57:9 | 59:20 67:23 70:22 | 39:25 72:12 |
| 22:19 31:20 | 57:24 58:12,16 | 73:10 75:7 77:2 | 138:11 142:5 |
| 104:24 105:4,7,24 | 59:13,15,18,23 | 80:4,10 90:17 | works 41:25 |
| 106:2 111:3 | 60:16 73:9,13 | 91:21 95:16 | world 102:25 |
| 134:10 | 75:1 77:5,9,13,15 | 108:18,19 111:8 | 129:7 |
| webster's 105:1 | 79:3,19,23 80:1 | 114:21,25 115:3,7 | worst 60:7 |
| 121:21 | 90:8,9,18,19,21 | 120:14 122:19 | worth 65:5 66:6 |
| week 47:16 | 91:20,22 92:14 | 124:17 130:22 | 82:16 128:7 |
| weeks 87:15 | 95:15,19 96:20 | 131:18 135:8 | 152:13 239:24 |
| 130:14 138:3 | 105:11,14,17 | 136:16 137:16 | worthless 11:20 |
| weighted 155:25 | 108:20,22 109:22 | 138:8,10 141:19 | 16:2 25:11 |
| 178:21,23 179:13 | 111:15 117:20 | 152:7,23 157:23 | worthwhile 243:2 |
| 181:14 | 124:21 126:14,22 | 158:6 159:23 | write 86:17 |
| wells 72:10 | 130:16 131:5 | 181:3,6 187:5,23 | writing 32:20 39:7 |
| went 11:934:18 | 133:13 134:6,12 | 193:9,15 208:18 | 102:15 |
| 34:19 40:25 80:19 | 137:4 169:1,4,6,9 | 210:12 212:22 | written 86:11,21 |
| 126:14 128:12 | 169:12 170:25 | 213:22,24 218:21 | 101:21 117:12 |
| 138:10 167:25 | 174:5 249:2,9,17 | 218:22,23 222:1,3 | 135:22 146:14 |
| 206:15 207:1 | 250:5,7 251:10,14 | 223:13,15 229:19 | 184:5,21 185:15 |
| 213:14 220:9,24 | wileypetersonla... | 237:15 243:19,21 | wrong 27:16 123:1 |
| 231:14 | 4:10 | 249:4,7 251:17,24 | 171:2 197:19 |
| western 59:7 61:2 | willing 48:8 | 256:24 258:17 | 198:3 |
| 61:3,6 | 222:23,23 223:21 | witnesses 23:16 | wrongful 98:6 |
| wharton 34:23,24 | 223:21,22,23 | 137:22 258:7 | wrote 12:25 88:7 |
| 35:1 | 226:8,8,12,12,19 | wonder 118:2 | 165:24,25 184:10 |
| whatnot 59:22 | 226:20,21,21 | word 99:1 198:14 | 184:12 |
| 213:12 | wilson 81:3 | 213:21 216:8 |  |

[x - zero]

| x | 213:18 |
| :---: | :---: |
| x 155:22 | уер 45:19 105:13 |
| y | $\begin{array}{rl} 194: 8 & 257: 12 \\ \text { york } 3: 19,19 \end{array}$ |
| yahoo 232:2,24 |  |
| 246:13 | z |
| yeah 10:4,4 19:24 | zero 47:20 48:7 |
| 20:24 21:8,24 |  |
| 23:10 31:13 32:8 |  |
| 32:10 38:2 45:3 |  |
| 45:14,16 58:17 |  |
| 61:13 62:2 63:5 |  |
| 100:1 112:23 |  |
| 116:10 117:1 |  |
| 132:12 135:10,12 |  |
| 135:12 137:8 |  |
| 138:6 149:12 |  |
| 158:6 165:20 |  |
| 170:5,18 176:8 |  |
| 195:3 199:8 200:5 |  |
| 201:17 209:1,11 |  |
| 210:11 211:4,11 |  |
| 211:23 212:18,22 |  |
| 214:3 215:25 |  |
| 223:8,11 227:13 |  |
| 227:22 229:13 |  |
| 233:17 234:24 |  |
| 236:9,13,24 239:2 |  |
| 240:3 241:2 |  |
| 244:12,16,16,20 |  |
| 244:23 245:1,1 |  |
| 246:20 248:2 |  |
| year 78:5 136:21 |  |
| 138:15 139:1 |  |
| 194:11 208:12 |  |
| 210:19,20,21 |  |
| 211:14 212:3,5 |  |
| years 30:7 35:6 |  |
| 138:20 148:19,22 |  |
| 148:23 211:18 |  |
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| 22 |  |
| 23 |  |
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|  | Page 260 |



| 1 | APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL (Cont'd) : |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | For the Defendant |
| 3 | NuVeda, LLC: |
| 4 | WILEY PETERSEN |
| 5 | BY: JASON M. WILEY, ESQ. |
| 6 | 1050 Indigo Drive |
| 7 | Suite 130 |
| 8 | Las Vegas, NV 89145 |
| 9 | (702) 909-5487 |
| 10 | jwiley@wileypetersonlaw.com |
| 11 |  |
| 12 | KOLESAR \& LEATHAM |
| 13 | BY: MATTHEW T. DUSHOFF, ESQ. |
| 14 | 400 South Rampart |
| 15 | Suite 400 |
| 16 | Las Vegas, NV 89145 |
| 17 | (702) 362-7800 |
| 18 | mdushoff@klnevada.com |
| 19 | ALSO PRESENT: |
| 20 | Jennifer Goldstein |
| 21 | Pejman Bady |
| 22 | Pouya Mohajer |
| 23 | Joe Kennedy |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |
|  | Page 262 |


| 1 | INDEX |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | EXAMINATION |  |
| 3 | WITNESS | PAGE |
| 4 | MICHAEL WEBSTER |  |
| 5 | Direct By Mr. Wiley | 267 |
| 6 | Cross By Mr. Feurerstein | 274 |
| 7 | Redirect By Mr. Wiley | 293 |
| 8 | DR. PEJMAN BADY |  |
| 9 | Direct By Mr. Feuerstein | 294 |
| 10 | Cross By Mr. Wiley | 321 |
| 11 | Redirect By Mr. Feuerstein | 325 |
| 12 |  |  |
| 13 | RESPONDENT'S CASE IN CHIEF | 333 |
| 14 | JOSEPH KENNEDY |  |
| 15 | Direct By Mr. Wiley | 334 |
| 16 | Cross By Mr. Feuerstein | 360 |
| 17 | Redirect By Mr. Wiley | 409 |
| 18 | Cross By Arbitrator Baker | 413 |
| 19 | DR. TERRENCE CLAURETIE |  |
| 20 | Direct By Mr. Dushoff | 415 |
| 21 | Cross By Mr. Feuerstein | 438 |
| 22 | Redirect By Mr. Dushoff | 475 |
| 23 | Cross By Arbitrator Baker | 476 |
| 24 |  |  |
| 25 |  |  |
|  |  | 263 |



ARBITRATOR BAKER: This is the continuation of the final hearing in the matter styled Jennifer Goldstein versus NuVeda, LLC, Case No. 01-15-005-8574.

Rather than having everyone make appearances again, can counsel just confirm the same parties that were present when we started yesterday are also here today.

MR. WILEY: Confirmed.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Confirmed.
MR. DUSHOFF: Confirmed.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Thank you. Yesterday we addressed the attorneys' fees issue briefly, and specifically whether Ms. Goldstein was seeking any sort of attorneys' fees against individual respondents, not withstanding that no claims are currently pending against the individual respondents.

I gave the parties the opportunity last night to consider the issue, provide me any sort of case law that would support an order of attorneys' fees. I didn't receive anything.

So I want the parties' positions -- I think I understand what respondent's position is. I want to
know what your position is so that we can get a resolution so Mr. Dushoff knows --

MR. FEUERSTEIN: What team he's playing for?
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Exactly.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Arbitrator Baker, I
appreciate the opportunity. While it was not Ms. Goldstein's understanding that we would be sort of addressing this up front and having this conversation, we've had time, or that we were waiving the claim as part of the sort of dismissal of the other claims.

At this time, we are prepared to seek our attorneys' fees against NuVeda, only and not pursuant as against the individuals. So if Mr. Dushoff would like to change jerseys now and play for NuVeda, we're fine with that.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Thank you. Anything you want to add?

MR. DUSHOFF: No. I think that was in exchange of giving him his phone cord back.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: So for his consideration is what you're saying.

MR. DUSHOFF: Yeah.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Thank you. So I understand that we are going to hear from Mr. Webster; correct?

MR. WILEY: Yes.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Let's call Mr. Webster.
Thereupon,
MICHAEL WEBSTER,
called as a witness by the Respondent
having been duly sworn, testified as
follows:
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. WILEY:
Q Would you please state and spell your name for the record.

A Michael R. Webster, W-e-b-s-t-e-r.
Q Can you please provide a brief background of your education post high school.

A Yes. I had community college, approximately 36 credits in Las Vegas. Graduated from Corporate Investment Business Brokers, also the Institute of Business Appraisers for businesses. I've owned and operated over 21 businesses.

Q The appraisal that's at issue in the litigation today that you prepared provides that you're a certified business appraiser. Is there any special schooling or instruction that you needed to attain that certification?

A Yes. I went through the Institute of

| 1 | Business Appraisers in San Diego, California. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q And what year was that? |
| 3 | A 1984, I believe. |
| 4 | Q Has that certification remained in place |
| 5 | since then? |
| 6 | A Yes. |
| 7 | Q Have you ever had any disciplinary actions |
| 8 | against you? |
| 9 | A No. |
| 10 | Q So you've been a certified business appraiser |
| 11 | since the mid 1980s? |
| 12 | A Yes. |
| 13 | Q Where have you provided appraisals, |
| 14 | geographic wise? |
| 15 | A I'm a licensed -- also a licensed broker, |
| 16 | real estate broker in Utah and Nevada. So those two |
| 17 | states. And I do these nationwide. If somebody needs |
| 18 | an appraisal nationwide, I'll do that. |
| 19 | Q Approximately how many businesses have you |
| 20 | provided an appraisal for? |
| 21 | A Eight hundred to a thousand. |
| 22 | Q Have you ever served as an expert witness in |
| 23 | a court or arbitration proceeding? |
| 24 | A I have. |
| 25 | Q Approximately how many times have you served |
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| 1 | as an expert witness? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A Probably four, maybe five. |
| 3 | Q Were those all located here in Nevada? |
| 4 | A Yes. |
| 5 | Q Is it your understanding that you're here to |
| 6 | provide testimony as to the appraisal that you |
| 7 | conducted for NuVeda in August of 2017? |
| 8 | A Yes. |
| 9 | Q What is your understanding what the purpose |
| 10 | of the appraisal was for? |
| 11 | A It was to buy out one of the managing members |
| 12 | who, I believe, had seven percent of the stock. |
| 13 | Q Who from NuVeda contacted you regarding the |
| 14 | need for the appraisal? |
| 15 | A Mr. Joseph Kennedy. |
| 16 | Q Did you have any discussions with any other |
| 17 | NuVeda members or representatives? |
| 18 | A Say that again. |
| 19 | Q Did you have any discussions or contact with |
| 20 | any other NuVeda members or representatives? |
| 21 | A No. |
| 22 | Q How many meetings did you have with Mr. |
| 23 | Kennedy? |
| 24 | A Approximately two. |
| 25 | Q Customarily when you prepare an appraisal, |
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what information do you require the requesting party provide to you in order for you to prepare the appraisal?

A In this case, $I$ was provided an eight month balance sheet of the corporation.

Q Was that the only information that you requested from the NuVeda representatives?

A That's all I received, yes.
Q Was there any information that you didn't receive that you requested from NuVeda that would have assisted with the preparation of the appraisal?

A No. My understanding was to base the appraisal on the balance sheet off the information on the balance sheet.

Q Let me go ahead and hand you the appraisal. It hasn't been admitted yet. It's going to be admitted as an exhibit to the e-mails. It's not stand-alone.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Go ahead. Mark it stand-alone. I have no objection.
(Joint Exhibit 261 was marked for
identification.)
MR. WILEY: This will be J261.
Q Mr. Webster, if you look at what's been marked as 261 , do you recognize this document?

| 1 | A I don't have a marked document. I have the |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | appraisal in front of me. There's no exhibit mark on |
| 3 | it. |
| 4 | MR. WILEY: Are you okay with him looking at |
| 5 | it? |
| 6 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: I mean, if he's going to |
| 7 | look at his documents, what are the underlying |
| 8 | documents in that book? |
| 9 | MR. WILEY: This is the appraisal. |
| 10 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: What's below it? What are |
| 11 | the rest of the documents? |
| 12 | THE WITNESS: My credentials of the |
| 13 | corporation. |
| 14 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: Okay. I'd like to see what |
| 15 | the book is. |
| 16 | BY MR. WILEY: |
| 17 | Q Now you've been handed what has been |
| 18 | designated as J261. Do you recognize this document? |
| 19 | A I do. |
| 20 | Q Who prepared this document? |
| 21 | A I did. |
| 22 | Q Were you the sole preparer of the document? |
| 23 | A Yes. |
| 24 | Q Did anybody that you're affiliated with or in |
| 25 | your office assist in the preparation of the |
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| 1 | document? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A My secretary. |
| 3 | Q And what specific task did your secretary |
| 4 | undertake with respect to the appraisal? |
| 5 | A She drafted it -- or I drafted it and she put |
| 6 | it on the computer. |
| 7 | Q The appraisal provides that on August 13th, |
| 8 | 2017, you met with Joe Kennedy. Is that a true and |
| 9 | accurate statement? |
| 10 | A It is. |
| 11 | Q And that Mr. Kennedy provided you with the |
| 12 | NuVeda balance sheet, which you previously testified |
| 13 | was the case; correct? |
| 14 | A That's correct. |
| 15 | Q And did that balance sheet list NuVeda assets |
| 16 | and liabilities? |
| 17 | A It did. |
| 18 | Q The amounts that are set forth in the |
| 19 | appraisal, where did you get those amounts for the |
| 20 | preparation of the appraisal? |
| 21 | A I simply subtracted the liabilities from the |
| 22 | assets to obtain the value. |
| 23 | Q And where did you get the assets from? |
| 24 | A From Mr. Kennedy in the balance sheet. |
| 25 | Q Same with the liabilities? |
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| 1 | A Yes. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q And I think you previously testified that you |
| 3 | derived the fair market value of the company by taking |
| 4 | assets minus the liabilities? |
| 5 | A Correct. |
| 6 | Q Is that a customarily accepted methodology |
| 7 | for determining the fair market value of a company? |
| 8 | A Based on what I had to work with, yes. |
| 9 | Q Have you used that methodology before, taking |
| 10 | the assets minus the abilities to determine the fair |
| 11 | market -- |
| 12 | A I have. |
| 13 | Q And that's in preparing other business |
| 14 | appraisals? |
| 15 | A Yes. |
| 16 | Q I think you testified to this, but I just |
| 17 | want to make sure. Other than the balance sheet that |
| 18 | was provided to you by Mr. Kennedy, did you rely upon |
| 19 | any other documents, whether from NuVeda or otherwise, |
| 20 | to assist in the preparation of the appraisal? |
| 21 | A No. |
| 22 | Q Did you undertake any independent |
| 23 | investigation as to the veracity of those numbers? |
| 24 | A I did not. |
| 25 | Q Did you contact anyone at NuVeda after you |
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| 1 | prepared the appraisal to discuss the contents |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | therein? |
| 3 | A Other than Mr. Kennedy, no. |
| 4 | Q What did you discuss with Mr. Kennedy after |
| 5 | the appraisal was prepared? |
| 6 | A Just the basis of the appraisal. |
| 7 | Q At any time did you have any discussions with |
| 8 | anyone from NuVeda where they conveyed that you needed |
| 9 | to skew your numbers or change your appraisal in any |
| 10 | way? |
| 11 | A No. |
| 12 | Q After August of 2017, did you have any |
| 13 | contact with anybody from NuVeda regarding your |
| 14 | valuation? |
| 15 | A I did not. |
| 16 | Q Up until recently? |
| 17 | A Correct. |
| 18 | MR. WILEY: I have no further questions. |
| 19 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 20 | BY MR. FEUERSTEIN: |
| 21 | Q Good morning, Mr. Webster. How are you? |
| 22 | A Good morning. |
| 23 | Q I am David Feuerstein. I'm from New York and |
| 24 | I'm representing the claimant, Ms. Goldstein, whose |
| 25 | shares you provided the appraisal for. |


| 1 | A Okay. Good to meet you. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q Nice to meet you, too. |
| 3 | First of all, we talked a little bit. You |
| 4 | have a book that's sitting in front of you, and you |
| 5 | said that that book contains your report. What else |
| 6 | does it contain? |
| 7 | A My license, my corporation (sic) of NuVeda, |
| 8 | my C.V. |
| 9 | Q Does it contain any backup information that |
| 10 | you used in preparation of this appraisal that's been |
| 11 | marked as Exhibit 261? |
| 12 | A No. |
| 13 | Q How long have you known Mr. Kennedy for? |
| 14 | A Approximately three years. |
| 15 | Q When did you first meet him? |
| 16 | A I believe it was approximately three years |
| 17 | ago, maybe two years ago, I believe it was. |
| 18 | Q Two years ago? |
| 19 | A Yeah, two years. |
| 20 | Q How did you meet him? |
| 21 | A He called me in reference to some |
| 22 | consultation. |
| 23 | (Cross-talking.) |
| 24 | (Court reporter asks for clarification.) |
| 25 | THE WITNESS: He called me in reference about |
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| 1 | some consultation. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | BY MR. FEUERSTEIN: |
| 3 | Q Was it a consultation with respect to NuVeda |
| 4 | or some other business? |
| 5 | A NuVeda. |
| 6 | Q Do you recall when he contacted you? |
| 7 | A I do not. |
| 8 | Q Is it typical -- strike that. |
| 9 | How did Mr. -- do you know how Mr. Kennedy |
| 10 | got your name? |
| 11 | A I believe he said it was a referral, but I'm |
| 12 | not sure how that occurred. |
| 13 | Q Were you surprised to hear from Mr. |
| 14 | Kennedy? |
| 15 | A No. |
| 16 | Q Did someone tell you he was going to be |
| 17 | calling you? |
| 18 | A I'm sorry. |
| 19 | Q Did someone tell you he would be calling |
| 20 | you? |
| 21 | A No. |
| 22 | Q Do you remember where you were when you took |
| 23 | the call? |
| 24 | A I do not. |
| 25 | Q Would you agree with me that he contacted you |
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on a Sunday?
A I have no idea.
Q Well, you state in your report here that on
August 13, you were retained by NuVeda and Mr.
Kennedy. Do you see that?
A I would have to go back to a calendar to see what date that would be.

Q Well, I'll represent to you that on the calendar, August 13th is a Sunday.

A Okay.
Q Were you in the office?
A I don't know where $I$ was.
Q Did Mr. Kennedy call you at home?
A I have a cell phone. Probably on the cell phone.

Q Now, you mentioned that you did 800 to a thousand appraisals?

A Consultations, sales and appraisals over 33 years, yes.

Q Any cannabis companies?
A I'm sorry.
Q Any other cannabis companies?
A No.
Q How many of those of the 800 to a thousand, either roughly or by percentage, are real estate
appraisals?
A I don't do real estate appraisals, just business appraisals. I'm also a broker, real estate breaker, but $I$ just specialize in businesses.

Q Got it. Do you know who Allen Butell is?
A I don't.
Q You ever speak to him?
A No.
Q After speaking with Mr. Kennedy and telling him about your appraisal, did you ever speak to him again about any request made by Ms. Goldstein?

A $\quad$ No.
Q The header on your letterhead says, Webster Business Group, and underneath it, it has sort of a quote in Italics. It says, "Where professionalism and confidentiality meet."

Why is that -- why did you quote that there?
A Well, over the years, we saw a lot of businesses that require nondisclosures; bars, restaurants, gaming license, liquor license, where it was confidential that the seller didn't know we were selling the business so we had a nondisclosure agreement signed. That's where the confidentiality came in.

Q So you would provide an appraisal for that
business and then maintain confidentiality of that appraisal?

A No, we're talking about the sale. That's what the letterhead ...

Q Okay. So you're talking about the sale of the business?

A Yes. We had NDAs on approximately 95 percent of our sales. It was a nice little token.

Q Now, you said that -- if I understood you correctly, that what you did with respect to this appraisal is you simply took the information that was given to you by Mr. Kennedy and then added and subtracted and got to a number. Is that fair to say?

A That's fair to say.
Q And you didn't do any work to confirm any of the numbers; correct?

A I did not.
Q In fact, you state in your report at the end that you don't warrant the accuracy of the information contained herein?

A Yes, sir.
Q Is that typical of your business, that when you appraise a business, you do nothing to confirm the accuracy of the numbers you're given?

A Absolutely.
Q Why is that?
A I can only attest to what's given to me. I can't attest to the accuracy of the numbers that are given to me. Somebody can falsify numbers.

Q So you're writing a disclaimer?
A This is a disclaimer, yes.
Q If the numbers -- did you understand that your task here -- well, let me withdraw the question.

Did you have an understanding that this appraisal, which has been marked Exhibit 261, would be used to -- pursuant to a contract?

A Say that again.
MR. WILEY: Objection. Vague.
BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q Did you have an understanding -- let me withdraw.

Did you know that while you were doing the appraisal?

A I did not -- well, correct that. It was for a managing member to be bought out or to leave.

Q Did you have an understanding of the circumstances of what you were actually calculating? Were you calculating book value? Fair market value? What standard were you using?

| 1 | A Market value on the assets versus |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | liabilities. |
| 3 | Q And did you have an opinion as to whether |
| 4 | that was the only way to calculate fair market |
| 5 | value? |
| 6 | A Based on the information I had, yes. |
| 7 | Q Did you ask for more information? |
| 8 | A No. |
| 9 | Q Did you ask to determine -- ask any questions |
| 10 | at all about the circumstances of the company? |
| 11 | A I did not. |
| 12 | Q Did you ask any questions with respect to |
| 13 | whether the company had revenue? |
| 14 | A No. |
| 15 | Q Did you ask any questions with respect to |
| 16 | whether the company was a going concern? |
| 17 | A No. |
| 18 | Q Did you ask any questions with respect to |
| 19 | what the intention of the members of the company were |
| 20 | in order to continue the business? |
| 21 | A Other than the seven percent, no. |
| 22 | Q You didn't know whether the company was |
| 23 | liquidating or whether it was an ongoing business |
| 24 | looking for future profits? |
| 25 | A I did not. |
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| 1 | Q Would it matter to you, Mr. Webster, in |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | calculating what's known as the fair market value? |
| 3 | Let me withdraw the question. |
| 4 | Do you understand what fair market value is? |
| 5 | A In this case, yes. |
| 6 | Q When you say "in this case," what are you |
| 7 | saying? |
| 8 | A What the business would be worth at the time |
| 9 | of the appraisal. |
| 10 | Q Is there an understanding -- you have an |
| 11 | understanding in all of your appraisals what the |
| 12 | phrase "fair market value" means? |
| 13 | A What the business is worth in today's market. |
| 14 | That's my understanding as far as business sales. |
| 15 | Q Is there a different understanding for fair |
| 16 | market value for, say, real estate? |
| 17 | $A \quad Y e s$. |
| 18 | Q What is the fair market value for real |
| 19 | estate? |
| 20 | A I don't do real estate appraisals. |
| 21 | Q So how do you know the fair market value is |
| 22 | different for real estate than it is for business? |
| 23 | A Because there is a general accepted method of |
| 24 | real estate and I don't do them. It was taught to us |
| 25 | in school. |
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Q Let me be clear. I'm not asking for how you -- one would calculate fair market value necessarily. I'm asking what's your definition of fair market value? Does it change by business?

A My definition is what the business would be worth in today's market.

Q Is the only way to determine what the business is worth is to add up the assets and subtract the liabilities?

A No, there's discretionary tax methods. You have tax statements, you have P\&L statements, balance sheets. That was not given to me in any of those documents.

Q Any other ways to do it?
A For business, the main two things are asset and discretionary cash flow.

Q How about market comparables?
A Not in business sales. We use multipliers, not capitalization rates.

Q You note on your -- you note in the second line under assets, that 35 percent of CWNV, LLC equals 3.5 -- I think it's 3.5 million. I think there's a typo there. Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q The period ought to be a comma; correct?

| 1 | A I'm sorry. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q The period ought to be a comma; correct? |
| 3 | A Refer to the balance sheet on my notes? |
| 4 | MR. DUSHOFF: No. |
| 5 | BY MR. FEUERSTEIN: |
| 6 | Q I'm sorry. What are those notes from? |
| 7 | A For the balance sheet. |
| 8 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'd like to see those notes. |
| 9 | I asked for that production. |
| 10 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: Any objection? You want |
| 11 | to take a look at it first? |
| 12 | MR. WILEY: Sure. I've got no objection to |
| 13 | them. Can I take these out. You want to take a look |
| 14 | at it? |
| 15 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: Yeah. |
| 16 | (Witness reviewing document.) |
| 17 | BY MR. FEUERSTEIN: |
| 18 | Q So this document, Mr. Webster, this is a |
| 19 | document you prepared or it was provided to you? |
| 20 | A No, it was provided to me by Mr. Kennedy. |
| 21 | Q And if I'm looking at it correctly, it looks |
| 22 | like it says on the second page of it that the fair |
| 23 | market value was already calculated. Do you see |
| 24 | that? |
| 25 | A No, that would be me that did that. I just |
|  | Page 284 |


| 1 | subtracted and put it up here, then I reiterated down |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | below. |
| 3 | Q Was that document prepared by you or was that |
| 4 | prepared by Mr. Kennedy? |
| 5 | A This document was a copy of the balance sheet |
| 6 | given to me by Mr. Kennedy. |
| 7 | Q The first page or the second page? |
| 8 | A No. This was prepared by me in the |
| 9 | appraisal. This reiterates the appraisal. Should be |
| 10 | verbatim. |
| 11 | Q Do you have the document that Mr. Kennedy |
| 12 | provided you? |
| 13 | A That would be a copy of this, the balance |
| 14 | sheet. I just made a copy of the balance sheet. |
| 15 | Q If you look at the next page of the document. |
| 16 | A Okay. |
| 17 | Q It says two of three on the bottom; |
| 18 | correct? |
| 19 | A I don't think we have the whole balance |
| 20 | sheet. It was two pages, but I think we have it mixed |
| 21 | up with the appraisal. No, that's the balance sheet. |
| 22 | What's the question, David? |
| 23 | Q I'm just trying to figure out what Mr. |
| 24 | Kennedy gave you and what you actually did. So I'm |
| 25 | wondering -- |
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A Mr. Kennedy gave me this. I prepared this (indicating.)

ARBITRATOR BAKER: We're going to mark this as an exhibit so we can refer to it.

THE WITNESS: I prepared this (indicating.)
MR. DUSHOFF: Would you like me to make copies of it?

ARBITRATOR BAKER: We could do it at a break, unless you'd like to take a break and do it now.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: So everyone is talking from the same document, let's take a quick break and make a copy.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: This will be 262.
MR. WILEY: I would propose that we have them as two separate exhibits because he just testified that one was a document that he prepared, and one was a document given to him by Mr. Kennedy.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: I think the confusion is that's not clear from what he said.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'd like to have it as one document.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: I'm not clear as to whether the first page, that page only, did you prepare that?

THE WITNESS: No.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: You were given that?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: The second page, did you prepare that?

THE WITNESS: Yes. That's actually part of the appraisal.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Whatever you want to do.
Two exhibits?
MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'd like to have it as one document.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: We'll do that. Let's take a quick break and get a copy for everyone.
(Break taken.)
(Joint Exhibit 262 was marked for
identification.)
BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q Mr. Webster, where we left off was we were talking about the document that you should have in front of you. It's two pages. The top says, "NuVeda, LLC, assets and liabilities as of 8/8/2017." And then there's a second page that looks like it repeats a little bit of the first page and resembles, if you would, page 2 of 3 of your appraisal.

A It would be the third page of my appraisal.
Q Second page?

| 1 | A Second page of my appraisal, yes. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q The handwriting that says -- it's on the top |
| 3 | Of the first page of the balance sheet, is that your |
| 4 | handwriting or is that Mr. Kennedy's? |
| 5 | A It is. |
| 6 | Q That's your handwriting? |
| 7 | A Yes. |
| 8 | Q Would you agree with me, Mr. Webster, that if |
| 9 | the number in the second line, $\$ 3.5$ million number |
| 10 | changed, that your appraisal would necessarily |
| 11 | change? |
| 12 | A Correct. |
| 13 | Q And you did nothing to confirm whether that |
| 14 | number was accurate? |
| 15 | A I did not. |
| 16 | Q How long did this report take you? |
| 17 | A Approximately four hours. |
| 18 | Q It took you four hours to add up all those |
| 19 | numbers? |
| 20 | A To draft it, bring my secretary in, draft the |
| 21 | document. I always draft it up first and then I give |
| 22 | it to her to type up. |
| 23 | Q You were given this sheet, you copied |
| 24 | basically verbatim into your report? |
| 25 | A Yes. Everything was redone in there. |
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| 1 | Q And your secretary did that; correct? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A Yes -- well, the only thing verbatim would be |
| 3 | the numbers. The other things I put in there were |
| 4 | disclosures myself. |
| 5 | Q I mean the numbers that you put in. |
| 6 | A That's correct. |
| 7 | Q You added up the numbers, subtracted the |
| 8 | numbers, about used a calculator to do that? |
| 9 | A Yes. |
| 10 | Q The calculation itself, how long did that |
| 11 | take you? |
| 12 | A The whole report, approximately four hours. |
| 13 | Q I understand the whole report took you four |
| 14 | hours, but I'm asking you specifically just adding and |
| 15 | subtracting the numbers, how long did that take you? |
| 16 | A Maybe 10 minutes. |
| 17 | Q You did nothing to verify any of the |
| 18 | amounts? |
| 19 | A I did not. |
| 20 | Q You didn't ask any questions of Mr. Kennedy, |
| 21 | you didn't look at any independent sources, you did |
| 22 | nothing of the sort; correct? |
| 23 | A That's correct. |
| 24 | Q You didn't ask for any documents and weren't |
| 25 | provided any documents other than the balance sheet; |


| 1 | is that correct? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A That's correct. |
| 3 | Q Did you ask any questions as to what any of |
| 4 | the valuations meant under the assets? In other |
| 5 | words, when you say 35 percent of CWNV, do you have |
| 6 | any idea what that is? |
| 7 | A No. I just relied strictly on the balance |
| 8 | sheet. |
| 9 | Q Now, it says that you met with Mr. Kennedy on |
| 10 | August 13, and then you prepared the report by August |
| 11 | 19, or at least dated August 19? |
| 12 | A The 19th or 17th, yes. 19th, that's correct. |
| 13 | Q Did you prepare the report immediately or did |
| 14 | you take some time to do it? |
| 15 | A Well, the spread between the 13th and the |
| 16 | 19th. |
| 17 | Q Did you spend 30 minutes a day doing it? Did |
| 18 | you spend four hours in one day? How did you do it? |
| 19 | A I don't remember. |
| 20 | Q Did you have any understanding, independent |
| 21 | understanding, Mr. Webster, of the cannabis industry |
| 22 | in Nevada? |
| 23 | A No, only what I read. |
| 24 | Q Can you tell me what you read? |
| 25 | A How it's growing and how many dispensaries |
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there are, so forth.
Q Did you happen to know whether cannabis was medicinal, recreational, both in August of 2017?

A I knew that they approved the medical first and then the last session, they approved the --

Q Did you know whether in August of 2017, cannabis was being sold recreationally in Nevada or was it later?

A It was later they approved it.
Q Did it matter to you -- performing your fair market value appraisal of the business, did it matter to you whether it was recreational or not?

A $\quad$ No.
Q Have you kept up with -- let me ask you a question. I want to give you a small hypothetical.

A Okay.
Q Suppose a buyer decides to make an offer for a business, and that buyer offers, let's say, \$30 million for the business. You with me so far?

A I am.
Q Would you agree that the seller sells its business for $\$ 30$ million, that that's fair market value of the business? MR. WILEY: Objection. Improper hypothetical. Mr. Webster is here as a lay witness.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: Without substantiation, no
numbers?
BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q Yes.
A Ask the question again, please.
Q The business, someone wants to buys it for \$30 million and the business is amenable to selling itself for $\$ 30$ million. So you have a willing buyer and a willing seller. Are you with me?

A Yes. The seller wants to sell it for 30 and the buyer wants to buy it for 30 ?

Q You got it.
A Okay.
Q Is that the fair market value of the business? Is that one way of measuring it?

A I would say if they agree to buy the business, yes.

Q Just a couple quick questions. What did you do to prepare for today's hearing?

A I'm sorry.
Q What did you do to prepare for today's hearing?

A I went over the appraisal and got my license together and my credentials and my C.V.

| 1 | Q Did you meet with any of the lawyers sitting |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | here today? |
| 3 | A No. This is the first I met anybody except |
| 4 | Mr. Kennedy. |
| 5 | Q Did you speak to Mr. Kennedy in anticipation |
| 6 | of today's hearing? |
| 7 | $A \quad$ No. |
| 8 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'll pass the witness. |
| 9 | MR. WILEY: Redirect. |
| 10 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: Yes. |
| 11 | REDIRECT EXAMINATION |
| 12 | BY MR. WILEY: |
| 13 | Q Mr. Webster, the exhibit that's been marked |
| 14 | as 262 , I just want to make it clear on the record, |
| 15 | the first page of this document, this was a document |
| 16 | that was provided to you by Mr. Kennedy; correct? |
| 17 | A That's correct. |
| 18 | Q And the only authorship that you have on the |
| 19 | first page of this document was the handwritten |
| 20 | calendar year? |
| 21 | A Yes. |
| 22 | Q And then the second page, it's your testimony |
| 23 | that that's just a copy of page 2 of your appraisal? |
| 24 | A Yes. |
| 25 | Q This second page was not provided to you by |
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Mr. Kennedy?
A That's correct.
MR. WILEY: Nothing further.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: I have one quick question,
Mr. Webster. In your letter dated August 19, 2017, you refer to a NuVeda, LLC balance sheet dated August 8, 2017. Is that the first page of the exhibit that we've been going over?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: So that is the balance sheet that you're referencing?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Any other follow up?
MR. FEUERSTEIN: No.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Thank you, Mr. Webster.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: I believe our next witness is Dr. Pej Bady.

Thereupon, DR. PEJMAN BADY,
called as a witness by the Claimant having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q Good morning, Dr. Bady. How are you?
A Good morning, sir. I'm good.

Q Bear with me one second.
MR. DUSHOFF: Mr. Feuerstein, did you want me to make an extra copy of that?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: If you could. It doesn't have to be right now.

Q Dr. Bady, you were here yesterday when there was a discussion about Dr. Bahri. Do you recall that?

A Yes.
Q Do you recall previously testifying in this case that you had pledged an interest to Dr. Bahri--

MR. DUSHOFF: Objection. Relevance. We have already discussed all causes of action. No attorneys' fees against them regarding Bahri and so forth. This is discussing the value of them.

What they're going into right now is alleged allegations of potential self-dealing with Dr. Bahri and issues with Dr. Bahri pledging shares and so forth, which is beyond the scope of what we're testifying to today.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Not really.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Overruled.
BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:

Q Do you recall testifying to that previously?

A I'm sorry. To what?
Q Do you recall testifying previously in this case about pledging shares to Dr. Bahri?

A I don't recall exactly. Can you refresh my memory?

Q Yes, be happy to. If you could look at - you're going to have to go into the exhibit. There's your computer. You have a deposition transcript dated January 12th, 2018 .

MR. WILEY: What exhibit number?
MR. FEUERSTEIN: It doesn't have an exhibit number. The depositions aren't numbered as exhibits.

MR. WILEY: I don't think we have it. I think we just have exhibits.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: No. My little thumb drive --

THE WITNESS: This only has exhibits. Is there an exhibit number?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Let me see if $I$ can help you. Did you not load the depositions on here? MR. DUSHOFF: He's there. Which one do you want?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'm actually going to change my mind. So January 16, 2018.

MR. DUSHOFF: Okay.
BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q If you could turn, Dr. Bady, to page, transcript page 112. You probably have the same one as me, so it's going to be page 29 of the PDF.

A Okay.
MR. DUSHOFF: Your Honor, if there's a question before him and he wants to impeach him with the deposition, that's proper use of a deposition.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: I asked him if he recalled -- okay. Let me ask the question.
(Cross-talking.)
BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q Let me ask the question. Dr. Bady, do you recall testifying previously in this case that you had pledged two percent interest to Dr. Bahri at a $\$ 25$ million valuation?

A I don't remember exactly what I said, but I can go -- I can answer that question.

Q Let me ask, do you recall pledging to Dr. Bahri a two percent interest at a $\$ 25$ million valuation?

A Yes.
Q You thought -- Dr. Bahri is your friend; correct?

| 1 | A Yes. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q You weren't trying to rip Dr. Bahri off, were |
| 3 | you? |
| 4 | A No. |
| 5 | Q You were giving him what you thought was a |
| 6 | generous deal? |
| 7 | A No, that's the deal that Shane came up with, |
| 8 | the valuation that we had to use at that time. |
| 9 | Q And Dr. Bahri agreed with it? |
| 10 | A Yes. |
| 11 | Q Can you give me the time frame of when that |
| 12 | was? |
| 13 | A That was when we were trying to raise money, |
| 14 | which was, I would say -- actually, I take it back. |
| 15 | We never pledged the licenses because two weeks later, |
| 16 | Shane dropped the value of the company from \$25 |
| 17 | million to $\$ 10 \mathrm{million}$, and Dr. Bahri was very upset |
| 18 | about losing his value in the company over two weeks. |
| 19 | So he said I don't want to do this. He |
| 20 | threatened a lawsuit and that sort of thing. So |
| 21 | nothing was ever pledged. None of the percentages |
| 22 | ever went to anyone. The whole thing just went belly |
| 23 | up. |
| 24 | Q There was a point in time, Dr. Bady, that you |
| 25 | pledged two percent to Dr. Bahri for a $\$ 25$ million |
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valuation; correct?
A Define "pledge." Nothing ever got
transferred. No percentage of the company ever got transferred.

Q I'm not asking whether it actually got transferred. You had a deal with Dr. Bahri where you were going to give him two percent -- let me finish my question.

A Oh, I'm sorry.
Q Where you gave him a two percent interest at a valuation of $\$ 25$ million dollars. Is that fair to say?

A We discussed it.
Q Did you come to an agreement on it?
A We did. Verbal agreement, no documentation.

Q Did Dr. Bahri contribute money in connection with that agreement?

A He loaned us -- from what I recall, he loaned us a million dollars to purchase the land in Apex. And we were going to use, from what I recall, half of it towards a percentage buying shares in the company and half of it as a loan.

Q And that money that was going towards shares in the company was that $\$ 25$ million valuation when you

| 1 | agreed to this deal? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A Originally. |
| 3 | Q Okay. |
| 4 | A But the whole -- |
| 5 | Q There's no question pending. |
| 6 | There came a point in time, Dr. Bady, that |
| 7 | you met with an individual named Dr. Clauretie. Is |
| 8 | that fair to say? |
| 9 | A Yes, it is. |
| 10 | Q How much time did you spend with him? |
| 11 | A I don't recall. I met with him a few |
| 12 | occasions actually. |
| 13 | Q How many times? |
| 14 | A Probably three times. |
| 15 | Q Do you recall where you met him? |
| 16 | A I think once was at the CW offices in Ali |
| 17 | Baba, and I think I met him once at Joe Kennedy's |
| 18 | office, I believe. |
| 19 | Q Any other times? |
| 20 | A I don't remember. |
| 21 | Q What were the purposes of your meetings? |
| 22 | A He was going to ask questions about the |
| 23 | company and information that he was discussing with |
| 24 | Joe. |
| 25 | Q Did you or Mr. Kennedy give Dr. Clauretie any |
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documents?
A Yes.
Q What documents?
MR. WILEY: I'm going to object. This is going towards litigation work-product. It could be privileged.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Mr. Clauretie is an expert.

MR. WILEY: Correct.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: So if he was given documents, that would be in his work file.

MR. WILEY: Correct.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: And expert work files are discoverable.

MR. WILEY: With respect to the documents, yes. But if we're going to go down the avenue of discussions that were had between Dr. Bady and Dr. Clauretie, that is privileged information.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: I've always understood they were not.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: I agree. And I would just further add that I expect -- we've already talked about Dr. Clauretie's report, some motions in limine in this case, and frankly Dr. Bady's testimony is a little startling because there were no documents or
very few documents that Dr. Clauretie reported he relied on.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: You can get to that, but I'm going to allow this questioning. I'm going to overrule the objection.

BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q Did you provide Dr. Clauretie any documents?

A I did not.
Q Did Mr. Kennedy?
A I think so.
Q Do you recall what those documents were?
A I think they were balance sheets and that sort of thing. I don't remember exactly.

Q Did you provide Dr. Clauretie any documents with respect to sales of licenses?

A No. I did give him information of a gentleman who's been involved in the cannabis industry before Nevada got on the market, and I told him -gave him the information to contact him. I did do that. I forgot to say that. I apologize.

Q Was that the extent of your conversations about valuations for licenses with Dr. Clauretie?

A Yes, I believe so. This is a long time. I don't remember. We only met a few times. I don't

| 1 | remember exactly what we talked about. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q What was the name of the person that you |
| 3 | gave -- |
| 4 | A Um -- |
| 5 | Q Let me finish my question. What was the name |
| 6 | of the person that you gave Dr. Clauretie? |
| 7 | A Last name is Paris Balaouras or something |
| 8 | like that. |
| 9 | MR. DUSHOFF: I have a spelling for that if |
| 10 | you'd like me to provide that. |
| 11 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: That would be great. |
| 12 | MR. DUSHOFF: S-m-i-t-h. |
| 13 | B-a-l-a-o-u-r-a-s. |
| 14 | BY MR. FEUERSTEIN: |
| 15 | Q Dr. Bady, you've seen Mr. Webster's appraisal |
| 16 | of the company? |
| 17 | A Yes. |
| 18 | Q Do you recall what the number was they |
| 19 | thought the fair market value of the company was? |
| 20 | $A \quad$ No. |
| 21 | Q A million, six? |
| 22 | A Yep. |
| 23 | Q At the time he issued that appraisal, NuVeda |
| 24 | was being sued by Ms. Goldstein; correct? |
| 25 | A Yes. |
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| 1 | Q Mr. Terry; correct? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A Yes. |
| 3 | Q Forefront; correct? |
| 4 | A Yes. I don't know the timing of Forefront, |
| 5 | but there was an issue there. |
| 6 | Q There was an issue. Any other lawsuits |
| 7 | against NuVeda? |
| 8 | A The 2113 issue, 2113 progressed, so I don't |
| 9 | know exactly where. |
| 10 | Q Well, if you look in what's been marked as |
| 11 | Exhibit 261, did we lose that document somehow? Did |
| 12 | he take it with him? |
| 13 | A Probably. |
| 14 | Q The valuation contemplated the 2113 number; |
| 15 | correct? Do you see that in the liabilities? |
| 16 | A Yes. The first one, yes. |
| 17 | Q So Dr. Bady, why didn't you sell the company |
| 18 | to Mr. Terry and Ms. Goldstein for a million, six? |
| 19 | A They didn't ask me. |
| 20 | Q You would have sold it -- you're testifying |
| 21 | today -- |
| 22 | A I don't think I would have sold it. |
| 23 | Q Why not? |
| 24 | A I started this company for different reason |
| 25 | and this had a whole different set of values for me. |
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Plus, to try to hijack the company, I would never deal with them.

Q So you were just making a bad business decision, but --

MR. DUSHOFF: Objection. Argumentative.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'll withdraw the question.
Q Dr. Bady, I just want to make sure I have my timing of events right. Do you recall when first recreational marijuana sales took place?

A When the first sale took place?
Q Approximately.
A Yeah. July -- it was --
MR. DUSHOFF: Objection. Vague.
Is it for NuVeda or for the entire industry?
MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'm asking for the entire industry.

THE WITNESS: Industry got voted on Question 2, 2017, was supposed to go into effect in beginning of 2018, but there was a early start program that they allowed them to have a start in July 1 to ramp up. BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:

Q Okay. And in August --
A July 1 of 2017. I apologize.
Q I understood. And Ms. Goldstein, you expelled her when?

| 1 | A August of 2017. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q And what happened in September of 2017, do |
| 3 | you recall, one month later? |
| 4 | A I don't know. Autumn. I don't recall. |
| 5 | Q Do you recall entering into an agreement to |
| 6 | sell your interest, NuVeda's interest in CWNV for more |
| 7 | than $\$ 24$ million or $\$ 26$ million? |
| 8 | A No. |
| 9 | Q Take a look, if you will, Dr. Bady, at -- we |
| 10 | need to go off the record for a second. |
| 11 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: We can go off the record. |
| 12 | (Break taken.) |
| 13 | (Joint Exhibit 263 was marked for |
| 14 | identification.) |
| 15 | BY MR. FEUERSTEIN: |
| 16 | Q Dr. Bady, I'm going to give you a document |
| 17 | we've marked as a joint exhibit list 263. |
| 18 | Take a look at the document and then I'll ask |
| 19 | you to turn the page to the end. Let me know if you |
| 20 | recognize any of those signatures. |
| 21 | A I do. |
| 22 | Q Who signed the top? |
| 23 | A That's -- I think that's Pouya Mohajer. |
| 24 | Q Who signed the second one? |
| 25 | A That's me. |
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| 1 | Q That's Mr. Kennedy below you? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A Yes. |
| 3 | Q And I believe that's Mr. Padgett; correct? |
| 4 | A Correct. |
| 5 | Q Do you understand what it means when you sign |
| 6 | a document, Dr. Bady? |
| 7 | A Yes. |
| 8 | Q What's it mean? |
| 9 | A You're agreeing to the terms. |
| 10 | Q So when you signed this document, you agreed |
| 11 | to its terms; correct? |
| 12 | A Yes. |
| 13 | Q Do you recognize this document? |
| 14 | A I do. |
| 15 | Q Let me ask you a question: In August of |
| 16 | 2017, was it your view that the MIPA was still in |
| 17 | existence? |
| 18 | A Yes. |
| 19 | Q Am I correct in saying in this document |
| 20 | that's been marked as JX263, the members, remaining |
| 21 | members of -- the members of Nye and Clark were |
| 22 | essentially selling the underlying assets for a future |
| 23 | guaranteed payment? |
| 24 | A I'm sorry. Repeat the question. |
| 25 | Q Yeah. Let's just look at the document. If |
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you look at one, two, three, four -- the fifth paragraph down, it says, "As previously contracted by CW and Clark and Nye." Do you see that?

A Uh-huh.
Q Who are Clark and Nye?
A These are the entities that own the
licenses.

Q And those were the licenses that were -those were the licenses that were, for lack of a better word, pledged or transferred pursuant to the MIPA; right?

A Correct.
Q And it says, "Clark and Nye shall transfer to CW, LLC, the marijuana-related business licenses described herein and owned by Clark and Nye, and thereby entitling $C W$ as the owner of the licenses, the ability to be engaged in all lawful businesses and sales authorized by said licenses."

Did $I$ read that correctly?
A Yes.
Q Then if $I$ read -- turn the page to page 2. And it says, "In consideration for the purchase of the aforementioned licenses." So you understand that those aforementioned licenses are the licenses that were being transferred by Clark and Nye; correct?

| 1 | A Correct. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q "And commencing on January 1, 2018, CW shall |
| 3 | pay to Glad 2B Home, LLC, a monthly payment of 2.625 |
| 4 | percent of CW's gross sales." Do you see that? |
| 5 | A Correct. |
| 6 | Q "Payment amount shall be subject to an |
| 7 | absolute minimum of $\$ 235,870$ per month." Do you see |
| 8 | that? |
| 9 | A Yes. |
| 10 | Q When you signed on behalf of Nye, you agreed |
| 11 | to those terms; correct? |
| 12 | A Yes. |
| 13 | Q It then goes on in the following paragraph, |
| 14 | it says, the last sentence of the next paragraph, "The |
| 15 | minimum term for this payment arrangement shall be |
| 16 | eight years commencing on January 1, 2018." Do you |
| 17 | see that? |
| 18 | A Yes. |
| 19 | Q Do you know how much minimum payment that |
| 20 | would have entitled G2BH over the term of the |
| 21 | contract? |
| 22 | A To be honest, this never transpired, got |
| 23 | rescinded. No money got exchanged. We just never |
| 24 | went into effect. |
| 25 | Q That's not my question. My question is do |
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you understand how much money, what we just read, at a minimum would have entitled G2BH to?

A I don't know the exact calculation, but $I$ can guess.

Q Give me your guess.
A It would be over $\$ 20$ million.
Q Now, go to the next paragraph. It says, "In addition to CW's monthly payments to $G 2 B H$ on or before January 1, 2018, CW shall transfer to G2BH a two percent equity holding of CW." Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q Do you have any idea sitting here today what that valuation could be, two percent to CW?

A Right now?
Q No. At the time that you entered into the contract.

A I have no idea what that means.
Q Then it had some terms in the event there was a sale.

MR. WILEY: Is that a question?
MR. FEUERSTEIN: No, I was just making a statement.

Q At the same time, Dr. Bady, there were certain agreements that had been entered into between either the members of NuVeda or the subsidiary, Clark

Natural and Apex. Do you recall that?
A Can you say it again.
Q Yeah. In 2016, plus or minus, there were certain agreements that had been entered into between the Clark Natural Medical Solutions, not this one, and the group of entities known as Apex. Are you aware of those documents?

A Are you talking about the Apex sale when we had the property in Apex?

Q No, I'm talking about the Apex --
A Operations.
Q -- operations?
A Yes.
Q And you were aware of that?
A Yes.
Q As of August of 2017, that agreement was still in place. Is that fair to say?

A Yes.
Q And in September of 2017, that agreement was still in place, correct, in Apex operations?

A In North Las Vegas?
Q Yes.
A Yes.
Q Is that -- I'm just curious, is that agreement still in force today?
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| 1 | A Yes. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q Dr. Bady, did you ever meet with Mr. Webster |
| 3 | prior to today? |
| 4 | A No. |
| 5 | Q Did you ever meet with a group called |
| 6 | Anthem? |
| 7 | A Yes. |
| 8 | Q What did you meet with Anthem about? |
| 9 | A I wanted them to look at the -- the Parker |
| 10 | report. |
| 11 | Q Did you personally retain Anthem? |
| 12 | A Yes. |
| 13 | Q Do you know how much time Anthem spent on |
| 14 | this report? |
| 15 | A No. |
| 16 | Q Did they bill you for their time? |
| 17 | A I'm sorry. |
| 18 | Q Did they bill you for their time? |
| 19 | A Yes. I don't know the exact amount. |
| 20 | Q Do you have an approximation? |
| 21 | A Yes. I think -- the dollar amount? |
| 22 | Q Yes. |
| 23 | A Between the few times they worked for us, I |
| 24 | think close to \$10,000, something like that. |
| 25 | Q And you mentioned a man named Paris |
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Balaouras?
A Balaouras, something like that.
Q Do you know what Mr. Balaouras does?
A Yes.
Q What does he do?
A He is in the cannabis industry. From what I understand, he started in the Arizona market, I think they're in the California market and the Nevada market. They own dispensaries, I believe, in all three markets.

Q He's also in the Nevada market?
A Yes.
Q Do you know what company he owned or has owned in Nevada?

A I don't know the ownership structure. I think he's involved with Acres. I don't think, I know he's involved with Acres.

Q Any other companies?
A I don't know the detail of his stuff.
Q Do you happen to know whether he sold any businesses in Nevada? Cannabis businesses, of course.

A I know they sold stuff in Arizona, his company did. I don't know the details, I just know he's a very well-known and respected, knowledgeable guy in the industry.
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identification two documents, 264, to the extent they get admitted. I'll represent on the record that they are printouts from websites concerning MJ Holdings and Paris Balaouras.

MR. DUSHOFF: I'd be making the same objection that they made to us regarding the Terra Tech and any articles regarding Terra Tech in this matter, printing them out and articles from where, I don't know.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Terra Tech article was in. ARBITRATOR BAKER: I believe it was the SEC part that we allowed in this form. You had an objection to the other two pages and I did not allow those.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Right. And unlike those two pages, these pages have a source of the material coming from the website. You can confirm it for yourself, should you choose. The authenticity of it is not the same as what you were printing out with the source material.

MR. DUSHOFF: With all due respect, I could have just gone online, we could have all gone online from Terra Tech and seen exactly where that was from, but didn't have the opportunity to do so. The objection did not get those in.

But he challenged my authenticity of literally going to Terra Tech's website and there it was. I'm just going to raise the same objection here and leave it up to you for your ruling on that.

MR. WILEY: I'll argue relevancy as well.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'll tie the relevance in in a moment.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Let me see it.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: To be clear, Joint Exhibit 257 is the same quality document.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: I'll overrule. I'll allow some questions on that. Is this one exhibit?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: These are two exhibits, 264 and 265 .
(Joint Exhibit 264 and 265 were marked for identification.)

MR. WILEY: Which one is 264?
MR. FEUERSTEIN: The article is 264 and the printout with the stock price is 265.

MR. DUSHOFF: I understand your ruling. The Terra Tech had to do with valuing. When you say article in, it was a value of the -- that they purchased, which is clearly relevant to what we were talking about is the value of the purchase or sale of, I think marijuana establishments.

This has nothing to do with value in this case. It really just talks about, after reading it, that Mr. Balaouras is to assume the CEO role. And there is no other information. But there's nothing in here that has anything to do with --

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Let me just stop you. I don't think I've heard a question yet on what he's asking. You can object to relevance when he asks questions that don't go to the issue of value, but I haven't even heard a question yet. But I understand your objection, but let's hear what he's going to ask. BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:

Q Dr. Bady, have you had a chance to look over Exhibit 264 yet?

A Both these?
Q Just one of them, just 264.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: 264 is the one without the graph on it.

MR. WILEY: Everyone okay with me marking this one?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: No objection.
THE WITNESS: I have it.
BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q Take a moment and let me know when you've taken a look. I'll direct your attention to the

| 1 | question. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A Okay. |
| 3 | Q Do you see that there, this represents 264, |
| 4 | an announcement of a definitive agreement of MJ |
| 5 | Holdings to acquire Red Earth. Do you see that? |
| 6 | A Yes. |
| 7 | (Court reporter asks for clarification.) |
| 8 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: Red Earth. |
| 9 | Q Do you see if you go into the second |
| 10 | paragraph below, the sort of bullet points, it says, |
| 11 | "In connection with the acquisition, Paris Balaouras, |
| 12 | manager of Red Earth and a seasoned entrepreneur, will |
| 13 | serve as CEO of the combined company and will assume |
| 14 | the role of chairman of the board upon close of the |
| 15 | transaction." Do you see that? |
| 16 | A Yes. |
| 17 | Q Does this refresh your recollection at all |
| 18 | how Mr. Balaouras became involved with MJ Holdings? |
| 19 | A I mean, I know how he came involved. |
| 20 | Q Is this how he became involved with MJ |
| 21 | Holdings? |
| 22 | A From what I read, yes. |
| 23 | Q And it says that, "Red Earth is a holder of a |
| 24 | provisional cannabis cultivation license." Do you see |
| 25 | that in the first bullet point? |


| 1 | A Okay. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q And do you see in the second bullet point, |
| 3 | "All Red Earth unit holders will receive approximately |
| 4 | \$52.7 million common shares of MJ Holdings." Do you |
| 5 | see that? |
| 6 | A Yes. |
| 7 | Q Take a look at what's been marked as Joint |
| 8 | Exhibit 265. Do you see that that's a quote for MJ |
| 9 | Holdings corporate. Do you see that? |
| 10 | A What do you mean by "quote." |
| 11 | Q A stock quote, yes. A stock quote. |
| 12 | A Yes. |
| 13 | Q And do you see in the bold, sort of on the |
| 14 | left-hand side under MJ Holdings, it says, 98 cents. |
| 15 | Do you see that? |
| 16 | A Yes. |
| 17 | Q And do you see if you go down a little bit |
| 18 | farther, it says it's a historical quote. Do you see |
| 19 | that? |
| 20 | A Uh-huh. |
| 21 | Q And it has a date. What's the date? |
| 22 | A November 14, 2017. |
| 23 | Q Right. It's the same date as the article was |
| 24 | printed in Exhibit 264; is that correct? |
| 25 | A Yes. |

Q And if $I$ did some very rough multiplication and I multiplied 52.7 million shares by 98 cents, what do I get, Dr. Bady?

A Fifty million.
Q Approximately 50 million; right? And that was for one provisional cultivation license in Las Vegas; isn't that correct?

MR. DUSHOFF: Objection. That's not what this says. It says it purchased Red Earth. I have no idea what other assets or anything else Red Earth has. He's saying that they have this cultivation license. That's what they specifically --

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Sustained.
BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q Dr. Bady, do you have any idea what other assets Red Earth has?

A I don't know Red Earth, what they own. The answer is no.

Q Dr. Bady, I want to go back for a moment to 263, which is the purchase and sale agreement. The company -- if Clark and Nye had already entered into the MIPA, and as you testified, the MIPA was an enforceable agreement at the time, why did you sign Joint Exhibit 263?

A We were trying to streamline our business.

We thought this would be a good situation for us, and it didn't work out.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Pass the witness.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. WILEY:
Q Dr. Bady, while you're looking at Exhibit J263, let me ask you a couple of questions regarding that. I believe your testimony was the status of the PSA, is that still in full force and effect?

A This thing?
Q Yes, J263.
A No.
Q What steps did the execution of that document take to make sure that that document was no longer in full force and effect?

A This whole thing was rescinded with another document. I don't know --

Q And were the terms and conditions of the MIPA always in full force and effect from execution of said document?

A Yes.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Sorry. What's the "said document"?

MR. WILEY: The MIPA.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Objection.

| 1 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: Sustained. Can you |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | rephrase that. |
| 3 | BY MR. WILEY: |
| 4 | Q Since the MIPA was executed in December of |
| 5 | 2015, has that document been in full force and |
| 6 | effect? |
| 7 | A Yes. |
| 8 | Q In fact, it's been testified by you in court |
| 9 | proceedings before? |
| 10 | A Yes. |
| 11 | Q And you recall Mr. Padgett testifying that in |
| 12 | the district court hearing? |
| 13 | A I don't recall. |
| 14 | Q Did any party perform any obligations |
| 15 | required of Exhibit J263? |
| 16 | A No. |
| 17 | Q Did Clark or Nye receive any monies or |
| 18 | distributions as set forth in J263? |
| 19 | A No. |
| 20 | Q Was there ever any transfer of equity |
| 21 | holdings as contemplated by Exhibit J263? |
| 22 | $A \quad$ No. |
| 23 | Q Talk about the overall financial structure of |
| 24 | NuVeda. Since entering into the MIPA, has NuVeda |
| 25 | received any distributions from CWNV? |
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| 1 | A No. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q Has CWNV been a profitable enterprise at any |
| 3 | time since the execution? |
| 4 | $A \quad$ No. |
| 5 | Q Has NuVeda or any of its subsidiaries |
| 6 | received any monies pursuant to the MIPA? |
| 7 | A No. |
| 8 | Q Do you recall -- |
| 9 | A I'm sorry. I've got to correct that. Yes, |
| 10 | there was a debt sheet at the end of MIPA that was |
| 11 | supposed to pay some debts back and we had paid some |
| 12 | of those debts. I don't remember exactly, but we |
| 13 | received some money from $C W$ to pay those debts, |
| 14 | small amount. I don't remember exact amount. |
| 15 | Small. |
| 16 | Q Do you recall Mr. Feuerstein asking you about |
| 17 | documents provided to Dr. Clauretie? |
| 18 | A Yes. |
| 19 | Q Do you recall providing any documents to |
| 20 | Dr. Clauretie? |
| 21 | A I don't recall. |
| 22 | Q You could have? |
| 23 | A Yes. |
| 24 | Q And again, I believe your testimony was with |
| 25 | respect to Red Earth, LLC. You don't know what that |
|  | Page 323 |


| 1 | company's portfolio includes, do you? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A No. |
| 3 | Q You were here for Shane Terry's testimony |
| 4 | yesterday; right? |
| 5 | $A \quad Y e s$. |
| 6 | Q Did you hear Mr. Terry testify as to the |
| 7 | acquisition of a cultivation license? |
| 8 | A Yes. |
| 9 | Q Do you recall the amount that Mr. Terry paid |
| 10 | for that cultivation license? |
| 11 | A $\quad \$ 200,000$. |
| 12 | Q Do you recall Shane Terry testifying about |
| 13 | the acquisition of a production license? |
| 14 | A Yes. |
| 15 | Q And do you recall the acquisition or the |
| 16 | price of that production license? |
| 17 | A Yes, \$200,000. |
| 18 | Q Do you recall Mr. Terry's testimony as to |
| 19 | when the acquisition of the cultivation license and |
| 20 | production license occurred? |
| 21 | A It was in 2016, I believe. I'm sorry. I |
| 22 | don't recall the month he said. I'm not sure. |
| 23 | MR. WILEY: No further questions. |
| 24 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: Mr. Feuerstein, do you |
| 25 | have any additional questions? |
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MR. FEUERSTEIN: Yes.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q Dr. Bady, what's your understanding of CW's obligations pursuant to the MIPA?

A There was a series of obligations. They were supposed to build out the cultivation. They were --

Q Processing; right?
A Processing.
Q What else were they supposed to do?
A They were supposed to manage the dispensary, run and manage the dispensaries.

Q How about build out the dispensaries?
A Yes. I'm sorry. They did, yes.
Q How about stock the dispensaries?
A Yes.
Q They were supposed to do that?
A Yes. All the management running of the dispensaries was their obligation.

Q Do you recall there being a penalty clause in the MIPA in the event that if they didn't build out the cultivation or processing in a timely fashion?

A Yeah. I think the MIPA clause, when they do build it, there's supposed to be some of the monies that would come back to us first or earlier or
something like that. I don't remember exactly.
Q Do you recall, I think Mr. Wiley asked you questions about Mr. Padgett testifying in connection with the preliminary injunction hearing. Do you recall that?

A The question --
Q Yeah. Do you recall Mr. Padgett testifying?
(Court reporter asks for clarification.) BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:

Q Do you recall Mr. Padgett testifying?
A I'm sorry. I thought the question was do I recall Jason's question.

Q That's right.
A I do recall Jason's question.
Q My apologies.
Take a look, if you will, at Exhibit 164.
A Can you help me with this? This is another deposition.

Q This is the transcript from the preliminary injunction.

A Okay. What page?
Q We're on page -- I'm not on a page yet. I'm going to ask you some questions.

Dr. Bady, do you believe that Mr. Padgett is

| 1 | an honest man? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A No. |
| 3 | Q You think -- you understand he's a lawyer; |
| 4 | correct? |
| 5 | A Yes. |
| 6 | Q You think he understands what the penalties |
| 7 | of perjury are? |
| 8 | A Yes. |
| 9 | Q You understand the penalty of perjury; |
| 10 | right? |
| 11 | A Yes. |
| 12 | Q Do you think that -- you know what happens to |
| 13 | a lawyer if he perjures himself in testimony? |
| 14 | MR. DUSHOFF: Objection. Speculation. |
| 15 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'll withdraw the question. |
| 16 | Q Do you have any reason to believe that |
| 17 | Mr. Padgett perjured himself at the hearing -- |
| 18 | A Yeah. |
| 19 | Q -- on January 8, 2016? |
| 20 | MR. DUSHOFF: Objection. Speculation; |
| 21 | vague. |
| 22 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: Sustained. |
| 23 | BY MR. FEUERSTEIN: |
| 24 | Q Do you believe Mr. Padgett provided truthful |
| 25 | testimony at the hearing on January 8, 2016? |
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MR. DUSHOFF: Objection. Vague; calls for speculation; legal conclusion.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Sustained. Maybe you can narrow the question, do you believe he was truthful when he said.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'll do that.
Q When testifying about what the MIPA provided, Dr. Bady, do you believe that Mr. Padgett was truthful in his testimony?

MR. DUSHOFF: Objection. Vague. If there's a specific question, the proper use of a transcript, if there's something that he wants -- if there's something about the MIPA he wants to talk about, put down the specific -- if he's saying some things could be truthful, some things he doesn't believe they're truthful, what specific part in the transcript is he referring to.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Sustained.
Mr. Feuerstein, perhaps you could say, do you agree with Mr. Padgett said.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: I will do that in a minute.
Q Do you agree with Mr. Padgett statement, Dr. Bady, that CW had a guaranty that the greenhouse would be up and running and operational in 2016?

A Do I agree with it?

| 1 | Q Yeah. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A In that document? |
| 3 | Q I'm just asking with his testimony, Mr. |
| 4 | Padgett testimony. Do you agree with that |
| 5 | statement? |
| 6 | A Yes, he said he's going -- I believe from |
| 7 | what I recall, he said something about that. |
| 8 | Q Is that consistent with your understanding |
| 9 | of the MIPA? |
| 10 | A Yes, it is. |
| 11 | Q I'd like you to turn to page 15, Dr. Bady. |
| 12 | And if you need a little more context, you can start |
| 13 | on page 14, but I'm going to focus on line 3, page 15. |
| 14 | A I'm sorry. Line 3, you say? |
| 15 | Q Line 3. |
| 16 | A "And if it is," is that what you want? |
| 17 | Q Right. And Mr. Padgett says, "And if it is, |
| 18 | if it doesn't have a harvest in it, and it isn't |
| 19 | making money, then until such time as it does, we spec |
| 20 | out what the cost of the revenue should be per square |
| 21 | foot and then we write a check monthly to CWNV as lost |
| 22 | profits." Do you see that? |
| 23 | A Yes. |
| 24 | Q Do you believe that's consistent with the |
| 25 | terms of the MIPA? |
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| 1 | Q So it's your understanding, Dr. Bady, that |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | if, in fact, the cultivation and processing weren't up |
| 3 | and running by a certain date, that CW was not |
| 4 | obligated to write a check to CWNV immediately. Is |
| 5 | that your understanding? |
| 6 | A Yes. |
| 7 | Q And would have to only write a check some |
| 8 | time in the future. Is that your understanding? |
| 9 | A Yes. |
| 10 | Q But it did have an obligation, existing |
| 11 | obligation to pay that check retroactively to January |
| 12 | 2017? |
| 13 | $A \quad I$ don't remember the exact date on the MIPA, |
| 14 | but I believe the thought process is correct. |
| 15 | Q So let's look at 149, Exhibit 149, which is |
| 16 | the MIPA. |
| 17 | A What page? |
| 18 | Q 149. |
| 19 | A Got it. |
| 20 | Q And if you could turn to page, I think it's |
| 21 | 18 of the PDF, it should say on the title on the top |
| 22 | of the page, Additions to operating agreement. Do you |
| 23 | see that? |
| 24 | MR. DUSHOFF: Do you have a Bates number on |
| 25 | that? |
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MR. FEUERSTEIN: The one you guys put in here. It doesn't have the Bates on it.

MR. DUSHOFF: Really?
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Honestly. Yours has a Bates number, Matt?

MR. WILEY: RESP50017.
BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q It says, Additions to operating agreement, so we're on the same page, at the top?

A Yes.
Q On the bottom of the page it says, Lost profits. Do you see that?

A Yes. I got it.
Q Why don't you read that into the record.
A "If cultivation and production are not up and running in earnest by the end of 2016, CW shall provide lost profits to CWNV based on the number of months the facilities are tardy in opening, and based on the profits those facilities actually make for the same number of months upon opening."

Q And that's your understanding of what the obligation is?

A Yes.
Q Is it your belief or is it your understanding, Dr. Bady, that that obligation still
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| 1 | exists today? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A Yes. |
| 3 | Q And it's retroactive to January 1, 2017? |
| 4 | A Yes. |
| 5 | Q And there's been no amendments to the MIPA to |
| 6 | change that obligation; correct? |
| 7 | A Correct. |
| 8 | Q And there's been no obligations to the |
| 9 | operating agreement to change that obligation; |
| 10 | correct? |
| 11 | A That is correct. |
| 12 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: No further questions. |
| 13 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: I don't have any |
| 14 | questions. Thank you. |
| 15 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: We rest. We have Joe, but |
| 16 | you're going to take him first, but Joe is part of our |
| 17 | case too. |
| 18 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: Joe Kennedy's testimony as |
| 19 | will be included. Okay. |
| 20 | (Discussion off the record.) |
| 21 | RESPONDENT'S CASE IN CHIEF. |
| 22 | MR. WILEY: Respondents recall Joe Kennedy. |
| 23 | / / / |
| 24 | / / / |
| 25 | / / / |
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Thereupon,
JOSEPH E. KENNEDY,
called as a witness by the Respondent
having been duly sworn, testified as
follows:
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. WILEY:
Q Mr. Kennedy, can you please state and spell your name for the record.

A Joseph Eugene Kennedy. J-o-s-e-p-h, E-u-g-e-n-e, $K-e-n-n-e-d-y$.

Q Mr. Kennedy, are you affiliated with NuVeda?

A I am.
Q In what way?
A I'm the CFO.
Q When did your affiliation with NuVeda begin?

A Back in 2014.
Q Were you the CFO back in 2014?
A No, some time in 2016.
Q Did you have any other title with NuVeda prior to being CFO?

A I was a board member.
Q Do you have an ownership interest?

| 1 | A I do. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q You had an ownership interest ever since your |
| 3 | affiliation with the company began? |
| 4 | A Yes. |
| 5 | Q With respect to being a CFO, what duties and |
| 6 | obligations are you responsible for on behalf of |
| 7 | NuVeda? |
| 8 | A I do the accounting for the company, I file |
| 9 | the tax returns for the company, and I prepare |
| 10 | whatever reports are requested by the management. |
| 11 | Q Do you have a background in accounting? |
| 12 | A I do. |
| 13 | Q Can you provide a brief overview of the |
| 14 | summary of your accounting background? |
| 15 | A I'm an enrolled agent. I first prepared tax |
| 16 | returns for compensation in 1970, and I have been |
| 17 | basically preparing returns ever since. |
| 18 | Q Preparing returns for who? |
| 19 | A I prepare returns -- most of my returns are |
| 20 | for corporations or for limited liability companies, |
| 21 | but I also do individual tax returns when they are |
| 22 | associated. |
| 23 | For example, if a $\mathrm{K}-1$ is issued from one of |
| 24 | the entities, I may do the tax return for that |
| 25 | individual who is seeking the $\mathrm{K}-1$. |
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| 1 | Q Do you recall the events of the summer of |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 2017 that led to Ms. Goldstein's expulsion? |
| 3 | A I do. |
| 4 | Q Do you recall participating in a meeting of |
| 5 | which the members voted on Ms. Goldstein's |
| 6 | expulsion? |
| 7 | A I did. |
| 8 | Q Do you recall which members voted in favor of |
| 9 | Ms. Goldstein's expulsion? |
| 10 | A Yes, Dr. Bady, and Dr. Mohajer. |
| 11 | Q Did you vote? |
| 12 | A I abstained. |
| 13 | Q Do you recall the combined percentage voting |
| 14 | interest that Dr. Bady and Dr. Mohajer possessed in |
| 15 | August 2017? |
| 16 | A It was more than 65 percent. |
| 17 | Q Are you familiar with the NuVeda operating |
| 18 | agreement? |
| 19 | A I am. |
| 20 | Q Specifically, provision 6.2 regarding |
| 21 | expulsion? |
| 22 | A Yes. |
| 23 | Q Do you recall the percentage of voting |
| 24 | interest required to expulse a member? |
| 25 | A Fifty-one percent. |
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| 1 | Q Is it your testimony that Dr. Bady and |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Dr. Mohajer had the requisite voting interest to |
| 3 | expulse Ms. Goldstein? |
| 4 | A Yes. |
| 5 | Q Did you participate in the drafting of the |
| 6 | NuVeda operating agreement? |
| 7 | A No. |
| 8 | Q Do you know who did -- |
| 9 | A Yes. |
| 10 | Q -- prepare the operating agreement? |
| 11 | A Yes. |
| 12 | Q Who's that? |
| 13 | A Jennifer Goldstein. |
| 14 | Q In the weeks leading up to the vote of Ms. |
| 15 | Goldstein's expulsion, did you review the operating |
| 16 | agreement, specifically section 6.2, to ensure that |
| 17 | the company complied with that provision? |
| 18 | A No. |
| 19 | Q Did you have any discussions -- and please |
| 20 | answer this yes or no -- with counsel regarding the |
| 21 | provisions of 6.2? |
| 22 | A Yes. |
| 23 | Q This was prior to Ms. Goldstein's |
| 24 | expulsion? |
| 25 | A Yes. |
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Q Again, without getting into specifics, were you provided an opinion as to whether or not NuVeda was complying with the provisions of 6.2?

A Yes.
Q Do you recall the provisions of 6.2 requires the company to hold a meeting in order for an expulsion to occur?

A Yes.
Q Did NuVeda notice and hold that meeting?
A They did.
Q What's your understanding as to retention of an appraiser to provide a fair market value as to the expulsed member's interest?

A Was the question what was my -- can you please repeat.

Q Sure. What is your understanding as to the events that NuVeda must undertake in retaining an appraiser to value the interest of an expulsed member?

A After the member's been expelled, within the 30 days we're required to get an independent appraiser, licensed appraiser to appraise the company as of the date of the expulsion, and to present the appraisal to the expelled member, and to prepare to pay the member according to the rules, which could
involve four separate payments.
Q Who from NuVeda was primarily responsible for the retention of an appraiser to provide the appraisal of Ms. Goldstein's interest?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question.
(Record read.)
THE WITNESS: That was me.
BY MR. WILEY:
Q Ultimately you made a selection of Mr. Webster?

A Yes.
Q Did you know Mr. Webster prior to retaining him on behalf of NuVeda?

A He had done the appraisal when Shane Terry had been expelled in March of '16.

Q And what steps or actions did you take personally with respect to the retention of Mr. Webster?

A I called Mr. Webster and explained what - our requirements, and $I$ asked him what he needed me to have prepared for him and we arranged a meeting.

Q Did Mr. Webster request certain information from NuVeda to assist him with the appraisal?

A He did.

| 1 | Q What did he ask for? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A He asked for a current balance sheet and a |
| 3 | profit and loss statement. |
| 4 | Q And you provided that information to him? |
| 5 | A I did. |
| 6 | Q And you possessed that information personally |
| 7 | at the time? |
| 8 | A Yes. |
| 9 | Q Anybody else from NuVeda prepare the |
| 10 | company's financials at that time? |
| 11 | A No. |
| 12 | Q Did NuVeda use an outside accounting firm at |
| 13 | any time in 2017? |
| 14 | A Yes, we had our tax returns reviewed by |
| 15 | Michael Singer company. |
| 16 | Q Was there any information that Mr. Webster |
| 17 | requested that NuVeda could not provide him to assist |
| 18 | him in his preparation for the appraisal? |
| 19 | A No. |
| 20 | Q It's your understanding that provision 6.2 of |
| 21 | the operating agreement simply provides for an |
| 22 | appraisal of the fair market value of the expulsed |
| 23 | member? |
| 24 | A I understand that, yes. |
| 25 | Q No special report or expert report or audit |
|  | Page 340 |

needs to be done to calculate the interest of an expulsed member?

A I made an effort to make sure that the information $I$ provided to the appraiser was accurate and current.

Q Other than providing the information to Mr . Webster, did you assist in the preparation of the appraisal in any way?

A I had discussions with him about certain liabilities that the company had and we came to a consensus on how to treat them in the appraisal.

Q Specifically, can you expand upon your answer, any questions that Mr. Webster might have had?

A Well, we discussed the Forefront litigation and the Shane Terry litigation, and we decided that there was no practical way to determine what the liability was for either of those -- those litigations.

So we made a note at the bottom of the balance sheet to say that those were not considered because the range was so great and the possibility of us correctly deciding what those numbers would be was -- we decided was not possible. So we simply made a note that those two liabilities would be left out.

Q Let's go ahead and look at the appraisal. And I don't know, did Mr. Webster take his copy? ARBITRATOR BAKER: I think he may have. MR. WILEY: What was the appraisal? What number? MR. FEUERSTEIN: 261.

BY MR. WILEY:
Q Mr. Kennedy, you're looking at Exhibit 261?
A I am.
Q And do you recognize this document?
A I do.
Q Turn to the bottom of that page, the assets. The second asset was this 35 percent of CWNV, LLC, at a valuation of $\$ 3.5$ million; correct?

## A Correct.

Q How did you come up with that valuation and the determination of that amount?

A There were two dispensary licenses and based on what I knew from inquiry of the current sale price of dispensary licenses, it was about $\$ 5$ million a license at that time. So we had $\$ 10 \mathrm{million}$ for the two dispensary licenses. We had two --

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Objection to -- the
testimony he's testifying to now is hearsay. Whatever his information is, is from some third party who's not
testifying at this hearing. He is saying I heard it from other sources.

So none of this testimony, which is from outside parties who aren't appearing, so I don't know how Mr. Kennedy gets to get that in.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Well, if I understand, Mr. Wiley, you're having him testify as to how he came up with this $\$ 3.5$ million, which was on this sheet, which was then transferred into here. So I'm going to overrule the objection.

BY MR. WILEY:
Q Go ahead, Mr. Kennedy.
A Then we had a production and a cultivation license that we valued at $\$ 200,000$ each, and then we took 35 percent of that amount.

Q Then the final asset down there at Clark Natural, can you explain how you came up with that evaluation?

A We had a production and cultivation license for North Las Vegas that was held under that subsidiary. And at the time, I was told that there were too many production licenses in North Las Vegas. So we had $\$ 200,000$ for the cultivation license and $\$ 150,000$ for the production license.

Q And those amounts were booked on NuVeda's
balance sheet?
A Yes.
Q Let's go ahead and turn the page to liabilities. First liability is a judgment of 2113 Investors, LLC, in the amount of $\$ 1.3$ million. Can you explain what that judgment and that liability entails?

A When NuVeda had bid on the North Las Vegas, the 2113 North Las Vegas Boulevard site in North Las Vegas, they bid $\$ 2.5$ million for that site, which they understood or we all understood to include an approval for a dispensary license, because the owner of the property was the City of North Las Vegas and they were anxious to dispose of it.

So the bid of $\$ 2.5$ million was accepted as the highest bid. And so when the time came, which was December 31st, 2014, I believe, when the time came to pay for it, about seven days before the funds were due, I was contacted by Dr. Bady and he said our investors are not going to come through, so we're going to need to raise the cash ourselves.

So I went to my lines of credit. I took my cash from the bank. Dr. Bady did the same thing and we came up with the $\$ 2.5$ million.

But I was unwilling to buy the property in
the name of NuVeda because none of the other members who owned, Dr. Mohajer, Shane Terry and Jennifer Goldstein and the Winmill group who had such a large interest in it, that $I$ was fearful for the invested money.

So about a month later, the second dispensary site came up. We had raised no funds, so we put both sites into the company, 2113 Investors, LLC.

So I arranged for a lease to be created, which would transfer both sites to NuVeda for the exact amount that was paid for those -- that 2113 had paid for those sites so that -- because we were anticipating that funds would be coming in some time in the next few months.

The funds never came in, and the lease payments were never made, and the property was -- the Third Street property was demolished. And the North Las Vegas property was ignored and had significant damage to the interior of the building because it wasn't properly secured during the time that NuVeda had it under lease.

So after approximately a year of no lease payments and both properties sitting there in a destroyed state, I decided that I should protect our interest and file suit against NuVeda for 2113

Investors. This amount here, it was a settlement that was signed off by all parties, including the court.

Q The 2113 --
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Before you go there, what is the timing of this, when this initial 2113

Investors coming up with the money and all this, what time period are we talking about?

THE WITNESS: To come up with the money for the original site, seven days.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: No, I mean year, month time.

THE WITNESS: So once the properties were acquired, it was approximately a year later that $I$ realized they didn't make any lease payments and they destroyed both properties and I was very concerned.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: When was the initial -when you say you came up with the $\$ 2.5$ million, what was that time period?

THE WITNESS: That was within 30 days.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Month and date approximately.

THE WITNESS: Well, it was December 31st of, I think it was 2015 .

MR. WILEY: 2014.
THE WITNESS: 2014.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Sorry. Go ahead.
BY MR. WILEY:
Q When you say all the parties signed off on the 2113 Investors settlement, which party specifically signed off on behalf of NuVeda?

A I would have to see the sheet. I don't recall.

Q Turning your attention to the fourth liability, the debt to 2 Prime, what is your understanding as to the debt to 2 Prime as of August 2017?

A That was amounts that were lent to NuVeda to continue its day-to-day business.

Q Other than the assets, the liabilities that are listed in the appraisal, were there any other assets or liabilities of the company that weren't included or provided to Mr. Webster?

A Well, they're in the appraisal, the liabilities for Shane Terry and Forefront.

Q I understand. Those aren't contemplated in the calculation --

A No, they weren't.
Q -- of the liabilities. I'm saying are there any other assets or liabilities that were excluded from being provided to Mr. Webster?

| 1 | A No. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q And that's a true and accurate overview of |
| 3 | the accounting of NuVeda as of August 2017? |
| 4 | A Yes. |
| 5 | Q Providing overview of the status of the |
| 6 | company in August of 2017, first let's start with the |
| 7 | two dispensary licenses. Were the dispensaries open |
| 8 | in August of 2017? |
| 9 | A Yes. |
| 10 | Q Approximately how long had they been open? |
| 11 | A I think North Las Vegas was December of 2016 |
| 12 | and Third Street was January of 2017. |
| 13 | Q And those dispensaries were compiling sales |
| 14 | figures and revenues during that period of open until |
| 15 | August of 2017? |
| 16 | A Yes. |
| 17 | Q How about the cultivation and production |
| 18 | license of August of 2017, was NuVeda actively |
| 19 | operating the cultivation license at that time? |
| 20 | A No. |
| 21 | Q How about the production license at that |
| 22 | time? |
| 23 | A I assume you're talking about the nine |
| 24 | licenses or do you mean the North Las Vegas licenses? |
| 25 | Q I mean both. |
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A Okay. Nye, there was a movement to start to build a production facility, but it hadn't been completed, and there was no action on the cultivation license.

Q Then with respect to Clark Medicinal?
A We were entering into an agreement with a group of investors to build a facility in North Las Vegas on Simmons Avenue and Brooks.

Q And that's --
A That would be both, the production and the cultivation.

Q Those are the Apex individuals?
A Those were the Apex individuals.
Q You were in the room for Dr. Bady's testimony; correct?

A Yes.
Q Would you agree with his assessment that NuVeda and its members have not received any distributions from inception to present date?

A Yes.
Q When the dispensaries were open, who was in charge of management of those two locations?

A CWNV.
Q Are the dispensaries still being managed by CWNevada?

| 1 | A Yes. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q And that's pursuant to the MIPA? |
| 3 | A That's pursuant to the MIPA. |
| 4 | Q Is the MIPA still in full force and effect |
| 5 | today? |
| 6 | A Yes. |
| 7 | Q Is it your testimony that the MIPA has always |
| 8 | been in full force and effect since its execution? |
| 9 | A Yes. |
| 10 | Q Are you familiar with two individuals named |
| 11 | Mr. Winmill and Mr. Penders? |
| 12 | A I am. |
| 13 | Q Who are Mr. Winmill and Mr. Penders? |
| 14 | A They are former members of NuVeda. |
| 15 | Q Do you recall when Mr. Winmill and Mr. |
| 16 | Penders relinquished their interest in the company? |
| 17 | A I remember the process. I don't remember the |
| 18 | dates. |
| 19 | Q What was the process? |
| 20 | A I negotiated with them. They had sent NuVeda |
| 21 | a bill for $\$ 133,000$ for security planning costs, and |
| 22 | they held between them at that time, one half of one |
| 23 | percent interest in the company. I negotiated the |
| 24 | amount to be paid to them down to $\$ 80,000$, and they |
| 25 | sold back their interest to NuVeda for \$1,000. |
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| 1 | Q Let's get some clarification. The payment of |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | \$80,000, that wasn't for their membership interest; |
| 3 | correct? |
| 4 | $A \quad$ Not at all. It was for their services |
| 5 | rendered. |
| 6 | Q And then the payment for the relinquishment |
| 7 | for their interest was in what amount? |
| 8 | A $\quad \$ 1,000$. |
| 9 | Q And they owned a collective what |
| 10 | percentage? |
| 11 | A One half of one percent. |
| 12 | Q So based upon that, the valuation of the |
| 13 | company would have been what? |
| 14 | A $\quad \$ 200,000$. |
| 15 | Q And that was an amount agreed to by Mr. |
| 16 | Winmill and Mr. Penders? |
| 17 | A Yes. |
| 18 | Q Turning your attention to Exhibit 198. |
| 19 | A Okay. |
| 20 | Q Joint Exhibit 198, do you recognize that |
| 21 | document? |
| 22 | A Yes. |
| 23 | Q What is it? |
| 24 | A That's the settlement agreement with the |
| 25 | Winmill Group. |
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| 1 | Q Do you see the date of that agreement? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A May 17, 2016. |
| 3 | Q So May 17, 2016, Mr. Winmill and Mr. Penders |
| 4 | relinquished their interest, their one half of one |
| 5 | percent interest for $\$ 1,000$. Is that your |
| 6 | testimony? |
| 7 | A That is. |
| 8 | Q Your testimony places a valuation of \$200,000 |
| 9 | based upon that acquisition? |
| 10 | A Yes. |
| 11 | Q After Mr. Webster prepared his appraisal, was |
| 12 | NuVeda ready, willing and able to remit payments to |
| 13 | Ms. Goldstein for her interest in the company? |
| 14 | $A \quad Y e s$. |
| 15 | Q Did NuVeda contact Ms. Goldstein regarding |
| 16 | the relinquishment of her interest through payment? |
| 17 | A Through its general counsel. |
| 18 | Q Did general counsel relay to you Ms. |
| 19 | Goldstein's response? |
| 20 | A No. |
| 21 | Q No, it wasn't conveyed to you or no, there |
| 22 | was no response? |
| 23 | A No, it wasn't conveyed to me. |
| 24 | Q At any time did Ms. Goldstein reach out to |
| 25 | you and request that payment be tendered? |
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| 1 | A No. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q NuVeda and CWNevada continued to operate as |
| 3 | if -- continued to operate pursuant to the terms and |
| 4 | conditions of the MIPA? |
| 5 | A Yes. |
| 6 | Q Does CWNevada continue to manage and run the |
| 7 | dispensaries? |
| 8 | A They do. |
| 9 | (Court reporter asks for clarification.) |
| 10 | MR. WILEY: To manage and run the |
| 11 | dispensaries. |
| 12 | Q Let's go ahead and have you look at |
| 13 | Exhibit 249. |
| 14 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: What number? |
| 15 | MR. WILEY: 249. I think we're going to run |
| 16 | into the same trouble, aren't we? That's the |
| 17 | spreadsheet. |
| 18 | Do you have any issue with Mr. Kennedy |
| 19 | looking at my 249? |
| 20 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: As long as it has your |
| 21 | answers next to it. |
| 22 | MR. WILEY: I'm not smart enough to provide |
| 23 | the answer. |
| 24 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: It's fine. |
| 25 | / / / |
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BY MR. WILEY:
Q Mr. Kennedy, Joint Exhibit 249, do you recognize that document?

A I do.
Q Can you explain to the arbitrator the sales figures that are set forth in 249 as they relate to NuVeda?

A NuVeda has -- okay. Going across the columns, NuVeda has no interest in the cultivation at Oakridge. NuVeda has no interest in the production at Ali Baba. NuVeda has no interest in the retail medical for Blue Diamond.

Has no interest in the retail rec for Blue Diamond. The retail medical for Third Street, one-third of the net revenues from that would be for NuVeda, or 35 percent, so more than one-third.

The retail rec on Third Street is the same. The retail medical at North Las Vegas Boulevard is also 35 percent of it is NuVeda. And retell rec at North Las Vegas Boulevard is the same situation, 35 percent for NuVeda.

Q What's the time period contemplated by Exhibit 249?

A It's apparently from April '17 to May of 2018.

| 1 | Q And that time period encompasses the time |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | within which Ms. Goldstein was expulsed from the |
| 3 | company; correct? |
| 4 | A Well, not entirely. She was expelled in |
| 5 | August of 2017, and there are four months before that, |
| 6 | that were -- that she was a member. |
| 7 | Q But August 2017 is included in Exhibit |
| 8 | J249? |
| 9 | A I'm sorry. |
| 10 | Q The sales for August 2017 are included in |
| 11 | J249? |
| 12 | A Yes. |
| 13 | Q What were the NuVeda sales in August of 2017 |
| 14 | as set forth in J249? |
| 15 | A Okay. |
| 16 | Q Put your math skill to the test. |
| 17 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: We'll stipulate to the |
| 18 | number. |
| 19 | MR. WILEY: Okay. |
| 20 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: It's 616,693.87. |
| 21 | THE WITNESS: Yes. |
| 22 | BY MR. WILEY: |
| 23 | Q So for that year period of time, what is the |
| 24 | approximate amount NuVeda sales from the dispensaries |
| 25 | at Third Street and North Las Vegas run? |
|  | Page 355 |


| 1 | A 7.2 million. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q Have you had a chance to review Mr. Parker's |
| 3 | expert reports? |
| 4 | A Yes. |
| 5 | Q Are you familiar with Mr. Parker's assertion |
| 6 | that the projected NuVeda revenues were 16.85 million |
| 7 | in year two, and 33.05 million in year three in his |
| 8 | report? |
| 9 | A Yes. |
| 10 | Q Is it your understanding that the time period |
| 11 | of year two in Mr. Parker's report contemplated 2016 |
| 12 | and 2017 and year three, it was 2017 and 2018? |
| 13 | A Yes. |
| 14 | Q So NuVeda didn't realize the 33.05 million in |
| 15 | revenue during that time period, did they? |
| 16 | A It did not. |
| 17 | Q The revenues didn't come close to that - |
| 18 | (Court reporter asks for clarification.) |
| 19 | BY MR. WILEY: |
| 20 | Q The NuVeda revenues did not come close to the |
| 21 | amount set forth in the Parker report, did they? |
| 22 | A They did not. |
| 23 | Q Do you believe that the sales amount set |
| 24 | forth in Joint Exhibit 249 are true and accurate? |
| 25 | A I do. |
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| 1 | Q Is there any reason to doubt their |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | veracity? |
| 3 | A No. |
| 4 | Q Let's look at -- we have all the exhibits |
| 5 | from yesterday in that pile? |
| 6 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: It should be. |
| 7 | MR. WILEY: The Apex company agreement, what |
| 8 | exhibit was that? |
| 9 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: It's between 257 and -- |
| 10 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: 259. |
| 11 | BY MR. WILEY: |
| 12 | Q Mr. Kennedy, turning your attention to Joint |
| 13 | Exhibit 259, do you recognize that agreement? |
| 14 | A I do. |
| 15 | Q Or that document, I should say. |
| 16 | Do you provide an overview as to what's set |
| 17 | forth in this exhibit? |
| 18 | A This is what I call the build it and they |
| 19 | will come agreement. This agreement says that Apex |
| 20 | ops, Apex land, Apex manager and Clark Medicinal |
| 21 | Solutions, LLC, will go into a joint venture in which |
| 22 | Apex land will purchase the land and finance the |
| 23 | building of the buildings. |
| 24 | Apex manager will manage the operations. And |
| 25 | Apex ops will be the entity to be shared by the -- all |
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three of the other entities. At this moment, the buildings have been completed.

There was contemplated it would cost about 6 million for the project. We actually ran over about 50 percent. And there's about 9 million outstanding in loans on the property.

The agreement is that all parties or all of the entities will stand as they are until the loan has been repaid. At that time, the entities will all receive an interest in Apex ops -- well, it would be land would have 20 percent, management would have 40 percent, and Clark Natural would have 40 percent. But all the outstanding debt has to be repaid before any transfers of interest occur.

So Clark Natural at this moment has its two licenses, and there's potential interest once the debt has been repaid. It's actually the value of the land and buildings right now is zero because the liability against them are the exact amount that it costs to build them. That's my overview.

Q And again, this agreement has to do with the cultivation and production license that is held by Clark Natural?

A Correct.
Q And it's your testimony that that entity
still holds those two licenses?
A That entity still holds those two licenses.
Q Until the retirement of the debt?
A Until the retirement of the debt.
Q What benefit did Clark Natural receive under this intercompany agreement?

A The buildings have been constructed by the other parties, which Clark Natural never could have afforded to do, or just couldn't afford to do.

And at the end of the retirement of the debt,
presuming that the debt has been retired from income from the venture, at that time, Clark Natural will share in 40 percent of the net income generated by the enterprise.

MR. WILEY: Look at my notes real quick.
Pass the witness.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Can we take a -- what would you like to do, Arbitrator Baker? I'm not going to fall within my seven minutes.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: I do need to take a break at 12:30 to make a call. If you guys want to break now and we can come back at 1:00, or if you want to get started for a little bit and want to go 15 minutes, 20 minutes.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'm happy to do that. Let
me cover one topic with Mr. Kennedy and then I think we can break for lunch.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q Mr. Kennedy, do you recall your testimony with Mr. Wiley a moment ago about the judgment to 2113 Investors that was included in the Webster group report?

A Yes.
Q You and I -- by the way, we've been in this format before. I took your deposition earlier in 2018. Do you recall that?

A I do.
Q And do you recall -- if you could summarize for Arbitrator Baker, what were the alleged damages that 2113 sought in its lawsuit against NuVeda?

A Failure to pay rent per the leases, demolition of the Third Street building and damages to the North Las Vegas building.

Q Now, you recall, and I think you testified, that you had entered into a lease on behalf of 2113 Investors and NuVeda. Do you recall that testimony?

A I do.
Q And do you recall whose obligation under the lease it was to procure insurance for the building?

| 1 | A Each party was to ensure their own |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | interest. |
| 3 | Q You're sure about that? |
| 4 | A Well, it's a triple net lease, and the |
| 5 | premium for the casualty damage to the building was to |
| 6 | be paid by NuVeda. |
| 7 | Q Who was obligated to procure the insurance? |
| 8 | A I was told it was procured by NuVeda in |
| 9 | conjunction with ensuring their own interest. |
| 10 | Q Can you answer my question, Mr. Kennedy? Who |
| 11 | was responsible under the lease to procure the |
| 12 | insurance? |
| 13 | A 2113 Investors. |
| 14 | Q That's your entity; correct? |
| 15 | A That's my entity. |
| 16 | Q Did you procure the insurance, Mr. Kennedy? |
| 17 | A No. |
| 18 | Q You also mentioned that some of your |
| 19 | liability was unpaid rent. Do you recall that? |
| 20 | A I recall that. |
| 21 | Q And do you recall that in entering into the |
| 22 | MIPA, there was a list of potential liabilities that |
| 23 | CW was going to pay on behalf of NuVeda. Do you |
| 24 | recall that? |
| 25 | A Under the MIPA? |
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| 1 | Q Under the MIPA. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A This was the appendix A? I'm sorry. |
| 3 | Q I don't remember if it's appendix $A$, but it |
| 4 | was at the back end of the MIPA. There was a chart |
| 5 | that had the potential liabilities. |
| 6 | Do you recall, Mr. Kennedy, that back rent |
| 7 | was one of the liabilities that 2113 was supposed to |
| 8 | pay -- I'm sorry -- that CW was supposed to pay on |
| 9 | behalf of NuVeda? |
| 10 | $A \quad$ No. |
| 11 | Q Let me refresh your recollection. Take a |
| 12 | look at the MIPA, which I believe is your Exhibit 149. |
| 13 | Tell me when you've opened it up. |
| 14 | A I have. |
| 15 | Q And you go to the very last page and there's |
| 16 | a chart there. Let me know when you get there. |
| 17 | A Okay. |
| 18 | Q And you see, if you look in the chart and |
| 19 | from -- counting from the bottom, it's the fourth and |
| 20 | fifth rows, there's an entry for 1320 South Third |
| 21 | Street rent and 2113 North Las Vegas Boulevard rent. |
| 22 | Do you see that? |
| 23 | A Yes. |
| 24 | Q At the bottom? |
| 25 | A Yeah, near the bottom. Fourth and fifth up |
|  | Page 362 |

from the bottom.
Q Yeah. And it's for about $\$ 240,000$. Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q That was the back rent allegedly owed by NuVeda; correct?

A I don't think 2113 was a party to this agreement.

Q I'm not asking, Mr. Kennedy, whether it was. I'm asking you, this represents that $C W$ was going to pay the debts for NuVeda to those entities?

A Yes.
Q So, so far you said that the damage you sought were rent and demolition. The rent was supposed to be paid by $C W$, and you were supposed to procure insurance for the building; correct?

A Well, actually, we had the insurance company come out and look at the building and because --

Q It's correct; yes or no? Correct; yes or no, Mr. Kennedy? You can redirect him.

MR. WILEY: He can answer the question.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: My question was, was it correct.

THE WITNESS: Repeat the question.

BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q The insurance was supposed to be procured by 2113; correct?

A Correct.
Q Now, Mr. Kennedy, you were here in the room when Dr. Bady testified about the obligations within the MIPA; correct?

A Yes.
Q And Dr. Bady testified that it was CW's obligation to build out the dispensaries; correct?

A Yes.
Q And those dispensaries are the buildings situated on those two properties, 1320 South Third Street and 2113 North Las Vegas Boulevard; correct?

A Correct.
Q So CW was picking up the cost to build the buildings; correct?

A Partially correct.
Q Now, what weren't they paying for, Mr.
Kennedy?
A They didn't pay for the structure on Third Street.

Q Where is that said anywhere in the MIPA?
A I don't know.
Q Well, take a look, Mr. Kennedy, if you will.

A Okay.
Q At page 3 of the MIPA. Tell me when you're there.

A Okay. I'm on page 3.
Q Look at section 1.1E.
A Okay.
Q And it says, "Commencing as of the effective date, CW shall commence funding and paying for 100 percent of Romanette i, all necessary tenant improvements, furniture, fixtures, equipment and fees and expenses relating thereto for the development of the facilities on the properties and all matters relating thereto in the manner, and as further described on schedule 1 attached hereto, incorporated herein by this reference collectively the tenant improvements."

Did I read that correctly?
A You did.
Q Does it carve out of that sentence anywhere it's not going to do anything with respect to the structure?

A Yes.
Q Where does it say that?
A It says tenant improvements. Tenant improvements are not the structure.

Q You'd agree with me that the definition of tenant improvements is actually a defined term in this agreement; correct?

A I'm very experienced with industrial real estate and I know what tenant improvements are. They do not include the walls, the roof, the foundation.

Q Are the walls fixtures?
A No.
Q Are the walls -- is the development of the facility part of the fixtures or part of the walls?

A My experience, all triple net leases exclude the walls, the floor and the ceiling.

Q Of course, this isn't a triple net lease; correct?

A Well, this is a separate agreement. The leases that were put in place on these --

Q I'm not asking a question about the lease. I'm asking a question with respect to this document, the MIPA, Mr. Kennedy. It says here tenant improvements, and I'm asking you, that's a defined term; correct?

A It's a term of art.
Q No, no, no. You understand what I mean by a "defined term"?

A Yeah. Where's the definition?

Q I'll point it right to you. It's right at the end of Romanette i, it says, Tenant improvements. Do you see that? It's referring to everything that was stated before that.

MR. WILEY: Is that a question?
MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'm asking if he sees that.
THE WITNESS: No. I'm sorry.
BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q It's okay. Let's go back to section l.1E on page 3.

A E?
Q E as in Edward.
A Okay. I have it.
Q And you're in Romanette i. What it says is, and you can read it to yourself, but then it says at the end, "Collectively the initial cap tenant, initial cap improvements." Do you see that?

A Collectively the tenant improvement, I see that.

Q And you have an understanding, Mr. Kennedy, of contracts and what it means when you put something in parentheses and quotes with initial caps; correct?

A Correct.
Q I've been using the phrase "defined term." Do you understand a defined term?

A I know what a defined term is.
Q And what this is reflecting in the MIPA is that the phrase or the defined term of tenant improvements means everything that was mentioned in Romanette i; correct?

A Yes.
Q Well, so if CW had the obligation to pay for everything in Romanette i, and you had the obligation to pay and procure insurance, and CW had the obligation to pay all of the back rent, how were you entitled to $\$ 1.3$ million?

A First of all, we haven't completed the discussion about what's included in E, and I'm telling you the building was not included as part of $E$. And at this late date, $I$ have no recollection of how we accounted for the award in the 2113 agreement.

I can only tell you that it was reviewed by attorneys on both sides, it was approved and it was recorded and tendered to the court.

Q Do you recall the members of NuVeda having a vote on whether to enter into that settlement?

A Since $I$ was on the other side of the agreement, $I$ didn't participate in that discussion.

Q So you have no idea whether Ms. Goldstein approved or rejected approving that settlement?

A I have no idea if anybody discussed it or what, but $I$ do know that the settlement agreement was returned to my attorney, McClairis, and then was filed.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: I think on this point, I've got through enough of 2113. If I start another area, I think we'll bleed close to 12:30. So why don't we break for lunch.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: How long do we want to break? We're in recess until one o'clock.
(Break taken.)
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Back on the record. Mr. Kennedy, you understand you're still under oath?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q Mr. Kennedy, I want to go back to parts where you started off your testimony, I guess it was this morning. You said a couple of things. I just want to make sure the record is clear.

Can you open up Exhibit 8, which should be the NuVeda operating.

A Is it 148 .
Q No, just 8 .
A Got it.
Q And I don't want to spend a lot of time with
it, but $I$ just want to direct your attention to 6.2.
A Okay.
Q And I think you had testified in response to a question from Mr. Wiley that you needed 51 percent of the vote to expulse a member. If you're looking at 6.2, is that still your testimony, 51 percent?

A No, apparently it's variable.
Q How do you mean variable?
A It says, "Voting members would be all members other than member $A$, and the vote could require 60 percent that the 80 percent disinterested voting interest to carry."

Q In fairness, I'm not trying to trick you, but it's really -- that was an example. It's in any situation, it's 60 percent of the disinterested members.

A Saying 60 percent of the 80 percent, which would be 48 percent.

Q That was just an example there because the person who's --
(Cross-talking)
Q I'm just saying, the example you pointed to, the member who's being expelled holds 20 percent; correct?

A Correct.

Q So the standard is not a 50 percent standard flat across the line. It's, as you said, variable; correct?

A Correct.
Q You also said that the appraisal has to be done, $I$ think, within 30 days, and $I$ just want to direct your attention to the next paragraph. It's not really the appraisal that has to be done, it's a notice provision; correct?

A Correct.
Q Now, you mentioned in response to some questions from Mr. Wiley, that there were conversations that you had with counsel concerning how to expel a member; is that fair to say?

MR. WILEY: Just answer yes or no to these questions.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q And who was the counsel?
A It was RGC, Allen Butell.
Q Did you happen to know if Allen Butell ever represented Dr. Bady personally?

A I don't know.
Q Do you happen to know if Mr. Butell ever represented CW personally?


| 1 | Q And same question with respect to a |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | production license; correct? |
| 3 | A Correct. |
| 4 | Q So at the time prior to entering into the |
| 5 | MIPA, is it fair to say that NuVeda held assets that |
| 6 | were worth plus or minus \$11 million? |
| 7 | A Well, the assets were worth that, but without |
| 8 | consideration of the liabilities. |
| 9 | Q I'm just asking right now about the assets. |
| 10 | A Yes. |
| 11 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: And this is prior to the |
| 12 | MIPA? |
| 13 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: Prior to the MIPA. |
| 14 | Q And what liabilities other than the one -- |
| 15 | withdraw the question. |
| 16 | What liabilities did NuVeda have at the time |
| 17 | that it entered into the MIPA? |
| 18 | A Had two dispensary licenses that required |
| 19 | building dispensaries. They had no facilities. Both |
| 20 | facilities had to be built, and they had to be built |
| 21 | in a relatively short period of time according to the |
| 22 | State. |
| 23 | Q So is it your testimony, Mr. Kennedy, that |
| 24 | the license, the dispensary license with a facility is |
| 25 | worth \$5 million, or is it just the license itself? |
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A A license that was permanent, which required having a location that was approved by the state. The license didn't have to own the facility; it just had to have a facility that the State approved of.

Q As long as it had a facility that the state approved, which made it a permanent license, in your view was worth $\$ 5$ million?

A Yes.
Q What is your basis for that?
A Some sales that happened around the time that we were looking. There was one sale in the county area, and there was one sale in the city. And my information was that they averaged out to about $\$ 5$ million.

Q Where did you get that information? Where did you get it from?

A I got it from Dr. Bady.
Q Do you know where Dr. Bady got it from?
A From the principals in the sales.
Q How do you know?
A He told me.
Q Did you do anything -- did you do anything, Mr. Kennedy, to confirm for yourself whether the valuations from Dr. Bady were accurate?

A We also had the dispensary -- we also had the
production and cultivation licenses that were temporary at the time, and the solution to making those --

Q Mr. Kennedy, I'm not asking that you question. I'm asking a different question.

I'm asking you, did you do anything to confirm for yourself whether the numbers that Dr. Bady gave you were, in fact, accurate?

A I talked to other people in the industry who confirmed.

Q Who did you talk to?
A All right. I talked to Chris, I think his name is Deglajon (phonetic), something like that. It's NG something. I spoke with Brian Padgett. I spoke with my daughter. That's about it.

Q Did you do any independent research on the Internet?

A I don't recall.
Q Did you do any -- you talk to any bankers or brokers in the business?

A Actually, we touched the cannabis industry, so no point in talking to the banks.

Q Is it your testimony, Mr. Kennedy, there's not a single bank institution brokering deals in the cannabis industry?

