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| 1 | A Yes. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q You've heard of CW Cowan -- Cowan Bank? |
| 3 | A No. |
| 4 | Q You heard of Canacort Bank (phonetic)? |
| 5 | A No. |
| 6 | Q Have you heard of World Bank of Canada? |
| 7 | A Are there any banks in Nevada you want to |
| 8 | talk about? |
| 9 | Q My question wasn't about banks in Nevada. |
| 10 | A If they bank, they have fed access for their |
| 11 | bank, then they won't touch it. It's the fed that is |
| 12 | the controlling factor. |
| 13 | Q Did you talk to any -- |
| 14 | A I don't know if there were banks that don't |
| 15 | use the fed. |
| 16 | Q Did you talk to any brokers in the cannabis |
| 17 | business in determining whether those numbers you got |
| 18 | from Dr. Bady is correct? |
| 19 | A That's a good question. No. |
| 20 | Q You talk to -- now, you have a view or you'd |
| 21 | agree with me, Mr. Kennedy, that when you combine |
| 22 | these licenses such as to create a vertical, you |
| 23 | increase the value substantially; correct? |
| 24 | A Potentially. |
| 25 | Q When would you increase the value? |
|  | Page 376 |

A Well, if you had a cultivation that could supply your production that could then put the product on your dispensary, you would have a guaranteed source, a guaranteed method of preparing your edibles and everything and a place to vend it from.

Q What do you believe the estimate value of those three licenses combined would be?

A I don't know they would be any different than they would be separately.

Q So your view now is, if I combine the licenses so $I$ can sell them in the vertical, they would be the same price as otherwise?

A I have a reason for saying that.
Q I'm just asking is that your testimony now?
A Yes.
Q Now, do you recall giving your deposition in this case, Mr. Kennedy?

A I do.
Q Do you recall testifying if you had the ability to sell a vertically-integrated license, it would add significant value? Do you recall it?

A I do.
Q So, in that case, you could add significant value, but today when you're testifying you can't?

A Because I've learned since then.
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| 1 | Q But when you testified in this case, it |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | was -- previously, it was in 2018; correct? |
| 3 | A Correct. |
| 4 | Q And your belief then was it would add |
| 5 | significant value; correct? |
| 6 | A Correct. |
| 7 | Q And your belief in 2017 was the same, that it |
| 8 | would add significant value; correct? |
| 9 | A I want to explain why. |
| 10 | Q Your lawyer can redirect you. |
| 11 | A That's fine. |
| 12 | Q It was in 2017, correct, that a |
| 13 | vertically-integrated license would add significant |
| 14 | value; correct? |
| 15 | A Thought so. |
| 16 | Q So back to my question, Mr. Kennedy, if I can |
| 17 | put you back in time. |
| 18 | A Okay. |
| 19 | Q When you thought it would add significant |
| 20 | value, how much value is "significant" in your view? |
| 21 | A I don't recall what I thought at the time. |
| 22 | Q Going back, if you can go back, what you |
| 23 | think is significant value? |
| 24 | MR. WILEY: Asked and answered. |
| 25 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: Overruled. |

MR. WILEY: You can answer.
THE WITNESS: I can't recall what $I$ thought then. I can only recall what $I$ think now. BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:

Q Now, Mr. Kennedy, are you aware of a man named Thomas Hanyie, $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{Y}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{E}$ ?

A No.
Q Are you aware of, Mr. Kennedy, of licenses for sale in Nevada in or around April of 2017, for a dispensary for $\$ 12$ million?

A I was only looking at completed sales, not what was for sale.

Q I'm asking were you aware of it?
A I was not.
Q Were you aware there was a cultivation and production facility available for sale for $\$ 12$ million in or around April of 2017?

A No.
Q Were you aware, Mr. Kennedy, that there was a vertical enterprise in Nevada being for sale in April of 2017 for $\$ 25$ million?

MR. WILEY: I'm going to object; lacks foundation.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'm asking if he's aware of it.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: Respond?
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Yes, please.
THE WITNESS: No.
BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q Were you aware there was a cultivation facility for sale for $\$ 7$ and a half million?

A No.
Q As you testified, you didn't do anything to make yourself aware when you were valuing the licenses that were on NuVeda's balance sheet; correct?

A As far as I knew, there were only two or three sales in Clark County, the total of Clark County. I didn't look for what was offered for sale because some of the asking prices were -- had no correlation to what they sold for.

Q Have you ever heard of a company called Canadian Bioceutical Corporation?

A I know a lot of Canadian some things.
Q I'll take it that you're not familiar?
A I'm not familiar.
Q And I guess you're not aware that in May of 2017, Canadian Bioceutical Corporation, that it was buying a U.S. subsidiary for $\$ 19$ million?

A I heard about significant purchases of
cannabis companies from Canadian companies.
Q And were you aware of that in 2017?
A I didn't even know if they were done by then.
Q See if I can refresh your recollection, Mr.
Kennedy. I'll mark as $I$ think we're marking it as Claimant's Exhibit 1 , marking for identification to see if we can refresh his recollection.

MR. WILEY: I think he testified, no, he doesn't.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: I thought he said what he knew about was, he's heard of Canadian companies buying, makes lots of acquisitions.

MR. WILEY: Not with respect to what you're showing him. He's not saying he has any information or knowledge as to this purported sale that you're discussing.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Let me lay some foundation.

Q Mr. Kennedy, do you have any knowledge whatsoever about Canadian Bioceutical Corporation exercising an option to purchase 100 percent of Green Mart of Nevada?

A I am not.
Q So you have no idea whether it would spend \$19 million for a cultivation and production
facility?
MR. WILEY: Objection.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Sustained.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'm going to move the document nonetheless as an exhibit, given that it's a newspaper article, again, that is two pages long with a URL link so you can check the authenticity of the document. From our perspective, it's no different than the Terra Tech article that was admitted earlier.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: I don't see any basis to get it in through this witness based upon his testimony.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Okay. We'll save it for another one.

Q Mr. Kennedy, were you involved at all in the Clauretie reports, or in helping form the Clauretie reports that are going to be testified to in a little bit?

A I did meet with Dr. Clauretie, yes.
Q What did you discuss with him?
A I gave him a balance sheet and income statement and had discussions with him about responding to questions about the company.

Q How many balance sheets did you provide?

| 1 | A I gave him the same balance sheet that I gave |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | to Mr. Webster. |
| 3 | Q Do you happen to know whether -- do you have |
| 4 | any recollection whether you gave him a balance sheet |
| 5 | from 2016 as well? |
| 6 | A I don't recall. |
| 7 | Q Take a look at the expert report, tab 2, in |
| 8 | front of you. If you would, take a look, Mr. Kennedy, |
| 9 | page 13 of that report. |
| 10 | (Witness reviewing document.) |
| 11 | A I see it. |
| 12 | Q Is that a balance sheet that you provided |
| 13 | him? |
| 14 | A I don't specifically recall. |
| 15 | Q If it wasn't you, who would it have been? |
| 16 | A I was going to say in all probability it was |
| 17 | me. |
| 18 | Q Do you see, Mr. Kennedy, that in that, in the |
| 19 | third asset down, the asset CWNV Investment, do you |
| 20 | see that? |
| 21 | A I do. |
| 22 | Q What did you say? You see it's valued at |
| 23 | \$4,470, 000? |
| 24 | A I do. |
| 25 | Q That's as of March 10, 2016; correct? |
|  | Page 383 |


| 1 | A Correct. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q And that's approximately a million 2.7, more |
| 3 | than what it was valued at in March -- in August of |
| 4 | 2017; correct? |
| 5 | A Correct. |
| 6 | Q And in August of 2017, the licenses were |
| 7 | recreational as well as medical; correct? |
| 8 | A Yes. |
| 9 | Q And in August of 2017, they were affiliated |
| 10 | with permanent structures; correct? |
| 11 | A Yes. |
| 12 | Q And they were operational; correct? |
| 13 | A Not all of them. |
| 14 | Q Really? So your testimony now is the |
| 15 | dispensary licenses in -- let me finish the |
| 16 | question -- that the dispensary licenses were not |
| 17 | operational in August of 2017? |
| 18 | A No, the dispensary licenses were, but not all |
| 19 | of the licenses were. |
| 20 | MR. WILEY: You asked about license. |
| 21 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: I realize that. |
| 22 | Q The cultivation and production licenses, they |
| 23 | were not operational in CWNV; correct? |
| 24 | A Correct. |
| 25 | Q But they were permanent; correct? |
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| 1 | A Not yet. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q They're still not permanent today? |
| 3 | A They are now; we made a pod. |
| 4 | Q When did you make that pod? |
| 5 | A In late '17. |
| 6 | Q I'll ask the same testimony question I asked |
| 7 | Dr. Bady: You understood that in the MIPA, there was |
| 8 | an obligation for $C W$ to pay money for not getting the |
| 9 | cultivation up and running by end of '16; correct? |
| 10 | A Yes. |
| 11 | Q And that obligation still exists today; |
| 12 | correct? |
| 13 | A No. I think it was offset. |
| 14 | Q What was it offset by, Mr. Kennedy? |
| 15 | A Well, we had a right to 35 percent of the net |
| 16 | income, but we also were obligated for 35 percent of |
| 17 | the net losses. |
| 18 | Q Where does it say that in the MIPA? |
| 19 | A That's what we agreed to at some point down |
| 20 | the line. |
| 21 | Q So even though Dr. Bady testified that the |
| 22 | MIPA was never amended, now you're suggesting that the |
| 23 | MIPA was changed because you agreed to offset the |
| 24 | losses? |
| 25 | A I'm saying it was interpreted to agree that |
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we would bear our share of the losses.
Q Can you point -- what document says that, Mr. Kennedy?

A The document would be the MIPA.
Q So let's look at the MIPA. MIPA, I believe it's Exhibit 149 on the computer?

Okay. Why don't you take a look at it, Mr.
Kennedy, and find me the provision that says that NuVeda would be responsible for 35 percent of the losses.
(Witness reviewing document.)
A It's on page $2,1.1 \mathrm{~B}$.
Q You had 35 percent of the issue and outstanding membership interest of CWNV. Is that what you're suggesting?

A Yeah.
Q If you look down to 1.1 E , CW was obligated to pay Romanette iii, sufficient working capital for the operations of the businesses of Clark and Nye; you see that?

A Yes.
Q And it was 100 percent of that; correct?
A For operating capital, yes.
Q One hundred percent of that?
A Yeah.

Q And one hundred percent of build-out for the dispensaries; correct?

A Yes.
Q And one hundred percent for the build-out for the cultivation and for the production; correct?

A Yeah.
Q So what losses are there, if all -- if CW is paying 100 percent of --

A Paying the capital. We have a partnership, and the partnership is defined by the federal tax code says that unless you have exceptions in the DLLC, we're liable for 35 percent of the losses, and we're also going to be credited with 35 percent of the profits. It says nothing to do with the capital expenses. The capital expenses are a different story.

Q Let me ask you a question: You're getting 35 percent of the losses as 35 percent partner; correct? That's what you're suggesting?

A I'm saying once the capital has been invested and the business is up and operating, if the business has a loss, then we're to bear what our proportionate share of the loses. If the business has a profit, we receive that proportion of the profit.

Q With all due respect, Mr. Kennedy, you agree
with me there's a difference between a tax loss or an actual loss; correct? You can allocate --

A Yeah, it's worse for the marijuana business.

Q If a business is --
A Because of the way the entities are treated. 2 ADE says you can't deduct your normal expenses.

Q Is it your testimony sitting here today, Mr. Kennedy, that NuVeda, there was a shortfall of capital, cash in the business, that NuVeda had an obligation to pay 35 percent of that short-fall, notwithstanding what we just read in section 1.1 E?

A No, not the capital. I'm talking about the income.

Q So let's make sure we're on the same page. If at the end of the day $C W$ puts in all the money to operate the business; correct?

A Yes.
Q And at the end of the day, you didn't make -CWNV did not make a profit; it has a loss; right?

A Okay.
Q That loss gets allocated 65 percent to CW and 35 percent to NuVeda?

A Precisely.
Q And that loss technically will flow down to
the members of NuVeda?
A Correct.
Q Which is a tax benefit when you're reporting your taxes because you can offset with your gains; correct?

A The K-1 will show a loss, yes.
Q And you can offset that loss or any gains you made from that tax year or carry them forward; correct?

A Correct.
Q That's what you bargained for in the MIPA; correct?

A We weren't anticipating losses when we created the MIPA. I mean, I know as a person who does taxes, that if we have a loss, how those losses will be distributed, yes.

Q So are you suggesting that at some point down the road, the members of NuVeda got together and agreed to waive the provision of lost profits?

Let me ask the question differently: What did you give up? What was the consideration that NuVeda gave to then, to CW, in order to release CW from its obligation to pay the loss profits?

A Well, we didn't give up anything because there were no loss profits, so ...

Q Let me withdraw the question and ask another the question.

You had a benefit. NuVeda had a benefit of lost profits coming to it at some point in time under the MIPA; correct?

A Yes.
Q And that was an obligation of CW; correct?
A Correct.
Q You released -- you're saying now for the first time that you released CW from that obligation?

A I didn't say relieved them. I said offset.
Q Okay. You offset them. You offset them. What did you offset them with?

A We offset them with the promises that the cultivation would be up and running in Nye County and that we would be receiving benefits from that, that cultivation facility by November of 2016.

Q I think you mis -- that's an obligation?
A That's an obligation.
Q CW had an obligation to pay you?
A Right.
Q And that obligation existed all the way into the future, correct, as it's written in the agreement?

A Correct.
Q Explain to me the arithmetic as to why you would offset anything; right? It sounds to me what you're giving up your tax benefit of loss, to relieve CW of an obligation to pay you profits?

A There are two aspects to the loss: One of them is that it passes through to the members, so the members, correct, do receive a tax benefit of a loss, which incidentally had to go two other entities before it got to the taxpayer. But the second is that somebody had to fund that loss, and we didn't have to fund the loss.

In exchange for not having our cultivation facility in Nye, that loss was funded by NuVeda.

Q We just talked about the fact that that loss was an obligation of CW --

A By CWNV.
Q Paying that loss was an obligation of CWNV because 1.1 E said they had to pay all the working capital?

A That's not working capital. It's loss by revenue. The capital is your investment into the facilities and everything else. It's not used for paying for the staff and the product and all the other things. That's operating capital.

| 1 | Q Really, Mr. Kennedy? Your testimony is -- |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | the distinction you're making is that working capital |
| 3 | and operating capital are two different terms? |
| 4 | A Yes. |
| 5 | Q There's no question pending. If that's your |
| 6 | testimony. |
| 7 | What document reflects the deal that you just |
| 8 | described, Mr. Kennedy? |
| 9 | A The 1065 for CWNV. |
| 10 | Q What's that? |
| 11 | A The tax return. |
| 12 | Q What document agreement between you and CW |
| 13 | exists to reflect what you just described in the |
| 14 | record? |
| 15 | MR. WILEY: Objection. Asked and answered. |
| 16 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: Overruled. |
| 17 | THE WITNESS: What document describes our |
| 18 | agreement? |
| 19 | BY MR. FEUERSTEIN: |
| 20 | Q That agreement that you just described. |
| 21 | A It was a verbal agreement at the time we were |
| 22 | preparing the tax returns. |
| 23 | Q Is there any -- has it been memorialized in |
| 24 | writing? |
| 25 | A I think it was in the minutes of the |
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meeting.
Q In whose minutes?
A CWNV's.
Q Do you know if those losses were passed on to Ms. Goldstein, by the way, in 2017?

A I'd have to look at the tax returns.
Q Mr. Kennedy, with respect to going back to the Clauretie report, can you just explain to me why the asset went down between 2016 and 2017?

A $\quad$ No.
Q I'd like to direct your attention to what we've marked as 263. It's not in the computer. It's a paper document.

A Okay.
Q Mr. Kennedy, we'll go through the document in a moment.

If you'll turn the page to the last page, I just want to confirm that's your signature on the third signature line of Glad 2B Home?

A That is my signature.
Q And you understand what your signature means when signing a document?

A Means I signed it.
Q Means you agreed to the terms?
A I agreed to the terms of the document.

Q And you agreed to the terms of the purchase and sale agreement in or around september 20, 2017?

MR. WILEY: I'm going to object. Outside the scope of direct.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Overruled.

BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:

Q You did hear my question? You agreed to the terms what's been marked as Joint Exhibit 263 in or around September 2017?

A Yeah. I wouldn't have signed it otherwise.
Q Glad 2B Home is an entity where you're the resident agent?

A I think Pro Advice is, but I Own Pro Advice.

Q Have you ever done -- did you ever calculate the minimum amount of money that would be entitled to Glad 2B Home pursuant to this agreement?

A It was somewhere just about $\$ 20$ million.
Q Did you give a valuation with respect to the interest in CW?

A Could be anywhere from zero -- I never thought it was very much.

Q Do I understand this agreement correctly, which is that NuVeda and its members were essentially giving all of its right in CWNV to an entity owned a

100 percent by you, then you were going to receive all the money from CWNV or from CWNevada, rather?

A No, not me.
Q Who are the members of Glad 2B Home, LLC?
A Different members over different times. But at this moment -- what's the date on here? I think it was Michelle Thompson and myself.

Q Who was it, I'm sorry?
A Michelle Thompson and myself.
Q Who is Michelle Thompson?
A An individual who lives in Las Vegas.
Q So all of the rights that Dr. Bady had and any profit from CWNV he was giving away?

A The intent of this agreement was that Glad 2B Home would act as an escrow agent. It was never intended that Glad 2B Home would receive the funds.

Q Why was Glad 2B Home acting as escrow agent in September 2017?

A Because we needed an entity to act as an escrow agent because the two parties couldn't agree on payment a recipient, and $I$ happened to have an available LLC that didn't have any function.

Q Was there an escrow agreement that was entered into?

A If it's not in this agreement, then the

| 1 | answer is no. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q You recognize the -- you recognize the |
| 3 | signature on the bottom of the last page on behalf of |
| 4 | CWNevada? |
| 5 | A I do. |
| 6 | Q And that's Brian Padgett? |
| 7 | A That's Brian Padgett's signature. |
| 8 | Q You'd agree with me based on the date of the |
| 9 | document, Mr. Kennedy, that this was entered into |
| 10 | approximately one month after Mr. Webster provided his |
| 11 | appraisal; correct? |
| 12 | A Correct. |
| 13 | Q And do you recall how long it took for the |
| 14 | members of NuVeda to negotiate this document that's |
| 15 | been marked as Exhibit 263 with Brian Padgett? |
| 16 | A I don't recall how long it took to negotiate |
| 17 | it. |
| 18 | Q Did it take six months? |
| 19 | A I just don't recall. It could be a lengthy |
| 20 | agreement, or it could have been a lengthy time or a |
| 21 | short time. |
| 22 | Q You testified a little bit in your deposition |
| 23 | about the Apex transaction we'll call it? |
| 24 | A Okay. |
| 25 | Q What was the thought process of entering into |
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that transaction?
A We didn't have any capital to build a facility -- a cultivation or production facility in North Las Vegas, so the thought process was that somebody else would build it; that we would utilize our license to allow them to use the facility to generate cash.

When sufficient amounts were generated to retire all of the debt, that then the three different parties would have their proportionate shares. So we would have shared 40 percent a facility which we thought at the time was going to cost 6 million to build, and turned out to cost 9 million to build, but we would have a 40 percent share of that after enough revenue had been generated.

Q How big is the facility on the Apex property?

A 32,000 square feet.
Q How big was the contemplated facility in Nye County?

A I don't know.
Q Do you recall Brian Padgett testifying he was looking to build a cultivation facility of 25,000 square feet?

A I do not recall that. You don't want me to
finish the logic?
Q No, not yet.
Is there something spectacular about the cultivation and processing facility of Apex that would cost $\$ 9$ million of capital?

A First of all, it includes a significant amount of land that goes with it. It's 12.4 acres, and it's right next to the North Las Vegas airport. So we were able to get it in town, green house facility because we didn't have complaints from the neighbors about odor and things like that because the neighbor was the airport.

Then, lastly, it was built to use a lot less power because it was designed originally made for Saudi Arabia, and they have 30 years of experience using these, and can even keep the temperature in the green houses in the 70 s without using air conditioning.

Q Besides from this build-out, do you have any view, Mr. Kennedy, of what it cost to build the cultivation facility in Nevada?

A You mean a green house? There are three options.

Q Tell me the three options.
A The three options, are, you can have a green
house; you can have an indoor, which is a concrete tilt-up building, or you can have an outdoor facility.

Q Well, I don't need to know how much it cost to build an outdoor facility.

A Okay.
Q How much is a green house?
A A green house is probably about a hundred dollars a square foot.

Q So if it's a 25,000 square foot facility, you think it cost $\$ 2.5$ million build-out?

A Yes.
Q And indoor?
A Indoor would be a little bit higher. It would be about $\$ 145$ a square foot.

Q So almost 50 percent more than --
A Yes.
Q What about the production facility, how much does that cost?

A Variable. I would say they're all going to be either the concrete tilt-up or steel buildings, so they're going to be in the ballpark of $\$ 150$ a square foot. Depends on the power requirements.

Q Depends on the equipment as well; right?
A That's why the power requirements are for the

| 1 | equipment. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q But I'm asking the total cost of the building |
| 3 | it's going to depend greatly on the type of machinery |
| 4 | you put in there; correct. The machines have varying |
| 5 | costs? |
| 6 | A I wasn't thinking about the machines, I was |
| 7 | just thinking about the building. |
| 8 | Q We talked a little bit about the experts and |
| 9 | you talked about Clauretie. I think you testified |
| 10 | that you met with him; correct? |
| 11 | A I did. |
| 12 | Q How many times did you meet with him? |
| 13 | A Four, maybe five times, one of them being |
| 14 | social. |
| 15 | Q You're friends with Mr. Clauretie? |
| 16 | A I like Mr. Clauretie. |
| 17 | Q How long have you known him? |
| 18 | A Since '16. |
| 19 | Q Do you remember the timing of those visits? |
| 20 | Was it mostly in '16? Was it '18? |
| 21 | A About four months ago we moved into a new |
| 22 | house and invited Dr. Clauretie and his wife over for |
| 23 | dinner. |
| 24 | Q I was talking more about the times you met |
| 25 | with him in preparation for his reports. For those in |
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'18, more than they were in '16?
A Yes, they were in '18 more than in '16.
Q What about Joe Lahoney?
A Leauanae, I think. Close enough.
Q Did you meet with him at all?
A I have seen him twice.
Q How many hours you spend with Dr. Clauretie in discussing the report?

A Five or six hours, total.
Q Did you ever see drafts of his report?
A Yes.
Q Did you edit those drafts?
A No.
Q Same question with Mr. Leauanae.
A I did not see a draft of his report.
Q Aside from giving them the balance sheet of NuVeda, did you give them any other documents?

A No. Well, the income statement.
Q The conversations you had with Dr. Bady about the license transactions, can you give me the time frame when these conversations took place?

A I see Dr. Bady all the time. I couldn't give you a date.

Q Is there a particular reason, Mr. Kennedy, that you chose Mr. Webster in doing the quote/unquote

| 1 | appraisal for this case? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A Yes. |
| 3 | Q Why? |
| 4 | A One of the lawyers I dealt with, George |
| 5 | Maglares, M-A-G-L-A-R-E-S, recommended him. |
| 6 | Q At the time you were aware there were expert |
| 7 | reports -- withdraw the question. |
| 8 | At the time that you went back to Mr. Webster |
| 9 | in August of 2017, you were aware there were expert |
| 10 | reports exchanged by the parties; correct? |
| 11 | A For the -- |
| 12 | Q In connection with this arbitration? |
| 13 | A Yes. Shane Terry's report. |
| 14 | Q Right. And NuVeda's -- |
| 15 | A NuVeda report. |
| 16 | Q And the individual respondents' report; |
| 17 | correct? |
| 18 | A I wasn't involved in the production of those, |
| 19 | but I was aware they existed. |
| 20 | Q You certainly had conversation with |
| 21 | Dr. Clauretie in 2016 in preparation of that report; |
| 22 | correct? |
| 23 | A Yes. |
| 24 | Q So you must have known they were being done |
| 25 | or perculating somewhere; correct? |
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| 1 | A Yeah, but I didn't know they were |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | submitted. |
| 3 | Q Any reason you didn't provide them to Mr. |
| 4 | Webster so he could do his own assessment as to the |
| 5 | value of NuVeda? |
| 6 | A Because I provided him with what he asked me |
| 7 | for, and no more. |
| 8 | Q Did you tell him at the time that there was |
| 9 | litigation? Their expert reports had been exchanged |
| 10 | between the parties? |
| 11 | A I told them there was litigation, |
| 12 | obviously. |
| 13 | Q Did you tell him there were expert reports |
| 14 | already submitted between the parties? |
| 15 | A I didn't know there were expert reports |
| 16 | already submitted. |
| 17 | Q You were aware, Mr. Kennedy, there were sales |
| 18 | figures for CWNV and around August 2017? |
| 19 | A There were what? |
| 20 | Q Sales figures. |
| 21 | A Sales figures? |
| 22 | Q Yes. |
| 23 | A For CWNV? |
| 24 | Q Yes. |
| 25 | A Yes. |
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| 1 | Q As I recall, you were the liaison between |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | NuVeda and CW. You were the CWNV representative, is |
| 3 | that fair? |
| 4 | A We all met every week on a Tuesday morning, |
| 5 | so everybody was there. I didn't have any special |
| 6 | standing. |
| 7 | Q Ms. Goldstein was never there, was she? |
| 8 | A No. |
| 9 | Q Mr. Kennedy, during those meetings you would |
| 10 | get sales figures; correct? |
| 11 | A No. That's not how we got them. |
| 12 | Q How did you get them? |
| 13 | A We got text messages. |
| 14 | Q When you went with Mr. Webster, did you tell |
| 15 | Mr. Webster you had sales figure for the |
| 16 | dispensaries? |
| 17 | A I didn't have the sales figure and the |
| 18 | expenses. I only had sales figures. |
| 19 | Q Did you tell Mr. Webster that you had sales |
| 20 | figures? |
| 21 | $A \quad Y e s$. |
| 22 | Q And he didn't want them? |
| 23 | A He didn't need them. |
| 24 | Q Now, you testified in response to one of |
| 25 | questions from Mr. Wiley that you believe that the |
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sales figures were accurate. Do you recall that testimony?

A Yes.
Q And you recall testifying previously that you didn't know if the records were accurate because there's a lot of cash in the business?

A I think those were in response to two different questions.

Q Well, they're definitely two different questions because one of those questions was mine, and one was Mr. Wiley's.

A Well --
Q Let me direct your attention back to your deposition on, $I$ guess you're going to have to call it up. I want -- well, let me ask the question first, Mr. Kennedy.

That $I$ asked you as the chief financial officer of NuVeda, how is it that you monitor how much CW is actually contributing to the CWNV enterprise? You remember me asking you that question?

A Yes.
Q You said, "CWNV has a CPA who does basically all the bookkeeping and accounting, and $I$ have a close relationship with him. I spend a significant amount of time with him and review those together." Do you
recall that answer?
A I do.
Q Then you said, "As I explained to you, though, if you're going to ask me that I absolutely know that records are accurate, the problem is that a lot of it is cash. So I am taking their word for what the cash amounts are." You recall that?

A Yes.
Q And cash amounts would be part of sales; correct?

A Yeah, sure.
Q So are you sitting here today -- when you said you think they're accurate, they're taking CW's word for it; correct?

A Well, there are some controls, and that's the reason that $I$ think they're accurate. Doesn't matter whether -- in fact, all transactions at the dispensaries are done in cash. But they have to go through a state-mandated point of sale machine called MJ Freeway, and the MJ Freeway sales are correlated to something called metric, which measures the amount of cannabis in all of the -- in the cultivation, in the production and in the dispensaries.

So because they're correlated, I have confidence in the figures.

| 1 | Q Do you audit that yourself? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A I have had to do that just recently for a |
| 3 | transaction. |
| 4 | Q What transaction? |
| 5 | A I don't audit the entire spectrum of them. |
| 6 | Q What transaction did you have to do it for? |
| 7 | A We had some material that had been spoiled in |
| 8 | transit, and it was returned to the clark facility, |
| 9 | and I had to make sure that the green waste was |
| 10 | accounted for in metric before we could issue |
| 11 | replacement material on MJ Freeway. |
| 12 | Q I'm sorry. Maybe I'm confused in the |
| 13 | transaction. |
| 14 | A In other words -- |
| 15 | Q Where were you distributing cannabis to? |
| 16 | A One of the dispensaries in Las Vegas. |
| 17 | Q And where were you distributing it from? |
| 18 | A Clark Natural in North Las Vegas. |
| 19 | Q So Clark Natural is now operational? |
| 20 | A The production facility had some prerolls. |
| 21 | Q And how long has Clark Natural been |
| 22 | operational for? |
| 23 | A Four months. |
| 24 | Q Are they growing cannabis in the green |
| 25 | houses? |
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A Growing it. We had to get rid of the first crop, and we are now on a second crop which, we hope will be selling in February.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Let me confer with my client and make sure $I$ don't have anything else.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Okay. Let's take five-minute break.
(Break taken.)
BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q Mr. Kennedy, very quickly, if, in fact, the fair market value of NuVeda's interest in CWNV increases, even if we accept the Webster report, you'd agree that the fair market value of Ms. Goldstein's share would increase as well; correct?

A You mean after August 8, 2018?
Q I'm just asking, if we replaced \$3.5 million, the number that you provided, Mr. Webster, with, say, the $\$ 22$ million that's in the purchase and sale agreement, you'd agree with me that the full value of NuVeda would increase?

A Yes.
Q And Ms. Goldstein's interest would increase concomitantly; correct?

A Yes.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: No further questions.

BY MR. WILEY:
Q Mr. Kennedy, turning to Exhibit 263, the purchase and sale agreements, you were in the room for Dr. Bady's testimony?

A I was.
Q Dr. Bady testified that that document is no longer in full force and effect; correct?

A That's correct.
Q Is it your understanding that that document was rescinded?

A It was.
Q And that the terms and conditions of the MIPA were always in full force and effect?

A Yes.
Q Did Glad 2B Home, LLC, ever receive any monies pursuant to this purchase and sale agreement that they put in a, quote/unquote, escrow account?

A $\quad$ No.
Q Were any of the obligations required of any of the parties of this purchase and sale agreement ever undertaken?

A No.
Q Did Glad 2B Home ever disburse any funds, regardless of the source, to any of the parties to
this purchase and sale agreement?
A No.
Q Mr. Kennedy, you agree with me that section 6.2 of the operating agreement simply requires that NuVeda acquire an appraisal as to the determination of an expulsed member's interest; correct?

A Correct.
Q You were in the room for the testimony of Mr. Webster; is that correct?

A I was.
Q Mr. Webster testified that the methodology he used was the asset method in determining the fair market value of the company?

A He did.
Q You recall Mr. Webster testifying that that was an approved methodology used by appraisers?

A I recall that.
Q You recall Mr. Webster testifying that he has used the asset method in prior business valuations?

A Yes.
Q Turning your attention to the sales figures. I don't know if you still have them up; you don't have to access them.

As you sit here today, you have no reason to doubt the veracity of sales numbers that you received

| 1 | from CWNV, do you? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A I have no reason to doubt it. |
| 3 | Q Let's talk about the judgment of 2113 |
| 4 | investors has. Is it your testimony that that |
| 5 | judgment remains valid? |
| 6 | A It does. |
| 7 | Q You recall Mr. Feuerstein asking you |
| 8 | questions about payment of rents? |
| 9 | A I do. |
| 10 | Q And payment of rents from CW? |
| 11 | A If CW made a payment to -- on that to 2113 |
| 12 | investors, it would be credited against the judgment |
| 13 | amount. |
| 14 | Q But as of August 8, 2017, no payments had |
| 15 | been made; correct? |
| 16 | A No payments had been made. |
| 17 | Q And it's your understanding that that is the |
| 18 | appraisal date or -- excuse me, the expulsion date of |
| 19 | Ms. Goldstein? |
| 20 | A Yes, it is. |
| 21 | Q Mr. Feuerstein asked you some questions about |
| 22 | purported sales of license here in Clark County. Do |
| 23 | you recall that line of questioning? |
| 24 | A I do. |
| 25 | Q As you sit here today, you don't know one way |
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or the other regarding veracity of any of those purported sales and the figures, do you?

A No. I sought out all the sales information I could get.

Q For clarification purposes, I think Mr. Feuerstein was going down the right road with respect to section 6.2 and the percentage of voting interest needed to expulse Ms. Goldstein. Instead of the 50 percent you testified to, is it your understanding now that that is 60 percent?

A It's 60 percent of the disinterested parties.

Q Did Dr. Bady and Dr. Mohajer possess greater than 60 percent interest in August 2017 at the time the expulsion occurred?

A Yes.
Q You recall we talked about the MIPA and certain events related thereto. In the event that the license were transferred and the terms and conditions of the MIPA were not effectuated, would that open up NuVeda to any liability from CWNV?

A Yes.
Q Can you give an overview of the summary of the liabilities that would be owed to CWNV in that instance?

A In that instance, then all of the build-outs that CWNV paid for would have to be repaid to them, plus 16 percent per year from the time that they were completed, and the other expenses that they may have paid, other coasts they had on behalf of NuVeda would have to be reimbursed with the same conditions.

MR. WILEY: Nothing further.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY ARBITRATOR BAKER:
Q Mr. Kennedy, I have a couple questions.
A Okay.
Q Can you look at 262, the exhibit. Do you have it?

MR. WILEY: It's going to be the last one there. I think it's the last one. You want this one? ARBITRATOR BAKER: Yes, if you don't mind.

Q I just want to clarify a couple of points. You testified that this first page of Exhibit 262 is something that you prepared; correct?

A Yes, I prepared it.
Q Did you prepare this before you spoke with Mr. Webster on August 13th?

A I did.
Q And so when you spoke with him on August 13th, did he tell you what he was looking for?

A Told me before we met what he was looking for.

Q Okay. Then did you speak with him before you prepared this first page Exhibit 262?

A Yes.
Q So you spoke with him over the phone?
A This was in response to making our appointment.

Q And he says, this is what I need from you, so you went and prepared this first page, and then you brought it to him on August 13th?

A He came to me actually, but, yes.
Q And when you went to prepare this document, what did you look at?

A I looked at the P\&Ls and the balance sheets, the prior ones, and I just updated them. Not that complex, so...

Q So in order to prepare this document, which you prepared in anticipation of meeting with Mr. Webster; correct?

A Correct.
Q You went and looked at other profit and loss documents, balance statements, updated them. Did you look at anything else?

A No.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Any follow up?
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Can $I$ follow up on something Mr. Wiley said or just on you?

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Just on me.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: NO.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Thank you, Mr. Kennedy.
Who is up first?
MR. WILEY: It's going to be Dr. Clauretie.
Thereupon, DR. TERRENCE CLAURETIE, called as a witness by the Respondent having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. DUSHOFF:
Q It's pronounced Clauretie?
A Clauretie.
Q Dr. Clauretie, can you spell your last name for the record.

A C-I-a-u-r-e-t-i-e.
Q Dr. Clauretie, can you give us your educational background after high school?

A Got a B.A. in economics from stonehill College, which is south of Boston. M.A. in economics, and Ph.D. in economics, both from Washington state

University, and at one time several years ago I had a CPA certificate, and that's my educational background.

Q How about teaching experience?
A I taught at Moss University for a year, then in West Virginia for total of eight years, Shepherd State University. I thought for about eight years at LSU in Shriveport, Louisiana, and finished up my teaching career beginning 1988 through 2011 at UNLV.

Q What do you teach?
A I started off by teaching basic economics and statistics, monetary theory, but ended up going more into finance and real estate. So I ended up teaching a lot of finance, mainly corporation finance, as well as real estate and real estate finance.

So it was more or less of a move from economics at the beginning to heavily concentrated teaching in finance. In fact, at UNLV I was on the finance department. Only in the last year was I in the economics department. It was more finance than economics.

Q Have you ever testified in court as an expert?

A Yes.
Q And how many times is that?

| 1 | A Several hundred. I've been deposed over |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 1,500 times. |
| 3 | Q And where have you been -- have you ever been |
| 4 | certified as an expert in District Court here in |
| 5 | Nevada? |
| 6 | A Many times, yes. |
| 7 | Q That would also the hundred times you've |
| 8 | testified? |
| 9 | A Oh, yes. |
| 10 | Q Have you ever testified as a business |
| 11 | valuation expert? |
| 12 | A Yes. |
| 13 | Q Can you tell me how many times you've done |
| 14 | that? |
| 15 | A Probably half a dozen to a dozen maybe, |
| 16 | around that area. |
| 17 | Q Is that here in the state of Nevada? |
| 18 | A Yes. |
| 19 | Q Were you certified as an expert in doing the |
| 20 | business valuations? |
| 21 | A I was certified, qualified to do that because |
| 22 | of my educational and experience background. |
| 23 | Q So you were qualified as an expert when you |
| 24 | were doing -- |
| 25 | A Yeah, yeah. |


| 1 | Q And how long have you been testifying as an |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | expert witness? |
| 3 | A Since 1983. |
| 4 | Q Bring you up to today of why we're here |
| 5 | today. |
| 6 | You were retained by NuVeda to provide a fair |
| 7 | market value of NuVeda at the time, initially of March |
| 8 | 10, 2016, is that correct? |
| 9 | A I believe so. |
| 10 | Q I want you to -- you have a book right there. |
| 11 | A Okay. |
| 12 | Q The book has an index, if you look on the |
| 13 | very first page. |
| 14 | A Got it. |
| 15 | Q And tab 2. |
| 16 | A Tab 2. That makes it easy. |
| 17 | Yes, Report, Fair Market Value as of March, |
| 18 | 10, 2016. |
| 19 | Q And that's a report you prepared; correct? |
| 20 | $A \quad Y e s$. |
| 21 | Q You also prepared report tab 3, Updated |
| 22 | Report of Fair Market Value as of 3/10 by yourself, as |
| 23 | of 11-- on 11/28 2016; correct? |
| 24 | A Yes. |
| 25 | Q Both of those were done for Mr. Shane Terry |
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| 1 | as of the value on March 10, 2016; correct? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A I didn't do it for him. |
| 3 | Q You did it for NuVeda? |
| 4 | A Right. |
| 5 | Q As of that date? |
| 6 | A In regards to Shane Terry; not for him, |
| 7 | correct. |
| 8 | Q You were retained by NuVeda, not retained by |
| 9 | Shane Terry? |
| 10 | A Yes. I did those reports in regards to Shane |
| 11 | Terry's case; correct. |
| 12 | Q So let's go, because I don't want to spend |
| 13 | time on Shane Terry since he's no longer in this case. |
| 14 | Let's go to tab 7. |
| 15 | A Yes, sir. |
| 16 | Q I want to look at tab 7. |
| 17 | A Yes. |
| 18 | Q You recognize tab 7? |
| 19 | A Yes. |
| 20 | Q What do you recognize tab 7 to be? |
| 21 | A Tab 7 was a report that I did -- really had |
| 22 | two parts to it, but the main part, the first part was |
| 23 | the market value of NuVeda as of August the 8th, |
| 24 | 2017. |
| 25 | Q And NuVeda retained you to prepare this |
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report for -- as of August 8th, 2017; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q And what did you -- I'm going to put you down on page 1. You write here, "Materials relied upon." The first that you have here is "Report of Michael Webster valuating NuVeda on a liquidation basis."

MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'm sorry, Matt, you're reading from page --

MR. DUSHOFF: Page 1 of 7 .
MR. FEUERSTEIN: On 8 --
ARBITRATOR BAKER: 7 .
MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'm there.
BY MR. DUSHOFF:
Q Report of Mr. Michael Webster valuating NuVeda on litigation basis. What, if anything, did you reply upon Mr. Webster's for your report?

A There were two things: No. 1, I wanted to see if he did the evaluation on the liquidation basis the same way I would do, and it was consistent with the way it was done. And I also wanted to see if for some reason my numbers might be different from his, and there was a slight difference, but pretty much the same numbers for the liabilities, so forth.

So $I$ didn't rely on it for my opinion. I
just relied upon it to see if there was a consistency between what we were doing, so if there was not a consistency, then $I$ could take that into consideration, but you didn't find any inconsistencies.

Q You also have here various discussions -withdrawn.

You also relied on -- skip over the articles.
You said you relied on a balance sheet of NuVeda as of August 8, 2017. Who provided you that balance sheet; do you remember?

A Yes. I sat down with Mr. Joe Kennedy. And, actually, some of the elements were provided by Mr. Kennedy; some of the elements were provided by outside information. So I can go over that for you, but most -- all of the liabilities were provided by Mr. Joe Kennedy.

Q I'm asking you right now about the balance sheet. We'll get to the other stuff, but you relied on the balance sheet from Joe Kennedy. Joe Kennedy gave you the balance sheet?

A Except for a couple of items, yes.
Q We'll get to those in your Tables. I just want to go over this right here.

And you have here No. 4, meeting with Paris

Bal --
A Balaouras.
Q I think we have the proper spelling of Balaouras. Meeting with Paris Balaouras of Acres Cannabis?

A Yes.
Q What did you meet with him about?
A I had been provided with a list from principals of NuVeda a list of sales.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Arbitrator Baker.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Is there an objection?
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Yeah, I'm going to object for a moment.

As you know, we made a motion in limine with respect to Dr. Clauretie's testimony, and in particular, to the fact when we had made a request for all documents provided to the expert that he based his opinion on. We have received no list that was provided to him. They have not claimed or shown the list to us in the production, so the idea of him testifying on this matter now, $I$ think is prejudicial to, or, in fact, contrary to what your order was.

MR. DUSHOFF: We have that balance sheet that you have that we have admitted, it's the exact same balance sheet. If you look at the numbers, it's the
exact same balance sheet.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'm not objecting to the balance sheet. I'm objecting with respect to what I think the doctor just said, that he was provided a list of transactions.

MR. DUSHOFF: This is the list.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: If that was the list provided to him in a document, which is what it sounds like when someone says "a list," then I'm objecting to his testimony because we were never provided that list.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: I understood his testimony that there was a list of questions provided to you by NuVeda management, and then you started to talk about, I think, meeting with him, and that's when the objection happened. Was that your testimony?

THE WITNESS: Well, my testimony was that I was provided with the list indicated in Table 1.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: It was provided as a document?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'm objecting.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: I'm sorry. You provided the list for what? In what? This is -- in Section 2 , we're going to --

MR. FEUERSTEIN: He's on Table 1, page 5. ARBITRATOR BAKER: Okay, okay.

THE WITNESS: That's the list I was provided with.

MR. DUSHOFF: Which is what we've already discussed with many of the other experts already in this case.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Who provided this list to you?

THE WITNESS: I believe it was Pej Bady, but I met with several principals at the time, but I believe it was him.

MR. DUSHOFF: Mr. Feuerstein actually even asked Dr. Bady regarding that.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: I'm going to note your objection. I want to hear the testimony, and then we can address it after the testimony. Okay? BY MR. DUSHOFF:

Q Let me ask you before we go to this. Why did you come -- how did you come to meet with Paris? Let's talk about that first.

A Fine. After $I$ was provided the list, I wanted to verify -- because it was provided by the principals of NuVeda, I wanted to independently verify whether the values in that list were reasonable.

They gave me the name of someone who they thought was very, very knowledgeable of the industry because of his position. I met with that gentleman and that was Paris Balaouras.

Q And do you have Paris Balaouras -- I believe it's in your report. You have his bio; is that correct?

A Yes. It's on page 20.
Q And what did you find out about Paris Balaouras -- I'll just call him Paris. What did you find out about Paris and his involvement in the marijuana industry?

A Well, from the bio which he gave me -- I did not write that -- he gave me that bio, and from my discussions with him, I came to believe that he was knowledgeable enough to look at the values in Table 1 and tell me if he thought that those were reasonable estimates of what the value were for dispensary, cultivation, production licenses.

So Paris, to me, was an outside source that I could go to, to verify the reasonableness of the values that were given to me.

Q So let me run something by you in here. Let's go to Exhibit A that you have here.

So according to Mr. Balaouras, he told you
that he assisted in raising over a hundred million dollars to oversee the development, construction and launch of cannabis businesses in Arizona, California and Nevada; is that correct?

A We didn't discuss that verbally.
Q What did you discuss?
A We discussed in general his background. This bio was given to me by him.

Q What did you discuss with Paris?
A The main reason $I$ sat down with him, and I told Mr. Balaouras, the reason I am here because I have a list of recently sold licenses -- excuse me, licenses to produce, cultivation and dispense marijuana products.

I want to know if the values in this table, in this list, are reasonable in light of your experience and your knowledge of the market as it exists at this time.

His discussion with me, they are very, very reasonable, and I don't see anything in these values that are maybe out of the ordinary. But there was one value that $I$ think was very low for dispensary. But other than that, he said, these are reasonable in light of my experience.

Q I want you to turn to Table 1, that's on

| 1 | page 5. In regards to the dates, the type, and the |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | amount. |
| 3 | A Yes. |
| 4 | Q Are those the same exact numbers, the same |
| 5 | exact, word for word, number for number, that you were |
| 6 | given in the list you were given? You just reproduced |
| 7 | it on here? |
| 8 | A Correct. |
| 9 | Q You said there was an outlier. I want you to |
| 10 | look at May 16th. You see that dispensary? |
| 11 | A I sure do. |
| 12 | Q \$500,000? |
| 13 | A Yes. |
| 14 | Q As compared to the rest of them, that is |
| 15 | about, at the very least, that is way off compared to |
| 16 | the values, is it not? |
| 17 | A Yes. |
| 18 | Q Approximately 5 million, 4 and a half million |
| 19 | dollars? |
| 20 | A Right. |
| 21 | Q You don't know why that is, do you? |
| 22 | A No. |
| 23 | Q And you came to a conclusion of value in this |
| 24 | matter for NuVeda; isn't that correct? |
| 25 | A Yes. |
|  | Page 427 |

Q I want you to turn to page 3 in your report, please, and No. 10.

A Yes.
Q And No. 10 says the liquidation value of the enterprise as of August 8 is estimated to be $\$ 1,605,277$; is that correct?

A Correct.
Q What methodology did you use to get to that number?

A I looked at the market value of the asset, the book value and the liabilities, subtracted off the book value the liabilities from the market value of the assets, and that difference is the estimated equity for market value of the company at that time based on liquidating the company.

Q Why did you use the liquidation method?
A That's probably the best question here.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Way to go, Matt.
THE WITNESS: I was informed by principals in NuVeda again, that they had acquired the licenses to cultivate, produce, distribute, and they wanted to go forward with their business.

But what they told me was very reasonable, that just because you have the license, doesn't mean that you're ready to go. Requires other investments:

Production facilities, rental payment for -- working capital, as we call it in corporate finance. They needed significant investments to go forward.

They indicated that they had had trouble getting investments into the company because of the ongoing litigation that was ongoing at the time.

Now, I had read some reports, and I can tell you that the plaintiffs in that particular ongoing litigation had reports done that indicated that their value was as much as $\$ 10$ million. So I concluded it was reasonable to suspect that no banker or no investor, reasonable investor, would put the kinds of money that they needed to continue -- to commence and continue their operations into that business, with the potential large amount of money that might be settled against the company in litigation.

So my conclusion was that a liquidation value can be made with relative certainty if we have good values there, and under the understanding that this business could not attract the investment necessary to be an ongoing concern at that time.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'm going to move to strike that last answer on the following basis, that is, it falls outside the scope of the expert's opinion. He's listed in his reports the documents that he has
relied upon, and you can look at tab 7, page 1, you can do the same for tab 3, page 1, and tab 2, and I'll represent that there is no reference whatsoever to some articles about investing in cannabis.

And it sounds to me, based on his last answer, and we can have the court reporter read it back, that he's basing his opinion on that article. So he's testifying now, and his opinion based on information he did not list in his actual report.

MR. DUSHOFF: My response is he wasn't testifying about some article. He was testifying about this litigation and the effect on value and why he pulled a liquidation value, because there's not an investor, in his opinion as an expert, that would invest the money they would invest on the basis of the litigation, which he provides for in here saying that the litigation really has had a negative effect on the value, that's why he chose the liquidation.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: But is his opinion that he was talking about no investor and those conclusions, are those conclusions contained in this report?

MR. DUSHOFF: Yes, he talks about --
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Can you point me to where?
MR. DUSHOFF: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Page 4.

MR. DUSHOFF: Page 4 he talks about the absence of litigation, and the litigation effect on whether an influx of cash investment. So he does talk about that and afraid that litigation will have a negative effect on there.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: I still don't see where he talks about can't get an investor.

MR. DUSHOFF: What he's talking about, and also if you look in -- he's talking about they can't get investors, nobody would invest because of the litigation. Litigation is affecting the value of it. And his opinion, because of the litigation, that it's going to affect the value, and hence why he did liquidation. That's what his testimony is.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Arbitrator Baker, just to be clear, I'm not objecting to what he's testifying to in his report. All I'm objecting to is the fact he's embellishing with some report that he did not identify.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: That's what I was trying to get to. I'm going to sustain your objection. I won't consider the testimony about investments. I'll have the transcript, so I'll know exactly what $I$ won't consider.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Thank you.

MR. DUSHOFF: I'll move on, but if I may at some point revisit that.

Q I want you to turn to Table 3.
A Yes, sir.
Q Before we go to Table 3, which is on page 9, is the liquidation method an acceptable method to determine fair market value of a company?

A Yes, depending on the circumstances.
Q How about in this circumstance?
A Yes, very much so.
Q So why is that, or did we already go through that?

A In this case it is because of the necessity, as I indicated on page 4, that they would need cash flows to continue their operations as a going concern. The cash flows would be in jeopardy because of the litigation.

Q So let's go to Table 3.
A Yes.
Q Table 3 contains assets. You see that it's your assets, liabilities, and equity. You see that?

A Yes.
Q And also license holding --
A Yes.
Q -- Of CWNV.

Now, you have -- I want you to look at the balance sheet. This information that you have here in Table 3, some of this information was given to you by Joe Kennedy in the balance sheet; correct?

A Yes.
Q And some of this information you got, specifically let's talk about the dispensaries down in your expert report. You see that where it says "Dispensaries, \$9 million"?

A Yes, held by CWNV.
Q How did you get to that number?
A Okay, that you'll have to go back. That information was not given to me by Mr. Kennedy.

You have to go back to my Table 1 and see that the dispensaries had an average value of 3,541,000. But then what I did when I was preparing Table 3 , I said what sort of values would we get if we left out the low value of $\$ 500,000$. I came up with something closer to like 4 million or something, so I said, let's say 4.5 million, and we'll give a value of the dispensaries at $\$ 4.5$ million a piece that were owned by CWNV at the time. That's where I got the $\$ 9$ million, the two dispensaries, 4.5 each.

Q From the operating agreement, that's where you've got -- if you can look under Padgett, 35
percent of the CWNV, LLC -- I apologize, from the MIPA. Is that where you got that?

A I got that actually from discussions with the principals. That's the case --

Q And 35 percent of 9 million would come out to 3,360,000?

A $\quad 9$ million 6.
Q 9 million 6, I apologize.
A Correct.
Q So you valued the cultivation license at $\$ 300,000$ ?

A Yes. I increased that as well, just to give an alternative estimate of the value of those licenses.

Q So you valued on the higher end than lesser?

A Yes. I did two valuations: The low one was at 7.4 back on Table 2 , $I$ believe, and this one would be a high value of 9.6.

Q And you used the high value in order to get the 1,605,277; correct?

A Exactly. I took the 9 million 6, take 35 percent of that, and that gives you up above 3,360,000. All the other numbers -- excuse me, the $\$ 400,000$ there is the Clark County Medical Solutions.

All the others numbers, especially when you get to the liabilities, all the liability numbers were given to me by Mr. Kennedy.

Q And here for the liquidation purposes, you did assets minus liabilities equals 1.605; correct?

A Market value of the assets minus book value of the liabilities, correct.

Q Just I want to bring you to page 9.
A Yes, sir.
Q You did a value of an ongoing concern?
A Right.
Q But you never used -- this is not something you used in determining the value -- used in determining the value of NuVeda; correct?

A That's correct, $I$ was just doing a hypothetical example of where those licenses might come into play in the absence of a litigation. If you want to try to value this as a going concern, with the information you have on the valuable licenses, that's the best you could do if there were no litigation, that you could do with the data.

Q Right. That's why on page 11 you have just -- a hypothetical -- you use the same numbers for revenue from 1 through 25, and expenses and net income, because it really wasn't about the numbers as
much as it was about the value of the licenses; correct?

A It's a hypothetical example of how you can look at just the license and come up with some theory of why that could help, estimate the value of a company as a going concern based on the balance sheet.

Q Okay. And let's turn to page 13 of your report.

A Okay.
Q Page 13 of your report, if you look at -- I want you to look at the second to last sentence. It says in this case from Tables 2 and 3, you have values of -- you have these two values. Now, what are those values?

A Again, if you're put in a position to say, you know what, can you take this balance sheet and tell me in any way what possible, what the value would be as a going concern, you would look at the value of the licenses and say, well, that's about the best you can do because they do represent in a sense -- the licenses are valued in the marketplace based on how they will produce revenues and expenses.

Now, you want to know where those figures came from?

Q Sure.
A The 2,990,000 figures comes from --
Q Table 2?
A Table 2. And you would go and you would look at the value of the licenses. 35 percent of $C W$ is 2,590,000. The Clark County Medical Solutions at 400,$000 ;$ that's $2,990,000.3,760,000$ would come from Table 3, and you go up and you take the 3,360,000 from the 35 percent CW, and add in the 400,000 from the Clark Medical Solutions.

If you wanted to try to attempt to say, Well, if you could do this with just this information as a going concern, could you possibly come up with some sort of a method, and that's the only thing I could think of.

Q So, in your testimony, your estimation, in your expert opinion, that the liquidation value is a reasonable and accepted method in this case to use to determine the value of NuVeda?

A Yes.
MR. DUSHOFF: Pass the witness.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Take two-minute break. I'll
get into my cross.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Sure.
(Break taken.)

BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q Good afternoon, Dr. Clauretie. My name is David Feuerstein. I'm a lawyer on behalf of Ms. Goldstein.

I have some questions on your direct
testimony and the reports that you've written in this case. Is that okay?

A Did you say reports in this case, with a plural?

Q Reports with a "S" yes.
A Okay.
Q You submitted three reports in this arbitration; is that correct?

A I believe that is probably accurate.
Q Is the entirety of your opinions contained in those reports?

A Well, to the best of my knowledge and belief they are.

Q You don't intend to offer any opinions that are not set forth in your report; is that fair to say?

A Unless the questions is going in that direction, no, I don't.

Q Do your reports reflect all the documents you

| 1 | reply on? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A I believe so. |
| 3 | Q You're familiar with the phrase, |
| 4 | Dr. Clauretie, "garbage in/garbage out"? |
| 5 | A You betcha. |
| 6 | Q What does that mean to you? |
| 7 | A It means the results of calculations are only |
| 8 | as good as the inputs into those calculations. |
| 9 | Q Now, you testified a little bit in response |
| 10 | to Mr. Dushoff's questions about your expert testimony |
| 11 | experience. I have a few questions about that. |
| 12 | A Sure. |
| 13 | Q Have you ever testified with respect to a |
| 14 | cannabis company before? |
| 15 | A Only to a leasehold interest, that's it. |
| 16 | Q So it was a property valuation? |
| 17 | A Leasehold interest of a cannabis company, |
| 18 | correct, not the value -- not the operations itself, |
| 19 | correct. Other than that, no, sir. |
| 20 | Q Have you ever worked with Kolesar and Leatham |
| 21 | before? |
| 22 | A Yes. |
| 23 | Q Have you ever worked with Mr. Dushoff |
| 24 | before? |
| 25 | A I don't believe so. |

Q How about Mr. Wiley, you worked with him before, Jason Wiley?

A Other than this case?
Q Yes.

A No.
Q Now, you testified in response to some questions about the fact you have a conclusion that the litigation in this case would -- affected the valuation of the company. Is that fair to say?

A To be precise, there's two different ways to value the company. The litigation did not value -the litigation did not affect it on valuing on the liquidation basis. It would have affected the value as an ongoing concern because the litigation would prevent the influx of cash flow necessary to continue the operations.

Q And that's what $I$ want to focus on.
A I want to be certain we distinguish those two.

Q I appreciate the clarity.
Your understanding -- what was your understanding of NuVeda's business as of August 2017?

A Their business was that they had licenses for production and cultivation, the stages of which I'm not certain of at that time. They also had 35 percent
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| 1 | interest in two dispensary licenses. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q What's the basis of that testimony right |
| 3 | there? Where did you learn that? |
| 4 | A Information that was given to me by Mr. |
| 5 | Kennedy . |
| 6 | Q Was it documentary information or just |
| 7 | conversation? |
| 8 | A I don't recall. |
| 9 | Q Did you ask for any documents to understand |
| 10 | why NuVeda held a 35 percent interest in two |
| 11 | dispensary licenses? |
| 12 | A Did I ask if he had any documents? |
| 13 | Q Did you ask any documents to support it? |
| 14 | A No. |
| 15 | Q Did you have any understanding of what was |
| 16 | going on in or about August 2017 with respect to the |
| 17 | dispensary licenses? |
| 18 | A No. |
| 19 | Q Did you ask whether the dispensary licenses |
| 20 | were operational or stagnant? |
| 21 | A No. |
| 22 | Q Did you know whether who was responsible -- |
| 23 | let me take a step back. |
| 24 | Is it important to you in determining whether |
| 25 | or not to evaluate a company on a liquidation basis or |
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going concern to know whether the business is actually operational or not?

A Well, it's a great question. One may have the opinion that once you begin an operation, then you should move away from perhaps looking at it from a liquidation standpoint. But just because you commence operations in some fashion doesn't mean that you're going to be successful without an influx of a lot more capital.

That's what $I$ was told, that they had trouble raising the capital to continue operations at any significant level. So if that was the case because of litigation, until that litigation would go away, they were not able to raise the capital sufficient to continue operations or to bring them to any level that would be profitable.

Therefore, if you can't bring your operations to a profitable level, the best valuation is the liquidated value.

Q Let me interrupt you -- are you finished?
A No. It's an unfortunate circumstance where the plaintiffs in the case bringing litigation seeking damages for which they have now, because of the litigation, have limited the ability of the company to operate.

Q I just want to make sure you're done. I didn't mean to interrupt you before.

A That's okay. But that's what $I$ believe is the case where you have significant numbers in a litigation reasonable to say that it's difficult to attract investors to operate at a profitable level.

Q So let me ask you a hypothetical.
A Sure.
Q Does your opinion change at all if I told you that NuVeda did not have responsibility for funding the operations of the dispensaries; that they didn't have to raise capital in order to continue the business?

MR. DUSHOFF: Objection. Beyond the scope of his knowledge. He testified on what he was given and what he did this on.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: I do not know. I cannot sit here and tell you precisely the amount of investments and capital they would have to raise at the time $I$ did the report. The only thing I can tell you is that they told me they had significant problems raising the monies necessary to continue operations. I can't tell you anymore than that.
///

BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q I'm going to ask you again a hypothetical, because I want you to see, sitting here today having the expert qualifications that you have, if, in fact, we took away the component of them having to raise capital.

Assume for the moment NuVeda had no obligation to raise capital and no need to raise capital because there was a contractual source that was required to pay for all the operating expenses of the company, everything. Are you with me so far? Following my hypothetical?

A Not really but, go ahead.
Q I want to make sure you understand because I want to get clarity on this.

A I think you have an argument you can present, but not to me.

Q I want to make sure we're on the same page.
Suppose that NuVeda entered into a contract, and that contract required that a third-party, or the contracting party, had to pay all the expenses going forward to develop the business, to develop the licenses, run the dispensaries, build the cultivation. That's what the contract provided.

In exchange for that contract, NuVeda would
give 65 percent of the interest in the licenses to that party. You with me so far?

A 65 percent? NuVeda would?
Q Yes.
A Not 35 percent?
Q They give 65 percent, retaining 35 percent.
A Thank you.
Q In that situation, does it change your conclusion with respect to the fact that whether or not to use a going concern model or a liquidation model?

A I'd have to know a lot more information about that aspect.

Q What else would you need to know?
A I can't tell you as I sit here.
Q Well, you just said you needed to know more information so I'm asking to follow up, what information did you need?

MR. DUSHOFF: Objection. Asked and answered. He's at the point of badgering. He already answered he doesn't know. He provided a hypothetical. He doesn't know the answer to the hypothetical, and now he wants to ask questions regarding, finding more information on a hypothetical.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Overruled. I'll ask that
you ask it one more time just so we're clear what information you would need.

BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q In the hypothetical I provided to you with respect to a contract between NuVeda and another party, and the other party would be paying all of the expenses for operations -- build-out, development, et cetera, such that NuVeda didn't have to raise money -- would that change your conclusion as to whether to use the going concern method or the liquidation method?

A I'd have to have a lot more information than I have.

Q Can you tell me -- I don't need an exhaustive list, but a list of what items you would need to know.

A Well, let me start with one obvious answer: What are the financial resources of the guarantor of funds? If we don't know what the financial resources are and the obligations -- I'd have to read the contract, I'd have to read all sorts of things. There are legal arguments involved, and I'm not a legal expert.

So you're really going into an area $I$ don't have enough information to give you an answer, and I'm not going to give an answer that, oh, yes, that would
definitely change my opinion, without knowing a lot more about that situation which you're talking about. And you asked for examples, and it could be many more as I sit here today.

Q Without the -- I understand your reluctance to say it would definitely change it. Would it affect your conclusion?

A It wouldn't affect my valuation at all.
Q I'm not asking the valuation. Would it affect your decision to use the going concern method or the liquidation method?

A Anything is possible. I don't know. I can't go down that route.

Q What did you base your determination on when you claimed that the litigation in this case would prevent an investor from investing in NuVeda? What's your basis for that statement?

A No. Let me be precise. What I stated was that the instigation of litigation presented a substantial financial risk to potential investors.

Q What's the basis of that conclusion? What are you basing that on?

A Well, couple of things: I mean, I've talked to the principals, and they've told me they had trouble raising money for the company, for the firm as
a result of the litigation.
I base it on the fact that litigation itself depresses the value of companies in the marketplace even. So if litigation or the threat of a litigation affects the value of a company, then clearly it could affect the value of the company in this particular case, particularly it would affect the value of the company if it cut off sources of funds for growth or development.

Q I assume -- let me ask you a question. Is it always the case when there is a litigation the valuation of the business is depressed?

A Yes. Well, unless it's de minimis. It's almost always. In fact, there's literature on the effect of litigation on values of companies. Of course, it's going to affect the value of the company.

Q But you didn't site any of that literature in your report; correct?

A No. You asked the question, and I answered it.

Q I assume the principals -- in your discussions with the principals, nobody involved with NuVeda revealed to you that there was an agreement called the Membership Interest Purchase Agreement or

| 1 | MIPA; is that fair to say? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A I'm not familiar with that. |
| 3 | Q And I assume -- |
| 4 | A I'm not familiar with it. It doesn't ring a |
| 5 | bell. |
| 6 | Q And I assume that in the discussions with the |
| 7 | members of NuVeda, that nobody revealed or discussed |
| 8 | an operating agreement for CWNV; is that fair to |
| 9 | say? |
| 10 | A An operating agreement with CWNV? I don't |
| 11 | believe I've seen that or heard about that. |
| 12 | Q In the course of your report, drafting your |
| 13 | report, Dr. Clauretie, did you ever ask for the |
| 14 | discovery documents in this case? |
| 15 | A No. |
| 16 | Q Did you ask for the pleadings in this case? |
| 17 | A No. |
| 18 | Q Did you ask for any of the deposition |
| 19 | transcripts in this case? |
| 20 | A I did not. |
| 21 | Q I want to turn to -- let me ask you a |
| 22 | question. If I looked at your report that's on tab 7. |
| 23 | A Tab 7? |
| 24 | Q Yes, tab 7. |
| 25 | A Let me go to that, please. |
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Q Yes.
A That's the one we're talking about?
Q Yes. Did that report incorporate your prior reports and the opinions set forth therein?

A I believe I may have referred to my prior report on page 15 where $I$ valued 3/10/16 liquidation value, 1,684,368 and on this report 1,605,277. That's the only reference $I$ think I made to that report.

There may be something else in there, but that's the only thing I recall, sir.

Q You recall having an issue about statements about a report filed by Don Parker; correct?

A Yes.
Q And one of your -- I'm going to leave that alone.

Now, I want you to turn to the balance sheet that you provided in your report on Table 2 . Table 2 was with the --

A Table 2 was the lower of the estimate of the license estimates; yes.

Q I appreciate that. I'm just going to ask some general questions.

Did you do anything, Dr. Clauretie, to actually confirm any of the numbers other than with respect to CWNV and Clark, did you confirm any of the

| 1 | Other numbers on this list? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A I did not audit this. |
| 3 | Q You did not? |
| 4 | A I did not audit it. |
| 5 | Q And you think it's important in issuing an |
| 6 | expert report to provide an independent assessment of |
| 7 | a balance sheet if you're going to be doing a |
| 8 | liquidation value of a company? |
| 9 | A Would you ask that again? |
| 10 | Q I guess what I'm asking, maybe we'll do it |
| 11 | stepwise. |
| 12 | When you do a liquidation value of a company, |
| 13 | which you're effectively doing I think you said, |
| 14 | you're taking the assets, subtracting the liabilities |
| 15 | and figuring out what the equity is; correct? |
| 16 | A Market value of the assets? |
| 17 | Q Yes. Do you think it's important as an |
| 18 | expert to provide an independent valuation of all of |
| 19 | those numbers on the balance sheet such that you're |
| 20 | comfortable issuing a report on the accuracy of what |
| 21 | the equity is in the document or in your conclusion? |
| 22 | A It's important that the numbers accurately |
| 23 | reflect reality. |
| 24 | Q What did you do to confirm -- |
| 25 | A I didn't say it's important for me to confirm |
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them. Okay.
In this particular case, I met with Mr.
Kennedy -- the real issue is the liabilities because, except for the cash items, the assets are pretty much the value of the licenses, which $I$ went over with Mr. Paris Balaouras. So if you look at the liabilities, that's where you would want to perhaps do an investigation.

Q And you didn't do that investigation?
A I did not, and there is a reason for that. The reason for that is --

Q Mr. Dushoff can ask you the reason.
A Okay.
Q Now, you testified, Dr. Clauretie, that one of the individuals at NuVeda provided you a list is how you comprised Table 1 ; is that your testimony?

A Yes.
Q Does the list that you received look exactly like that?

A No. I mean this is vertical, but it was horizontal.

Q Was there any other information on the list other than what's on this page?

A No. Oh, was there any other information on the list?

| 1 | Q Yeah. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A Yeah, I think there was some footnotes, but I |
| 3 | can't recall. |
| 4 | Q Was there -- |
| 5 | A Let me put it this way: I don't think there |
| 6 | was any essential information on the list in terms of |
| 7 | the valuation -- of determining the valuation of the |
| 8 | licenses, but there may have been. I did not peruse |
| 9 | the entire sheet other than the value of the |
| 10 | licenses. |
| 11 | Q Is there anything, in your view, that would |
| 12 | be essential in being able to determine whether the |
| 13 | value of the licenses in this list is somehow |
| 14 | comparable to the licenses held by NuVeda? |
| 15 | A I'm not following that. |
| 16 | Q Let me flesh it out for you. |
| 17 | A Okay. Sure. |
| 18 | Q Is a cultivation facility -- rather, is a |
| 19 | dispensary in Clark County the same as a dispensary in |
| 20 | Nye County? |
| 21 | A I see what you're saying. No. |
| 22 | Q Is a cultivation facility that's 500 feet the |
| 23 | same as a cultivation facility that's 25,000 feet? |
| 24 | MR. DUSHOFF: Objection; beyond the scope. |
| 25 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: Overruled. |


| 1 | THE WITNESS: They wouldn't be the same. I |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | don't know if they would be the same, and that's |
| 3 | precisely the reason why I went to Mr. Balaouras and |
| 4 | said these are the licenses which has NuVeda given me |
| 5 | as comparable to their licenses. |
| 6 | In your opinion, are these license values |
| 7 | reasonable to apply to the NuVeda situation? It was |
| 8 | reasonable. |
| 9 | BY MR. FEUERSTEIN: |
| 10 | Q That was the extent of your conversation with |
| 11 | Paris? |
| 12 | A That's was the essential part, yes. |
| 13 | Q How long was your conversation with him? |
| 14 | A 20 minutes, half an hour. |
| 15 | Q You know that Paris was referred to you by |
| 16 | Dr. Bady; correct? |
| 17 | A Correct. |
| 18 | Q And you have no idea if Dr. Bady had a |
| 19 | conversation between the time he referred you and the |
| 20 | time you arrived; correct? |
| 21 | A Do not know that. |
| 22 | Q Did you have a conversation with Paris in |
| 23 | person? Over the phone? By e-mail? How was it? |
| 24 | A With Paris? |
| 25 | Q Yes. |
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| 1 | A In person. I went to his office. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q When did that conversation take place? |
| 3 | A It took place -- within a week, I didn't |
| 4 | write the date down. Within a week when I authored my |
| 5 | report, because I knew the deadline was coming up when |
| 6 | they wanted me to write the report, so I saw him |
| 7 | relatively soon. |
| 8 | Q Is there a reason, Dr. Clauretie, that you |
| 9 | took into account sales from January or in January of |
| 10 | 2018? |
| 11 | A Any reason I took them? |
| 12 | Q Why did you accept them as indicative of what |
| 13 | the value of Ms. Goldstein's interest is worth? |
| 14 | A What date again? |
| 15 | MR. DUSHOFF: Objection. That was not the |
| 16 | testimony. Indicative of what the licenses - |
| 17 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: You're right. Let me |
| 18 | withdraw the question and ask it better. |
| 19 | THE WITNESS: Yeah, ask it a little bit |
| 20 | better. |
| 21 | MR. DUSHOFF: That wasn't a great question, |
| 22 | by the way. |
| 23 | BY MR. FEUERSTEIN: |
| 24 | Q Is there a particular reason that the |
| 25 | licenses sold in January of 2018 were considered in |
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arriving at the conclusion of what the licenses were worth in August of 2017?

A No particular reason. So --
Q Sitting here --
MR. DUSHOFF: There's no question before you, Dr. Clauretie.

THE WITNESS: I did not see as I look -- as I look at it now, $I$ don't see there's big decline in prices. In fact, the cultivations went up. I didn't see any change from pre July 2017 to post July 2017. I didn't see any appreciable changes there.

So I had a larger number. The larger the number you have, the better.

BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q So it's okay in your view when valuing a business to use data points that come after a certain date for which you're evaluating that business?

MR. DUSHOFF: Objection. Misstates his testimony.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: I just asked him a question and he answered it.

MR. DUSHOFF: Objection; misstates the testimony. He took them into account --

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Okay. Sustained.
Can you rephrase your question.

BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q Dr. Clauretie, is it acceptable in your opinion, to use data points that come after the date on which you're supposed to be valuing the business to determine valuation?

A Under certain circumstances, yes.
Q What circumstances?
A If you have reason to believe there's no substantial change in values.

Q Let me ask you another question, Dr. Clauretie.

You have independent familiarity with the -with Nevada's cannabis market. Are you familiar what's going on in the cannabis market in Nevada?

A Today?
MR. DUSHOFF: Objection; vague.
THE WITNESS: No.
BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q Did you happen to know, for example, whether the licenses that sold in February 2016 were medical licenses or recreational licenses?

A I can tell you in 2016 those were licenses that were sold prior to recreational being approved.

Q In 2017, did you know whether those licenses were recreational or medicinal?

| 1 | A I don't know; I can't tell you. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q In 2018 whether those licenses were |
| 3 | recreational or medicinal? |
| 4 | A I don't know. |
| 5 | Q Is it your opinion, Dr. Clauretie, that when |
| 6 | you have an operating business that doesn't require |
| 7 | capital to continue to run, that the book value is the |
| 8 | best way to assess fair market value? |
| 9 | MR. DUSHOFF: Define "book value." Are you |
| 10 | talking liquidation value? |
| 11 | BY MR. FEUERSTEIN: |
| 12 | Q Liquidation value. Want me to say it again |
| 13 | for you? |
| 14 | A You better do that. |
| 15 | Q Is it your opinion, Dr. Clauretie, that you |
| 16 | have an operating business that doesn't require any |
| 17 | outside capital -- |
| 18 | A Assume you're operating. |
| 19 | Q That the best way to figure out the fair |
| 20 | market value is to use the liquidation method? |
| 21 | MR. DUSHOFF: Objection. Vague; overbroad. |
| 22 | In this case was it the best, or you're talking |
| 23 | overall? |
| 24 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'm saying overall. In his |
| 25 | expert opinion. |
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ARBITRATOR BAKER: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: The best value between values of liquidating the company and values of ongoing concern, the best value is always a function of the situation that you're looking at. So I can't answer that question. I can just say that if you had a going concern that didn't make (unintelligible), maybe value of an ongoing concern might be better.

There is a determination to be made, in my opinion, that this was the best method at that time for this company in this circumstance, but you can't say uniformly in every case which is best. It's a case-by-case analysis you would have to make. BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:

Q So there's no rule of thumb, in your view, that says when you ought to use the liquidation value versus when you should use the ongoing concern value?

A There would be a circumstance using a rule of thumb like bankruptcy or something like that. But generally, no absolute determination. It goes on the facts of the case at hand.

Q And you'd agree with me if the facts you were provided were inaccurate or incomplete, your determination to use the liquidation value may not be
correct?

A To the extent they were de minimus, it would be de minimus, or substantial, could be substantial.

Q And would you view the fact that NuVeda didn't require any outside capital to fund its operations in August 2017 to be a de minimus fact or fairly relevant fact?

MR. DUSHOFF: Objection. Beyond the scope of his knowledge; improper hypothetical.

He doesn't know anything about any of that. ARBITRATOR BAKER: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: That's correct. I don't know anything about their situation other than the fact what they told me, and they're the best people to answer that question.

BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q I want you to turn, Dr. Clauretie, to your report.

A Yes.
Q I'm looking for the right page. First, I'd like you to go on tab 2.

A Tab 2. One second; got it.
Q And the first thing I'd like you to look at is on page 13. There's a balance sheet as of $3 / 10$ $2016 ?$

A I see that.
Q And you see there's, again -- first of all, where did you get the information for that balance sheet?

A Mr. Joe Kennedy.
Q What did you do to confirm the accuracy of that information?

A Nothing.
Q Did you do anything to confirm the accuracy --

A I did not audit it.
Q Did you at that time have this so-called list with respect to the asset -- with respect to the valuation of licenses?

A I did not.
Q How did you get to the valuation of licenses there?

A I'm not sure. I'm not sure in this report. Let me explain something to you: I could take some time, an hour, a day, go through all of these past reports and be able to answer your questions a lot better. But these reports were done a couple of years ago, and my memory would only be improved by taking the time to go through them again.

I have not looked at these reports in some
months. So to be able to answer questions completely and accurately as you would like, I may not be able to do. I hope you appreciate that.

Q I do. I'll direct you and help refresh your recollection, so $I$ hope you appreciate that.

A Okay.
Q I would like to know, because you sort of raised it, what did you do in preparation for today's testimony?

A I read my report. That is on tab 7.
Q Okay. Did you meet with counsel to talk about anything?

A Yes.
Q When did you meet with counsel?
A I met with counsel yesterday.
Q When did you meet with them?
A I think it was about 2:00 o'clock.
MR. DUSHOFF: I think you're mistaken. Two days ago.

THE WITNESS: Two days ago, Monday.
BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q Dr. Clauretie, before we move off this, I want to point you to page 14. You say on page 14 in paragraph 2, do you see that? You're looking on the wrong page, sir.

| 1 | A I see it. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q It says \$4.5 million valuation was based on |
| 3 | recent sale for $\$ 5$ million. That also included a |
| 4 | leasehold advantage and options. Do you see that? |
| 5 | A Yes, I see that. |
| 6 | Q Does that refresh your recollection as to how |
| 7 | the number was calculated in the balance sheet? |
| 8 | A Yes. |
| 9 | Q Did you actually look at the leasehold and |
| 10 | options? |
| 11 | A I did not at that time. |
| 12 | Q Was that something that was told to you by |
| 13 | one of the principals of NuVeda? |
| 14 | A It was. |
| 15 | Q Did you do anything to confirm the accuracy |
| 16 | of that? |
| 17 | A I did not. |
| 18 | Q Now, turn the page if you would, |
| 19 | Dr. Clauretie, to page 15. |
| 20 | A Yes. |
| 21 | Q I'm sorry, page 16. And if you look at page |
| 22 | 16, there's a -- right below paragraph 7 it says |
| 23 | "Member Loans." Do you see that? |
| 24 | A Yes. |
| 25 | Q It says number about Jennifer Goldstein, |
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$\$ 47,660.50$. Do you see that?
A Yes.
Q And that was a number, I assume, was provided to you by the members of NuVeda; correct?

A Yes. That would have been a liability.
Q Let me ask you another question,
Dr. Clauretie. Assume for the moment -- I want to go back to my hypothetical with the contract, where the contract is there to provide financing to NuVeda's licenses so they can operate, they can run, and they don't need to get any sort of outside capital. You with me so far?

A Yes.
Q Suppose also there's a provision in that contract that requires this outside source who's funding NuVeda to provide payments, future payments based on certain terms of the contract; so NuVeda is assured of getting money as profits in the future. Is that an asset of the company?

A I don't know.
Q What would you need to know to determine whether a contract promising further payments is an asset to the company?

A The way you're structured; there's so many questions. I can come up with lots of questions
unless you can give me more details.
For example, you'd have to give me a lot more details about that particular contract. The contract itself, the obligations, liquidated damages in the case of the contract, financial position of the obligor.

I mean, you're asking an open-ended question. You're asking a question of me that $I$ can't give you a yes or no on your hypothetical without knowing a lot more about your hypothet. I'm not trying to gemiset (phonetic) around the matter, I'm really not, but I'm not going to allow you to get me to provide an answer yes or no on something that is so open-ended.

Q Okay. I was simply asking a question. I appreciate your response.

I'm going to give you a -- well, in determining whether to use the book value or the liquidation value -- let me take the question back because I started off and I kept getting worse.

In determining to use the liquidation value, did you ask the principals of NuVeda whether they had provided you all the assets of the company?

A Yes.
Q Did you ask them for any contracts that might provide beneficial contributions to the company?

A No. I just asked for a list of their assets.

Q And they told you the only assets were what was set forth in Table 1 or Table 3 of your report; is that fair to say?

A That's correct.
Q Now, I want you to assume for the moment, Dr. Clauretie, that in July of 2017, recreational sales of marijuana began in Nevada. Okay?

A Okay.
Q What do you think, sitting here today, that would do to the valuation of the dispensary licenses?

MR. DUSHOFF: Objection; speculation. What he thinks would happen? It's already beyond the scope of his knowledge. We keep doing these assumptions. It keeps dragging on and on.

If he has an actual question on the valuation, $I$ ask that we get to it.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Sustained.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Arbitrator Baker, he provided a expert report. I feel compelled to expand --

ARBITRATOR BAKER: I think the testimony is he doesn't know.

BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q Is that your answer, you wouldn't know what happens in the case of -- in the promulgation of recreational laws?

A I don't know what has happened to the values as we sit here today.

Q Okay. You understand, by the way, the reports that you're providing and that Mr. Parker provided are designed to calculate fair market valuation, not loss profits; correct?

A Yes. I take the term "fair market value" to incorporate -- fair market value is a -- the market value arrived between a willing seller and a willing buyer, and it would pertain to both an ongoing business and a liquidated business as well.

Q Is it your testimony or your understanding that NuVeda was in liquidation as of August 2017?

A No.

Q Do you have an understanding sitting here today, Dr. Clauretie, what a vertically-integrated enterprise is?

A Do $I$ have an understanding?
Q Yes.

A In general.
Q Do you have an understanding how that applies
in the cannabis business?
MR. DUSHOFF: Objection; relevance. This doesn't go to the valuation, to anything he's testified to before here today.

He was given information. I hate speaking objections, but this is going far afield.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: I'm going to allow it. Overruled.

BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q Do you know how the phrase vertically-integrated applies in the marijuana space?

A In general?
Q Yes.
A I believe so.
Q What's your understanding?
A A vertically-integrated company, in the marijuana business you would have a company that owns the cultivation facility, the production facility, and the dispensaries.

Q Sitting here today, do you know whether selling a vertically-integrated set of licenses does anything to the price of those licenses?

A No.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: No, you don't know or no
it doesn't? I want to be clear. You don't know?
THE WITNESS: No.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Okay.
BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q I want to turn to page 11 of your report. MR. DUSHOFF: Which one?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'm sorry, tab 7.
Q I thought I understood you to say that the numbers you include in here in revenue, expenses were numbers that you derived from the balance sheet. Did I hear you correctly?

A No, not at all.
Q Can you explain to me then how you picked the number of $\$ 900,000$ ?

A Yes.
Q Okay.
A The question when $I$ was writing the report, the question came to my mind: Is there any way to try to estimate the value of a going concern based solely on its assets? And in some situations, you can't.

If you assume that the value of the asset reflects the value of the company going forward, the cash flows that asset will make. Let me help clarify that for you.

```
                        There's a difference in the balance sheet
```

between the book value of an asset and the market value of an asset. Okay? In fact, the book value of their assets is like a couple thousand dollars maybe that they applied to get the license.

The market value reflects what those licenses can make on an ongoing basis as if it were ongoing concern. If you think about an investor that went to NuVeda and said you're in trouble, we'll buy your licenses because you can't operate, those investors are thinking about what the cash flows and revenues and expenses are going to be from that license, and they're not going to pay more for that license than what it's worth in terms of the cash flows that are generated.

That's what I'm showing in a hypothetical example in this section of the report. That, if you consider an investor in a license, valuing the license based on the cash flows of operating it, then, yes, you can come to the conclusion that, in a sense, the market value of the license represents the market value as an ongoing concern.

If they had to liquidate because they couldn't continue, they would sell it to an investor that could continue, and that investor would pay the market value of the license, which reflects basically
operating that license with revenues, cash flows, expected rate of return and so forth. The only reason I was doing that section of the (unintelligible.)

The numbers here have nothing do with the actual numbers of NuVeda.

Q I think I understand that. I guess my question, is the $\$ 900,000$ number in revenues just a number you picked out of thin air?

A Yes.
Q Could it have been $\$ 2$ million --
A Right. Exactly. It's probably a little bit too low because the value of that license in my hypothet comes out to be 2.2 million, something like that, exactly.

Q So I guess my question is how does Table 4 -if you're picking the numbers out of thin air and not basing it on any sort of numbers that are actual numbers of NuVeda, how does Table 4 do anything with respect to bolstering your opinion or refuting what NuVeda is alleging -- what claimant is alleging?

A It doesn't. I'll answer one more. It's an intellectual exercise to say that if you really wanted to look at the value of the licenses and extract from them some sort of value as a going concern, then you still come back to the value of the licenses.

Q And if I told you that the revenue number in year one was in the millions, the actual number, that wouldn't mean anything to you?

A If the actual number was a million?
Q Multiple millions; how about 7 million? MR. DUSHOFF: I'm going to ask some clarity. Are we talking about this example on page 11?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: No. I'm asking him --
Q If you had a data point that said the actual revenue of the two dispensary licenses was north of $\$ 7$ million in 2017 and 2018, that doesn't affect your opinion?

A No.
Q Now, I'm looking at page 17 to 18 of your report.

A Okay.
Q About this you say on the bottom of page 17 next to the last line, "To my knowledge, there have been no market transactions of fractional share in a marijuana company in Clark County." You see that?

MR. DUSHOFF: Where are you looking at?
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Second to last line.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q There have been no market transactions with

| 1 | fractional share in a marijuana company in Clark |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | County with an interest in six licenses. You see |
| 3 | that? |
| 4 | A Yes. |
| 5 | Q I was asking, Matt. |
| 6 | $A \quad \mathrm{Oh}$. |
| 7 | Q So you don't know whether NuVeda ever sold |
| 8 | fractional interests in the licenses that it holds |
| 9 | sitting here today? |
| 10 | A Correct. |
| 11 | THE WITNESS: Can we take a break? |
| 12 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: You need a break? |
| 13 | Absolutely. |
| 14 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: Let's take a break. |
| 15 | (Break taken.) |
| 16 | BY MR. FEUERSTEIN: |
| 17 | Q Dr. Clauretie, I have one question, or one |
| 18 | set of questions. I want you to assume for the moment |
| 19 | that 30 days after Ms. Goldstein's expulsion, NuVeda |
| 20 | sold its assets for \$30 million. |
| 21 | Does that affect your conclusion in any way? |
| 22 | MR. DUSHOFF: Objection. Improper |
| 23 | hypothetical. |
| 24 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: Overruled. |
| 25 | THE WITNESS: That's a good question. Let me |
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tell you why. Because I'm not a legal expert, but there's also some legalese in there as to when you do valuations and what you know after a valuation was done should not affect that valuation, so that's a good question.

The other question is, was any of the information that would have produced the valuation of $\$ 30$ million generally known at the time of the valuation? That's another very important question. 30 days after they discovered they owned this plot of land and discovered oil on it does not affect the valuation of 30 days prior to that. There's a serendipity. So it's the question of what they could have sold their assets for and paid off their liabilities as of that date of valuation.

The fact that a week later or two weeks later or a month later of a day later it was worth $\$ 30$ million, you'd have to ask the question, if that information was available that produced the $\$ 30$ million as of that date earlier, then that would have affected the value then. Does that help you out? BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:

Q So if the members of NuVeda knew or had reason to know that they were going to sell an asset for $\$ 30$ million dollars 30 days or within a certain
amount of time after the expulsion, that would affect, in your view, the valuation of the company?

MR. DUSHOFF: Objection. Speculation as to what -- speculation as to what they know.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Overruled. I believe that we're still in the hypothetical; right?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: We are.
MR. DUSHOFF: But hypothetical asking what members of NuVeda knew.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Understood.
BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q Did you get my question?
A Well, let me answer it this way: If they happen to have information when $I$ sat down with them that this company may have a value of $\$ 30$ million dollars a week later than what $I$ sat down with them, something like that, and they didn't tell me that information, then $I$ wouldn't stand by this report.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: No further questions. REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. DUSHOFF:
Q I wasn't going to have any questions until the follow-up.

Mr. Feurstein just put together a hypothetical, said 30 days later there was somebody
who offered them -- it was a sell for $\$ 30$ million. They offered for sale, somebody bought it. Isn't that one of the definitions of fair market value? Has nothing do with your value. If there's a willing buyer and a willing seller for $\$ 30$ million doesn't affect what you valued at on that given day, on August 8; correct?

A On that given day?
Q Yes.
A Correct.
Q Even two days later somebody offered $\$ 30$ million to purchase that property, that's just a willing buyer; is that correct? And then a willing seller would assume that, and that would be fair market value; correct?

A It would be, yeah.
MR. DUSHOFF: Thank you. I have nothing further.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: I have one clarification question.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY ARBITRATOR BAKER:
Q Table 1 that's on page 5, tab 7 of your report, which $I$ believe you testified you showed this to -- I'm going to say Mr. Paris because I won't
pronounce his last name correctly.
A Show the original document.
Q That was my question. It was exactly this information and nothing else that was shown to Mr. Paris? Understanding he didn't show him this page, but I'm just talking about --

A Correct.
Q -- the universe of information you provided to him is contained in this Table 1; is that correct?

A The document itself might have had a footnote or heading something here, but I said, Look at these values, and that's what he opined upon. Those values are reasonable, comparables to the licenses held by NuVeda.

Q Was there any information as to where the licensed were located in any other information?

A On the data sheet?
Q Yes.
A No, ma'am.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: I don't have any other questions. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

Thereupon,
JOSEPH LEAUANAE,
called as a witness by the Repondent having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. WILEY:
Q Would you state your name for the record.
A Joseph L-e-a-u-a-n-a-e.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Can you state it one more time.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Maybe twice.
THE WITNESS: Joseph Leauanae.
BY MR. WILEY:
Q Mr. Leauanae, can you provide your background post high school.

A Bachelor of science in accounting from University of Utah as well as master's in business administration from Utah as well.

Q Can you provide an overview of your professional certification.

A CPA, certified public accountant in Nevada, California and Utah. I'm actually -- do you happen to have my report? Sometimes I forget.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Right here.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Tab 4, your initial

| 1 | report. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | THE WITNESS: I'm a Certified Information |
| 3 | Technology Professional, which is a designation |
| 4 | granted by the American Institute of Certified Public |
| 5 | Accountants. I'm a CFF, which is Certified in |
| 6 | Financial Forensics, also by AICPA. I am a CFE, which |
| 7 | is a Certified Fraud Examiner with the Association of |
| 8 | Certified Fraud Examiners. I am an ABV, which is |
| 9 | Accredited in Business Valuation by the AICPA, and I |
| 10 | am an ASA, which is an Accredited Senior Appraiser |
| 11 | with the American Society of Appraisers. |
| 12 | BY MR. WILEY: |
| 13 | Q That's it? |
| 14 | (Laughter.) |
| 15 | You have experience providing business |
| 16 | valuations? |
| 17 | A I do. |
| 18 | Q And approximately how long have you been |
| 19 | providing business valuations? |
| 20 | A Over 20 years. |
| 21 | Q Has that been exclusively in Nevada? |
| 22 | A No. |
| 23 | Q What are the jurisdictions that you've |
| 24 | provided business valuations? |
| 25 | A Also in Utah and in California, but I've also |
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| 1 | been involved in cases that span multiple |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | jurisdictions. |
| 3 | Q Have you previously been retained as an |
| 4 | expert witness in any litigation proceedings? |
| 5 | A Yes. |
| 6 | Q Approximately how many times? |
| 7 | A Hundreds of times. |
| 8 | Q Have you ever been disqualified as an expert |
| 9 | witness? |
| 10 | A Not to my knowledge. |
| 11 | Q I think you've already opened up tab 4 in the |
| 12 | exhibit binder set forth in front of you. |
| 13 | A Yes, I have. |
| 14 | Q Do you recognize that document? |
| 15 | A I do. |
| 16 | Q And can you provide for the arbitrator what |
| 17 | that document is? |
| 18 | A This report was the first of three reports |
| 19 | that I have issued in this case. |
| 20 | Q What is the date of the report that's |
| 21 | contained in tab 4? |
| 22 | A November 29, 2016. |
| 23 | Q If I refer to this report as the November |
| 24 | 26 th report, you know I'm referring to tab 4 ? |
| 25 | A Yes. |

Q What was the purpose of the preparation of the November '16 report?

A We had been asked to review a report prepared by Don Parker as of May 2016 that opined as of value as of March 2016 . This report spoke to Don Parker's report as of March 2016.

Q Let's go ahead and thumb to page 7 of your report, please.

A Okay.
Q Under section 6 entitled, "Our Analysis of Parker's Key Considerations," it appears you addressed four considerations in that section; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q The first was with respect to Mr. Parker's valuation approaches. What did you determine with respect to those methodologies?

A Mr. Parker looked at three approaches -- the income approach, the asset approach and the market approach -- and he ultimately determined that the market approach and the asset approach, in his opinion, did not apply as of that valuation date.

Q Is that problematic in your view in any way?

A Yes.

Q Why is that?
A In the qualitative sections of Mr. Parker's report, he referred to various characteristics that seems to better fit the asset approach application, meaning this is a company that had no operations at that point in time or limited operations, no revenues, was in a federally illegal industry, had limited access to financing, issues of that nature.

Whereas, the approach Mr. Parker ultimately used in that valuation was an income approach that anticipated significant revenue growth.

Q Did you agree with the revenue growth that was set forth?

A No.
Q And can you explain why not?
A Mr. Parker had five different projection scenarios, and each of the projection scenarios, he anticipated kind of a best case, worse case spectrum, then he applied what he considered the appropriate level of risk to those various projections.

I had concerns regarding the derivation of those projections and assessment of the risk applied against those projections.

Q What specifically?
A His income projections really were wide
ranging, and they also included initial periods, I think at least a couple of years, where there hadn't been sufficient equity.

He projected the company would have negative equity for the first couple of years without any explanation in his report as to how the company would overcome the issues that you would expect, which is, no capitalization, the potential inability to grow without other financing. Those issues were not addressed in Mr. Parker's report.

Q Were there any other considerations or analysis that you had with respect to the valuations?

A Yes. So, and this perhaps relates to what he did later as well.

At the time of his March 2016 analysis, he indicated that he did not believe there was sufficient companies to form a comparable market, meaning that he did not deem the market approach to be useful as of that valuation date.

Q And subsequently he did?
A That's correct.
Q I believe you touched briefly about not considering the asset approach, but do you believe that was a methodology that should have been
considered at this time?
A I do. For a company that hasn't generated really any substantive operations, you will at least have a value, that is the value if you close your doors. If you close your doors, you got a value as is. That would essentially be the asset approach. So that would at least serve as kind of a grounding or tempering basis for the determination of value.

What Parker did instead with the income approach, he projected out using five different scenarios, none of which, according to his own report and through the use of hypothetical restrictions in his report, he did not evaluate in any meaningful way.

So he has projections that were provided to him; he has an assessment of risk that $I$ deemed excessively low for the projections he applied them against, and he determined their value under one approach that did not appear to be even close to the value that he determined under the asset approach that he ultimately disregarded.

I have issues with the way that he calculated his asset approach. But even his asset approach was significantly less than his income approach indications.

Q What issues do you have with Mr. Parker's
asset approach?
A Just the -- he has various assessments of asset value that come from source unknown.

Q The second consideration that you set forth in your report on page 10 dealt with Parker's assessment of projected income. What issues did Anthem have with the assessment of the projected income?

A With the projected income, some of the considerations were that, first of all, he had five different scenarios. But then in addition to those scenarios, he didn't appear to consider some of the issues that he did list qualitatively, meaning he indicated this is a federally-illegal business with limited access to financing and some of these other issues.

It's an early stage company, there's no necessarily proven track record as of the valuation date. But then when he's projected this income and assessed the risk, he does not appear to consider those risks in his calculation of what we refer to as the discount rate.

So when you're doing an income approach, there are two primary components: There's the projected income, then there's the risk that you will
actually achieve that projected income.
The projected income we kind of talked about. The assessment risk associated with that income I also have issues with. He had what he determined to be an 18 percent discount or that he applied against the income stream after adjusting it for, basically before tax dollars.

So he started with an 18 percent discount, and he adjusted it upwards by 8 percent to get to a discount rate of about 26 percent.

In my experience, if you're looking at a discount rate for post tax dollars of 18 percent, which is what that number represents, you're looking at companies that have been fairly well established, that have a long history of profits, that are federally legal, and don't -- that are not restricted by certain things such as there's a revenue ruling Section 280 E, which basically says that companies in this marijuana space are not allowed to deduct certain expenses. They can essentially just deduct cost of goods sold.

If you're looking at an income statement for any business, the expenses are primarily broken up into two different types: Costs of goods sold, which are essentially expenses required to generate the
revenues, then operating expenses, which are administrative, overhead-type expenses that are required -- the salary for your office staff, et cetera.

280-E basically only allows you to deduct the cost of goods sold and not all the other expenses. You're still going to generate, or cause to be incurred those expenses, but you're just not allowed to deduct them for tax purposes.

In his analysis, Parker uses 35 a percent tax rate. In my experience with marijuana companies, the effective tax rate you're looking is typically quite a bit more than that.

Q Mr. Leauanae, did you take any umbrage with respect to Mr. Parker's reliance and the projections that Shane Terry provided to him?

A I do to the extent he sought, at least in my opinion, to disqualify any potential due diligence he might have had to undertake.

So he had hypothetical conditions in his report that basically said essentially that he would accept these at face value. But then $I$ believe he used that hypothetical condition to assess a relatively low discount rate. He assumed that this industry essentially was stable, management operations
would be consistent, some of which I don't know that he necessarily demonstrated elsewhere in his report.

So he makes assumptions through this hypothetical condition session that $I$ think he then justifies or uses to justify what $I$ believe are artificially high projections and artificially low in receiving those projections.

Q Your report addresses Parker's inclusion of a large income growth without the corresponding increase in expenses. Can you provide for the arbitrator an overview of your assessment on damage?

A To a certain extent this also touches on the 280-E issue as well. In order to generate revenues, you have to incur expenses. The way that Parker builds his model, I see the revenue growth, but I don't see the expenses that you would otherwise expect to see with that level of growth.

So, essentially, if you imagine in Parker's model, he projects that after a certain point in time, relatively quickly, almost every dollar that is earned in revenues is going to go straight to the bottom line or straight to net income, which is not typically the case, especially a new industry that is federally illegal, has a lot of competitors, things of that nature.

Q The report also addresses an issue with Parker's reliance on projected incomes for 2015 where he shifted those same amounts to March of 2016. You have any issue with that action?

A I do. So essentially what Parker did, he had projections that were prepared or effective as of March of 2015, and then, he without anything more than I think a one-sentence explanation, moved them forward to be as of March 16th. And the only explanation that was provided was that he believed that that better fit the fact pattern or the facts set. I'm not quite sure what that means. He doesn't justify that any further.

In my opinion, if you have projections, again, even if you're comparing those projections March of 2015 to operations through March of 2016, you would have had a comparative. You would have projections for a year and actual activity for a year.

Had he done that comparison, I think he would have noticed that those March projections did not realize in that first year. His response to realizing that they wouldn't match is basically taking those exact same projections without modification and moving them forward one year.

So essentially he's saying it didn't work for the last year, but maybe for the next year,
essentially what he did.
Q The last topic covered under your second consideration has to do with Parker's application of generic industry growth. First of all, what is a growth rate?

A Growth rate basically is just the increment by which subsequent years, if we're using years as the period, increases over a base period.

Q And how was Parker's application of a generic industry growth rate problematic?

A Kind of corollary to, if I'm valuing a business, I'm valuing that particular business. I'm not valuing that industry. By applying an industry growth rate to a particular business. And, again, I have issues with his derivation of the actual income for the business.

Assuming that his derivation of income was accurate, applying an industry growth rate to a particular business without justifying why that industry growing rate applies, it's essentially saying you're valuing the industry.

There's no reduction from that growth to reflect the actuality of the company you're valuing. So to call that a business valuation I think is disingenuous.

Q The third consideration that you set forth in your report on page 13 has to do with Parker's assessment of discount rates. First, can you provide a brief summary as to what a discount rate entails in a valuation?

A So a discount rate essentially is the reflection, when it's used in an income approach, it's a reflection of the risk inherent in the projected income. So in this particular case, Parker used a build-up method, which essentially is an alternative investment theory. Meaning, instead of investing in the company, you could invest elsewhere. You could invest in treasury, you could invest in large or small publicly-traded companies.

His build-up method getting to about 18 percent I don't really have a particular issue with. The issue I do have with this derivation is that he stop short. The additional increment that he doesn't appear to consider quantitatively is the assessment that ties all the qualitative factors in his report to the number.

You're looking at a company that is almost early stage venture capital levels. Typically in my experience, those discount rates start around 40, 45 percent, as opposed to 18 percent. That's just for
early stages companies. Then you've got to factor in the characteristics of a federally illegal company, potential mismanagement, if there was any, issues that would increment the discount rate.

To use an 18 percent discount rate for a company that he qualitatively indicates had problems, I think is a mismatch that results in significant problems with his result.

Q You also briefly touched upon the fact that Parker's estimation of growth in net income is ridiculously high for years 1 through 5, but then levels out thereafter, and there is no reconciliation; is that correct?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Object to the form. You're leading your own witness now. You use the phrase, "ridiculously high."

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Sustained. Rephrase. BY MR. WILEY:

Q Your report talks about Parker's estimation of growth and net income for years 1 through 5, and then levels out thereafter.

Do you see any issue with that?
A Yes.
Q And what issue is that?
A So essentially what Parker has applied in the
income approach is what's referred to as a discounted cash flow method. The discounted cash flow method calculates out into the future a discrete period of time during which the company is going through either excessive or less than normal growth.

At a certain point in time it reaches what we refer to as terminal value, meaning after that point in time, things stabilize and they grow in perpetuity at a constant rate. Parker used a three percent constant growth rate. I have no problem with that. The problem I do have, though, is he's basically saying for the first five years there's this significant growth and all of a sudden it completely disappears.

Instead, so what he may argue, well, I could have grown it out for 10 years or 15 years and had even more growth, but instead I determined that after five years, it will go terminal.

I would have approached it from a slightly different perspective. I would say if you're going to say after five years something is going to happen, that causes everything to stabilize, it's not in his report. There's no demonstration in his report as to why this significant drop, which to me would lead me to question why there's significant growth during the
first five years as opposed to why there's a big drop after five.

Q Parker applied a 28 percent discount for lack of control and lack of marketability. Do you question that application at all?

A I did.
Q Why so?
A The derivation of that 28 percent is a combination of two different things: One is a discount for lack of control of 10 percent, and the other is a discount for lack of marketability of 20 percent.

A discount for lack of control is basically a reflection of the inherent inability to manage 100 percent operations of the company. So to the extent a company is not managed well and could be managed better had you controlled the company, then the discount for control would be greater. So to the extent as of the valuation date, the company may have been mismanaged or had other issues, that discount would have possibly been higher.

Typically in my experience, the discount for lack of control is closer to about 20 percent. His derivation of 10 percent came about through examining closed-end funds. It has a very specific application
that I don't believe is applicable to an operating company here. So that's the discount for lack of control.

The discount for lack of marketability is 20 percent, and basically what that reflects is a discount for the fact this is a privately-held company and a minority interest in a privately-held company, and you can't just turned around and sell it and get cash in your account a day later. So there's various studies that speak to these discounts.

But ultimately what Parker did, he referenced a couple of studies, then he said the discount indication was 26 percent, but he was reducing it by six to 20 percent because he said in the operating agreement there's language of the buy-back of an expulsed partner.

To my opinion, the buy-back for an expulsed partner was no different than the language that would allow another departing partner to leave and get paid market value. I don't know that that reduction of six percent has any necessary play in the calculation of the discount rate.

Again, I also have an issue with his calculation of just the 26 percent unadjusted discount for the lack of marketability. He referenced a couple
of studies, but in my experience, those discounts, especially for a minority interest, can be fairly substantial. This creates a compounding issue when we are comparing a 22 percent interest, which was the case with Terry to a seven percent interest, which is the case with Goldstein.

A 22 percent interest has the ability to do certain things, perhaps needs the approval of only a few other people to reach super majority than a seven percent interest might. So there are discrepancies as well in the level of ownership interest that are not reflected in his 20 percent discount for lack of marketability.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: I'm going to move to strike that last part of his testimony. I don't think that there's any opinion or any part of his opinion that speaks to that. I think his first two opinions speak to Mr. Terry's interest, and then his actual opinion served in rebuttal simply says that you shouldn't pay attention to the report because all the prior reports of Mr. Parker were with respect to Terry. Now it's with respect to Goldstein. So I think he's speaking outside the scope of his reports.

MR. WILEY: I would offer that there's language in the report which expressly provides
that.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Where?
MR. FEUERSTEIN: In fact, I would just note on page 6 of the rebuttal report, tab 12, Mr. Leauanae stated, "Given our foundational objection that these" -- paragraph 5 -- "that these theories and methodologies should be precluded because their use is predicated on an improper supplement, which is an opinion that we provide based upon our training and experience as business valuation and economy damage experts, we do not address these technical issues in this report."

MR. WILEY: Keep reading.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: I will, page 7.
"Notwithstanding the foregoing, we reserve the right to address these technical issues in a report or through testimony if deemed necessary." I think you have a blanket sort of open opportunity to opine on things that are not in your report, doesn't give an opportunity to understand his opinions ahead of time and prepare for them.

MR. WILEY: Again, based upon the fact that we filed our motion to strike in the expert report, there was never an expert disclosure by Ms. Goldstein of Mr. Parker, and as such we didn't want to shoot
ourselves in the foot with respect to our argument on a motion to strike, just to make sure we've got belt and suspenders, we're going to address the methodologies when we believe they're improper. And that was the crux of our argument.

So we had to have language that provides for the testimony of the expert if deemed necessary, and based upon the arbitrator's ruling, it was deemed necessary.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: To the extent it was deemed necessary by the arbitrator's ruling, that was over a almost a week ago now, and this is the first we're hearing of any change.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: I don't believe when I made that decision that $I$ had this December 27 th report, because I think I asked during the call, was there any -- did respondent's have the opportunity to respond to Mr. Parker's report. My recollection is the answer was, yeah, it may not have exactly been produced on the right day, but we got it out.

And so I said I'm not striking that, and I'm not striking Mr. Parker's report. So I don't think I have this in front of me.

But let me -- I'm going to note -- let's put this to the side for a second, this issue of -- I
think he does challenge in his report, I'm looking at tab 4, about the lack of control, lack of marketability equal to 28 percent.

I have not read the entirety of it, so I can't tell you what other details there are. But let's get through his testimony. You can ask your cross, then we'll figure out how to handle that.

MR. WILEY: I don't believe he fully answered the last question, so can we have the question posed before counsel lodged his objection.
(Record read.)
MR. WILEY: We'll just move on. I think he did cover that answer.

Q Mr. Leauanae, let me ask you a question quick regarding the history of valuations.

Have you had the opportunity to render valuations for any marijuana companies in the past?

A Yes.
Q How many?
A I've been involved in probably ten or so, including currently.

Q Have you been retained as an expert witness in any of the marijuana valuation cases?

A Yes.
Q Approximately how many times?

analysis, $I$ was rebutting an analysis of Terry's interest. So the facts that Parker in his second and third reports, the reports that $I$ was rebutting, considered post valuation date information, meaning information as of March 2016, I determined that from a valuation perspective, that was improper.

Q And what specifically did you find is improper as far as part of Mr. Parker's methodology?

A Really it even goes beyond methodology to clearing.

Valuation is conducted as of a specific valuation date. So the only information that you should know, or use, is what was known or knowable as of that valuation date. The valuation date at the time of these reports was March of 2016 , or at least the first two reports. The information, however, that he references in his second report and his third report was after March of 2016.

So my response is essentially to the second report or in my second report, which was dated December 13, 2018, was that Parker considered post valuation date information and, therefore, the analysis that he conducted and the conclusions he derived did not apply as of March 2016.
My criticisms of his third report for my
purposes, which was my rebuttal report dated December 27th, was that it appeared he was taking an analysis that was, for all intents and purposes, calculated for Shane Terry, which was a different interest as of a different valuation date, which essentially could mean a different company, and trying to apply it to a different individual.

And so my rebuttal in the December 27, 2018, report was a rebuttal of Parker's analysis as it pertained to Terry, not really for any other purpose.

Q Mr. Parker in his second report switches his methodology from income approach to the market approach?

A Yes.
Q Do you find that problematic in any way?
A I do.
Q How so?
A I'm just trying to tab it in the binder, which I believe is the February 23 rd report of Mr. Parker.

So, essentially, a valuation requires -always requires consideration of the three approaches: The income approach, the asset approach, and the market approach. I don't think I actually necessarily
describe what they are.
The income approach basically determines what the value for a company will be based on the assessment of the returns and the risk generating those returns, as I discussed before.

The asset approach basically is a reflection of the value of the company at a particular point in time when you consider its assets and it's
liabilities. If the difference between assets and liabilities is positive, then it has a positive asset value.

The market approach is typically broken into two different methods: One is the guideline public company method, and the other is referred to as the transaction method. Essentially, the guideline public company method looks to public markets for companies that are actively traded and comparable, and determines from the share prices of those companies what a potential multiple might be for your subject company.

The transaction method, by contrast, looks for transactions in an entire company, meaning the sale of one hundred percent of an interest in a company, and determines multiples as well that then applies to the subject company. So those are the
three approaches.
In his first report, he ultimately used the income approach and disregarded the other two.

Notably when he disregarded the market approach, he said there were no comparables. As of his February 2018 report, again, when he's still referring to Terry's interest as of March 16, he suddenly deems the market approach to have comparables, and the income approach to have no value in his assessment. Again, there's no explanation as to why this change occurred, other than it did occur.

Q Turning to page 4 of Mr. Parker's second report there, tab 8.

A I have it in front of me.
Q That's under the heading "Guideline Public Company Method"?

A It is.
Q You spoke briefly about that.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Where are you?
MR. WILEY: Page 4, tab 8.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Thank you.
BY MR. WILEY:
Q You testified briefly about the public guideline company method. Did you find any issue with Mr. Parker's use of the four companies that are set
forth in the box in the bottom of that page?
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Objection. Goes beyond the scope of his opinion. There's nothing talked about that in any of the docs submitted to date.

MR. WILEY: Other than the fact he addresses the methodologies that are set forth in complete detail in his expert witness report of December 13th, specifically, when he's talking about in the second paragraph of section 4, "As demonstrated above, Parker mentioned the only reason he was able to supplement his original valuation analysis with the application of the market approach was he used information that was not known, knowable or applicable in March 10th, 2016. Fundamental consideration in business valuation is that the value should be determined as of a specific date using information that was known or knowable as of that date."

So, now, we have a switch in the fundamental methodology that it's being used to determine the application of the accounting principals, and as such, the expert witness should be able to testify as to and opine on as to those issues. Switching from a market approach --

MR. FEUERSTEIN: I believe what he opined on and what he said in his testimony was that Mr. Parker,
according to the witness, improperly used information post -- that became available post March 2016. Now Mr. Wiley is directing him to specific issues and specific companies and asking him to say do you have issue with those companies.

He doesn't say anything in his report that $I$ take issue with any of the companies that are used, any of the facts, anything like that. He just says that he's using like a general statement to back his way into specific testimony that was never opined on in the report and, therefore, is outside his scope, improper.

MR. WILEY: The initial application as set forth in Parker's 2016 valuation dismisses this methodology and now comes back --

ARBITRATOR BAKER: This is the guideline public company method?

MR. WILEY: Yeah, under the market approach, because at that time, this is set forth in the expert's opinion, there were publicly-traded companies that were active in cannabis. We're talking about publicly-traded companies, which as the testimony will show, that this is the use of those companies in that box right there.

As the cannabis industry matures, largely due
to the push for legalization, publicly-traded companies involved in the marijuana trade became more widely followed both by the public at large and market analysts. So based upon that, that was the shift from Parker's methodology into the second report and -ARBITRATOR BAKER: I'll allow a few questions. Let's keep this moving forward, so objection overruled.

BY MR. WILEY:
Q Mr. Leauanae, did you take umbrage with Mr. Parker's use of the publicly-traded companies as comparables as set forth in tab 8, page 4?

A Yes.
Q How so?
A So assuming even though the date August 2017 does not show anywhere on Parker's February 2018 report, assuming that this analysis applies to August 2017, I have issues relative to the application of this guideline public company method because, in his own report, he references that the selection of these companies came from a list that was available only after August of 2017. It was available as of February 2018, more than six months later. And he also used financial metrics that were only known as of February 2018, as opposed to August 2017.

So in addition to the other issues I have with the market approach, the fact that he uses post valuation information subsequent to August 2017 in conducting his analysis is a problem.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: My objection --
ARBITRATOR BAKER: I understand. Let's move on.

BY MR. WILEY:
Q In your second and third report, did you have ongoing concerns with the use of Terry provided revenue projections?

A I did.
Q Why so?
A Those projections changed in Mr. Parker's February $23 r d$ report. The only rationale provided was that the projections he then used were more current. There was no assessment as to any due diligence he undertook to verify the veracity of those numbers.

Q Did the same issues you had with respect to the initial report regarding the 28 percent discount for lack of control and lack of marketable, did those remain?

A They did.
Q For the same reasons you testified previously?

| 1 | A Yes. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q Let's go ahead and look at Mr. Parker's |
| 3 | December 14 th report, which is tab 11. |
| 4 | A I have it in front of me. |
| 5 | Q Did you have an opportunity to review this |
| 6 | report? |
| 7 | A I did. |
| 8 | Q Now, what are your initial thoughts regarding |
| 9 | this report? |
| 10 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: Just note my objection. |
| 11 | ARBITRATOR BAKER: That's sustained. |
| 12 | BY MR. WILEY: |
| 13 | Q You agree with me that the value of Ms. |
| 14 | Goldstein's interest was determined for the first time |
| 15 | in the report dated December 14, 2018? |
| 16 | A In report is supposed to represent Ms. |
| 17 | Goldstein's interest, yes. |
| 18 | Q Turn your attention to page 5 of the report |
| 19 | that's denoted in tab 11. |
| 20 | A I have it in front of me. |
| 21 | Q In the box at the top of the page are the |
| 22 | four companies. Do you recognize those companies? |
| 23 | A I do. |
| 24 | Q Are any of those privately-held companies? |
| 25 | A No, not to my knowledge. |
|  | Page 509 |

Q Do you have any issue with Mr. Parker using these companies to prepare a market cap/revenue multiplier to use in Nevada?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Objection; beyond the scope.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Sustained.
MR. DUSHOFF: Your Honor, if $I$ may be heard on this?

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Yes, go ahead.
MR. DUSHOFF: Thank you. We had our motion in front you at the time when this was still going on, when they filed the report. We had the motion and said, hey, wait a minute, this is not correct. They cannot file this supplement, because clearly, his supplement was based off something off of the 2016 that she never hired.

So out of an abundance of caution, we said, hey, we told you what happened. We told our expert, hey, this is what this is. We think you're not going to be able to get this in because, as he said, it's an improper supplement.

Now, he reserved the right to testify, but it wasn't something -- you didn't even rule on yet that their expert's supplementation was out. This was -you ruled on that after, after the motion you heard
this, and you said, You know what, I'm going to allow that in as long as you had a rebuttal. But this was part of out rebuttal, knowing that there may be more information that he has been allowed to testify to regarding this. This was after your motion.

You could have said, You know what, I'm not letting that in. And I'm not letting that in, and then a rebuttal would have been moot anyhow if you weren't letting that in.

He should have a right to be able -- what you're doing now is foreclosing us on being able to have our person rebut their expert witness that you allowed to come testify after he submitted a rebuttal report on it. What he's trying to say, Listen, I'll reserve -- this is not right. You said, I'll allow it based on a rebuttal when he said it was not right. But he should have a right to absolutely testify regarding what's wrong with this report.

MR. WILEY: More importantly, we are talking about the multiplier issue, which hasn't been addressed yet in rebuttal. Mr. Parker was able to opine as to the use of the market cap/revenue multiplier, how he addressed that methodology.

We believe it's improper. We believe that the expert will opine why it is improper. And, again,
we're talking about an issue where we do have language set forth in the third report from Anthem as to what will allow Mr. Leauanae to be able to opine as to valuation of Ms. Goldstein, which of course, we saw for the first time 32 days ago.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Can I respond?
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Yes.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: I feel little bit that this
is somewhat to an extent of trial by ambush. Don Parker had a report, he's actually submitted multiple reports in this case, and Anthem has had the opportunity to respond to those reports.

The market multiplier, revenue multiplier was not produced for the first time in Ms. Goldstein's report. It was actually produced way back when, in tab 8, back in February of 2018, to which Anthem filed a rebuttal report. It was at that time Anthem could have said just like it said in its rebuttal report to tab 11, that we take issue with the revenue multiplier, and here's why we take issue with the revenue multiplier, and $I$ would have had an ample two weeks to prepare and talk about why I take issue with his issue.

Instead they've punted twice. They punted back in February 2018, they didn't take issue with it,
and they punted here again.
The fact there was no knowledge of whether Mr. Parker's report was going to get in as of December 2017 doesn't mean they couldn't prepare for it as it was. It's the old boycott rule, always prepare. But I don't think it's fair to say now without anything. It's not even produced in their pretrial brief as to why they're taking issue and what basis they're taking issue with the revenue multiplier. They're just dropping it on us now for the very first time.

As Mr. Wiley said, they had 32 days to prepare for this.

MR. DUSHOFF: If we may. He doesn't address what I discussed before. I think it's humorous coming out when I cross-examined Mr. Parker, he somehow comes out with this proxy thing; that was never brought up, never in any of his reports anywhere when $I$ said, You used CWNV report for the NuVeda reports. Now all of a sudden that's not a surprise? That gets in? No.

He has a right to testify regarding this. We never had the opportunity because there was no ruling. If we had a ruling before he did -- before he did his rebuttal, we could have said, Okay, listen, you need to do your specific rebuttal regarding the facts in here. You can't just reserve your right to testify.

But we never had that opportunity because you ruled on it afterwards. If they're asking us to do a rebuttal to the rebuttal, that's a different situation. That would be nuts, but you did not rule on it yet. What they're asking for us to do is a rebuttal to a rebuttal and that is not fair.

If they're saying trial by ambush, that's ridiculous. What do they think, we're not going to try and rebut the actual facts in here, that Mr. Parker can just make up stuff and we're not going to go against it?

The same four companies, the Terra Tech and Marafam (phonetic) was the same ones that were used in eight, the exact same companies. So if he was able to testify regarding that, how was he not able to testify regarding this? It's not ambush. They had all the information regarding this.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Did he testify, or in his expert reports talk about this market capitalization issue with these companies?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: No, he did not.
MR. WILEY: Let the expert --
THE WITNESS: I did speak to those because
they were post valuation date as they related to Terry. So in my opinion, it was improper to even
consider that information.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Here's the issue that I have: I understand your arguments to Parker's report on December 14th. We hashed this out as the subject of the motion.

I recall being told, because I asked, did you have -- did the respondents have the opportunity to respond, and the response $I$ recall was, Well, yeah, but it may not have gotten out exactly on December 29th or whenever rebuttals were due to reports, in which case I said -- I think I asked you, are you going to move to strike it?

I think you kind of wabbled a little bit. Well, I want to take a look at it and I'm not sure. You hadn't even had the chance to look at it yet. I said, Well, forget it. I'm not going to exclude it because I'll let yours in, and I'll let their report in. But $I$ did not have this report in front of me, and I was never informed that it was a reservation of a right to rebut it later. And my recollection is you haven't had the opportunity to look at it even at that point?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Correct.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: That's my recollection of the conversation. So here's what I'm going to do.

I'm going to allow it, and this is already -- we're already at 5:19.

So I'm going to allow a few more questions. I'm going to look through these reports in detail, and I will note your objection and decide whether to give any weight to what he is testifying to or not. And I think that's the quickest way and the fairest way to sort of move this along.

MR. DUSHOFF: May I ask, weight as to Ms. Goldstein's -- as to 11?

ARBITRATOR BAKER: What he is testifying to -- I mean, I need to read his report in detail. I don't even know -- there's some reviews and opinion, I don't even know what he's trying to say right now is even marginally can be inserted in that. I don't know at this point because $I$ have not read it.

So let's finish with some testimony. Let's move this along. I'm going to go back and read these reports, and then decide in my decision how much weight, whether to consider it, how much weight to give it at that point.

MR. WILEY: Arbitrator Baker, I'll be brief.
Q Mr. Leauanae, what is your opinion on the use of four public companies as a base line determination for the market cap revenue multiplier?

A I would say having that few number of companies does not constitute a market for purposes of guideline public company method.

Q What would need to be done to make it compatible and usable as far as a comparable?

A There needs to be a correlation between the general database from which these companies were derived and their application in this case. Those details were not provided in Mr. Parker's report other than reference to a list that he then modified as well without any justification or explanation.

Q Do you have any issue with Mr. Parker providing that a private company's market cap revenue multiplier is 50 percent of a public company?

A Not necessarily, but, again, that's a subjective assessment. And when you're looking at these four companies, these are all what we refer to as over-the-counter companies, OTC. While they are publicly-traded, they could be very well be thinly traded.

So if you image the bottom of the bucket in terms of public companies, these would be them. And I would say they would not constitute a freely and actively traded market that is a requirement of comparables under the guideline public company
method.
Q If you were preparing a market approach valuation of NuVeda, what would you look for in a comparable?

A I would look for a company that had revenues that were comparable to the extent of 10 to 20 times revenues to get the right size. I would look for a company that was actively traded. I would typically disregard OTC companies, which are all four of these, because they would not represent an active market.

I would identify the criteria $I$ used in the selection of my companies, which is not something that's present in any meaningful way in Parker's report.

Q In your opinion, would you dismiss Parker's report and his methodology in its entirety?

A I would say the way he narrowed down to this market approach and excluded consideration of the asset income approach is problematic, and that problem is only exacerbated by the problems I see in his application of the market approach. Again, I'm not a trier-of-fact obviously, but from a valuation standpoint, $I$ would say this analysis is improper. MR. WILEY: I have nothing further. ARBITRATOR BAKER: Mr. Feuerstein.

BY MR. FEUERSTEIN:
Q Good evening, Mr. Leauanae.
A Joe.
Q I'm going to call you Joe.
A That's perfect.
Q Now, you don't provide an independent valuation of Ms. Goldstein's interest; correct?

A That's correct.
Q You weren't asked to calculate what the interest should be given the corrections; is that right?

A That's right.
Q You didn't do a review of any the other expert reports from respondents to determine whether those analyses are correct; isn't that true?

A I didn't review any other reports.
Q Before I continue, let me make sure we're on the same page.

Your report at tab 4, your report at 10, and your report at 12 , that is the entire scope of your opinion that you're offering in this case, correct, subject to what we've been fighting about today on the record?

A Yes.


Q Is it your view that when asset values come from sources unknown, that's not a proper expert report?

A When asset values come from --
Q Let me restate the question. When an expert uses asset values that come from sources unknown, does that detract from the reliability of the report?

A Not necessarily.
Q What situations can it still be considered reliable?

A It would depend on the level of due diligence that should be undertaken by the appraiser. For example, if $I$ value a business that has a fair amount of real estate, I'm not a real estate appraiser, so I may rely on the appraisals done by real estate appraisers.

Q Let me ask you a hypothetical: Would you view it to be -- an expert report to be reliable if the expert took his client's data, spoke to a person referred to him by the client, and did no other due diligence whatsoever to confirm the values of the assets or the liabilities?

A It would depend on how the result of those discussions were presented.

Q What do you mean?

A If $I$ were presenting the results of those discussions as a valuation opinion, then the question would go to the level of due diligence that was undertaken to verify the statements that were made to you.

Q Let me stop you right there. If there was no due diligence taken to verify the statements made to you, other than by relying on the principles and one other person, does that seem reliable in your opinion?

A It would depend on the nature of the assets. It could be, it could not be, it just depends. For example, if the representation in the balance sheet says there's $\$ 100,000$ in cash, that's something that's easily verifiable. If the assessment is that there's a million dollars in intangible value, that's less so.

Q So if an expert, for example, provided a valuation of a marijuana license, cannabis license and relied on the statements of his clients, the statements of one other person and nothing else, is that reliable to determine the valuation of a cannabis license?

A I would say that would probably be an issue without additional due diligence for verification.

Q You mentioned during your testimony that
you've been involved with approximately ten marijuana company valuations; is that right?

A That's fair.
Q Have those all been in the state of Nevada?
A Some operations outside but, yes.
Q You were an expert witness in three or four of those matters; correct?

A A was designated in at least three or four, possibly more.

Q Did you testify in those matters?
A Not yet.
Q Did you provide reports in those matters?
A Some of them, yes.
Q Did you provide actual valuations or just criticisms of other expert's valuations?

A It's a combination, but some of those did provide values or estimates of value.

Q What -- were they businesses that were akin to NuVeda in the sense they were operating companies with vertical licenses?

A That's fair.
Q And did you use the -- what approach, methodology did you use to determine the valuations of those companies?

A Look at all three approaches, and typically
in the ones that resulted in the report, I think the genesis for was most of the opinions was the income approach.

Q Why did you use the income approach instead of the asset approach?

A It wasn't so much a selection on my part, but a comparison of the three approaches, and which provided the best amount of data and potentially the most reliable outcome.

Q Is there a rule of thumb, in your view, Joe, when one doing evaluations should choose the liquidation approach or asset approach versus the other two approaches?

A A rule of thumb, not necessarily. Really the appraiser has discretion, but they should consider all three approaches.

Q Were you aware in drafting your two rebuttal opinions whether at the time that you did that, whether NuVeda was operational?

A I don't recall.
Q Do you recall whether the dispensary licenses that NuVeda possesses were operational?

A As of the two December reports?
Q Yes, as of the two December reports.
A I can't recall.

| 1 | Q Do you recall or have any knowledge whether |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | NuVeda was -- those dispensary licenses were recording |
| 3 | any sales? |
| 4 | A I can't recall. |
| 5 | Q Is the fact that those dispensary licenses |
| 6 | that they were recording sales, is that important in |
| 7 | any way in your decision of which valuation approach |
| 8 | to apply? |
| 9 | A You should apply all three approaches, but it |
| 10 | would be probative in terms of how it would apply in |
| 11 | each of the approaches. |
| 12 | Q By the way, you don't have an opinion -- you |
| 13 | didn't provide an opinion with respect to the revenue |
| 14 | multiplier, correct, what it should be? |
| 15 | A Again, when $I$ was reviewing this in terms of |
| 16 | it being a Terry report, it's my belief that even |
| 17 | getting to a criticism of a revenue multiplier was |
| 18 | improper. |
| 19 | Q In the course of your valuations for the |
| 20 | other 10 marijuana companies, have you used a revenue |
| 21 | multiplier in those instances? |
| 22 | A For some of those it's been a consideration, |
| 23 | yes. |
| 24 | Q Have you used it, yes or no? |
| 25 | A For ones that I've been designated as an |
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expert that result in a report, not to my knowledge.
Q How about just the valuations and conducting valuation rather than being an expert or not?

A Yes. Typically when assisting in the consulting area, meaning in a mergers and acquisitions area, looking at potential during the due diligence phase of a transaction, assisting with what
indications a value might exist, I have looked at various indications, including revenue multiples as well as net income multiples.

Q Is there any sort of standard in the industry that you're aware of, of revenue multiples for private companies in assessing value?

A It's a hard question to answer because --
Q I only ask hard questions.
(Laughter.)
A There's various multiples. Whether or not they are applicable is really the issue.

Q Have you seen in the course of your evaluations of other marijuana companies, the revenue multiplier of six being applied on top line revenue?

A Yes.
Q You're aware -- withdrawn.
Are you aware, Joe, there was a document called the MIPA that was entered into between NuVeda
and a company called CWNevada?
A I'm not sure about the name of the document, but I believe -- I have a general understanding of an agreement.

Q What's your general understanding of that agreement?

A Just there was -- if you're referring to the 2015 transaction, just there was a combination of two entities that resulted in an entity known as CWNV.

Q Do you know what any of the parties' obligations in CWNV -- let me withdraw the question.

Do you know any of the parties' obligations in CWNV, meaning what's NuVeda's obligations and what are CWNV's obligations?

A Just the general recollection that $I$ believe CW was going to be responsible for management. As to what management functions specifically, I don't know.

Q So you have no recollection or idea sitting here today whether one party or the other was responsible for paying operating cost and expenses in the build-outs?

A My understanding, CW was to contribute, but the totality of those contributions, I don't know.

Q Would it be important or relevant in your valuation of NuVeda if, in fact, $C W$ was responsible
for paying all the costs and expenses in building out the dispensaries, the operating costs, and the production and cultivation?

A It could be, yes.
Q You mentioned, or you noted in your report -I go to your tab 4.

If I go to your report, on page 21 you
identify the letter of intent between NuVeda and CWNevada. You see that?

A I know it's in here. Can you point me to it.
Q $\quad 16$.
A Yes, I see that.
Q Did you ask for any additional information?
A I can't recall.
Q Do you recall having any conversations with either the lawyers or the individuals at NuVeda for additional information in framing your opinions?

A As of that November 2016, I can't recall.
Q How about at any point in time?
A Most likely, because I think there's a commentary in here regarding not being able to see $\$ 22$ million referenced in Parker's report, so I believe I would have sought clarification.

Q To that end, you mention in your -- by the way, did you read all the documents on here what's
been marked as Appendix 1 ?
A No, I don't believe $I$ would have.
Q Did somebody in your office read all the documents?

A Possibly not.
Q Possibly not?
A Yes. This is just a reflection of the documents we received.

Q Were those documents -- did you ask for those documents, or those were the documents that were just provided to you?

A It probably would have started with a general request for information. I don't know if it was supplemented for additional information we did not request.

Q Do you recall reviewing the transcript of Brian Padgett in connection with the preliminary injunction hearing?

A I don't know.
Q If I directed you to No. 25.
A I see that.
Q It says transcript of preliminary injunction hearing. You see that?

A I do.
Q You don't recall ever reviewing that?

| 1 | A I may have reviewed it, I just don't |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | recall. |
| 3 | Q Let me direct you, Joe, to Exhibit 164. So |
| 4 | you're going to have to play computer expert. |
| 5 | MR. WILEY: Let me help you. Go ahead and |
| 6 | minimize that one. |
| 7 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: Instruct him how to pull up |
| 8 | the answers. |
| 9 | MR. WILEY: Yeah. See the one that says |
| 10 | Feuerstein's a bad guy. Click on that one. |
| 11 | (Laughter.) |
| 12 | THE WITNESS: I've got the document in front |
| 13 | of me. |
| 14 | MR. FEUERSTEIN: Move to strike. |
| 15 | (Laughter.) |
| 16 | BY MR. FEUERSTEIN: |
| 17 | Q Take a look at the document, Joe. Tell me if |
| 18 | you've seen it before. |
| 19 | A I don't recall. |
| 20 | Q You know who Brian Padgett is, though? |
| 21 | A I do. |
| 22 | Q Who is he? |
| 23 | A I believe he was counsel at one point in this |
| 24 | case. |
| 25 | Q Would you accept my representation he's also |
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a principal in CWNevada?
A Sure.
Q I'd like you to turn to page 89, or scroll down to page 89.

A I'm there.
Q And I want you to look -- you can look at the question beginning on page 6 -- excuse me, line 6, and I want you to see in particular, beginning on line 15, where Mr. Padgett testified, "In total value, I mean, we came up with a total value for the deal, which includes cost savings when you don't have pay a loan of $\$ 4$ and a half million back, total value of approximately $\$ 22$ million." You see that?

A I do.
Q Do you have any recollection whether you saw that prior to issuing your report?

A I can't recall.
Q If you had seen that prior to issuing your report, would it have affected your opinion therein?

A It would have, but I think my opinion was regarding the LOI referenced in Mr. Parker's report. I don't know if this was any portion of the LOI.

Q I think what you say, you mention on page 8 that you were referring -- there was talk of the LOI, and you say it bears noting that the LOI received by
our office does not reference $\$ 22$ million; you see that?

A I do.
Q I'm asking if, in fact, you had the testimony from one of the principals of the party who we claim was paying the $\$ 22$ million, would that change your opinion in anyway?

A I would say this is a reference to 22 million. I don't know if this would be a representation of the value it represented.

MR. FEUERSTEIN: I think I'm finished. I'd like to sort of look at my notes. If I have anything, it's going to be very brief.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Let's take a couple minute break.
(Break taken.)
MR. FEUERSTEIN: I don't think I have any further questions at this time.

MR. DUSHOFF: Your Honor, and I apologize, just walking in. I know from your prior ruling that basically the exchange, and $I$ apologize speaking out of order -- but basically based on Mr. Feuerstein's motion to strike, it was summarily stated that since he didn't mention anything about in 12 regarding 11, that it's summarily out. That, therefore, if he
didn't mention it --
ARBITRATOR BAKER: That's not what I said. I allowed questions to continue, been given over his objections. And what I'm going to do is get the transcript, I'm going to read back through it. I'm going to read through these reports is what $I$ said, because I don't know whether something he said, because there appears to be some sort of analysis and considerations, even in this December -- I don't know whether what he said then encompass what was objected to or is it fairly included.

So I noted the objection. I'm going to go back and read through the transcript, and I'm going to read these before $I$ issue an opinion. That was my decision.

MR. DUSHOFF: I apologize. I was just getting a case regarding that very issue you were talking about.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Okay. Anything else?
MR. WILEY: No redirect for me.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Nothing from me.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: Thank you. Let's go off the record for now.
(TIME NOTED: 6:00 p.m.)

I, the undersigned, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the state of Nevada, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me at the time and place herein set forth; that any witnesses in the foregoing proceedings, prior to testifying, were duly sworn; that a record of the proceedings was made by me using machine shorthand which was thereafter transcribed under my direction; that the foregoing transcript is a true record of the testimony given.

Further, before completion of the proceedings, review of the transcript [ ] was [ ] was not requested.

I further certify I am neither financially interested in the action nor a relative or employee of any attorney or party to this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date subscribed my name.

Dated: January 31, 2019


NV. CR NO. 475
CALIF. SR NO. 11861

Page 534
[\& - 2016]

| \& | $\begin{gathered} 100 \quad 365: 8381: 21 \\ 386: 22387: 8 \\ 395: 1494: 14 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 149331: 15,15,18 \\ 362: 12386: 6 \end{gathered}$ | 83:7 386:12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \& 260:16 262:12 |  |  | $88: 7418: 15$, |
| 0 |  | 14th 509 | 23:24 430:2 |
| 5 |  | 15 329:11,13 | 434:18 436:13 |
| 259:7 260:7 265:6 | 10017 261:20 | 450:6463:19 |  |
| 1 | 1050 262:6 | 493:16 531:8 | 462:24 471:10 |
| 1 305:20,23 309:2 | 1065 392:9 | 50 399:22 | 2,590,000 437:6 |
| 309:20, | 10th 505:13 | 150,000 343: | 2,990,000 437:2,7 |
| 333.3 335.23,25 | 11 373:6418:2 | 16 259:16 26 | 2.2 471:13 |
| 365:14 381:6 | 435:22 469:5 | 265:2 296:2 | 2.5 344:10,15,2 |
| 389:6 420:5,10,18 | 472:7 509:3,19 | 330:8 339:16 | 346:17 399:11 |
| 423:18 424:1 | 512:19 516:10 | 385:9 400:18,2 | $\mathbf{2 . 6 2 5} 309: 3$ |
| 425:16 426 | 532:24 | 401:1,2 413:3 | 2.7 384:2 |
| 430:1,2 433 | 11/28 | 463:21,22 481 | 20 310:6 358:11 |
| 435:24 452:16 | 112 297 | 504:7 528:1 | 59:24 370:23 |
| 466:4 476:23 | 11861259 | 16.85 356:6 | 394:2,18 425:8 |
| 477:9 492:11,20 | 534:25 | 164 326:17 530:3 | 454:14 479:20 |
| 529:1 | 12 379:10,16 497:4 | 16th 427:10 489:9 | 494:11,23 495:4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{1 , 0 0 0} 350: 25351: 8 \\ & 352: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 500: 10,11519: 21 \\ & 532: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} 17 \quad 352: 2,3354: 24 \\ 385: 5472: 14,17 \end{array}$ | 495:14 496:12 |
|  |  |  | 518:6 |
| 1,500 417:2 | $12.4 \quad 398: 7$ | 17th 290:12 | 200,000 324:11,17 |
| $\begin{array}{cc} \mathbf{1 , 6 0 5 , 2 7 7} & 428: 6 \\ 434: 21 & 450: 7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{1 2 : 3 0} 359: 21 \\ & 369: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 18 331:21 400:20 | 343:14,23 351:14 |
|  |  | 401:1,2 472:14 | 352:8 372:23 |
| $\mathbf{1 , 6 8 4 , 3 6 8} 450: 7$ | $369: 7$ 12th 296:9 | 486:5,8,12 491:15 | 2011 416:9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1.1 \quad 386: 12,17 \\ & 388: 12391: 19 \end{aligned}$ | 12th 296:9 <br> 13 277.4 290:10 | 491:25 492:5 | 2014 334:19,20 |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 13 \quad 277: 4290: 10 \\ 383: 9436: 8,11 \end{gathered}$ | 19 290:11,11 294:5 | 344:17 346:24,25 |
| 1.1e 367:9 | $\begin{aligned} & 383: 9436: 8,11 \\ & 460: 24 \text { 491:2 } \end{aligned}$ | $380: 24381: 25$ | $\begin{gathered} 2015 \quad 322: 5346: 23 \\ 489: 2,7,15527: 8 \end{gathered}$ |
| 1.1e. 365:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 460: 24491: 2 \\ & 500: 18501: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{lll}1970 & 335: 16 \\ 198 & 351: 18,20\end{array}$ |  |
| 1.3 344:5 368:11 | $\begin{array}{ll} \mathbf{1 3 0} & 262: 7 \\ \mathbf{1 3 2 0} & 362: 20 \end{array}$ |  | 2016 311:3 324:21 |
| 1.605 435:5 |  | 1980s 268:11 | 327:19,25 328:24 |
| 10 289:16 298:17 | $\begin{gathered} 1320 \quad 362: 20 \\ 364: 13 \end{gathered}$ | 1983 418:3 | 332:16 334:21 |
| 342:21 383:25 | $\mathbf{1 3 3}, \mathbf{0 0 0} \quad 350: 21$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 1984 & 268: 3 \\ 1988 & 416 \cdot 9 \end{array}$ |  |
| 418:8,18 | 13th 272:7 277:9 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 348: 11352: 2,3 \\ & 356: 11383: 5,25 \end{aligned}$ |
| 428:2,4 429:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 290:15 413:22,25 } \\ & 414: 11505: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { 19th } & 290: 12,12,16 \\ \mathbf{1 : 0 0} & 359: 22 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 390: 18393: 9 \\ & 402: 21418: 8,18 \\ & 418: 23 \text { 419:1 } \\ & 457: 20,22460: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| 485:5 493:16 |  |  |  |
| 494:10,24 500:2 | $\begin{array}{r} 14 \quad 319: 22329: 13 \\ 462: 23,23509: 15 \end{array}$ | 2 |  |
| 500:10 518:6 |  | 2 |  |
| 519:20 525:20 | 9:1 | $287: 23$ | 480:22 481:4,5,6 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 , 0 0 0} 312: 24$ | 148 369:22 | $305: 18 \text { 308:21 }$ | 483:16 489:3,15 |
|  |  | 330:9 347:9,10 | 501:5,15,18,24 |

Page 1

| 505:14 506:2,14 | 534:21 | 263 264:14 306:13 | 3,541,000 433:16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 510:15 528:18 | 205 261:18 | 306:17 320:20,24 | 3,760,000 437:7 |
| 2017 269:7 272:8 | 20th 261:19 | 393:12 394:8 | 3.5 283:22,22 |
| 274:12 291:3,6 | 21 267:19 528:7 | 396:15 409:3 | 288:9 342:14 |
| 294:5,7 305:18,23 | 2113 304:8,8,14 | 264 264:15 315:1 | 343:8 408:16 |
| 306:1,2 307:16 | 344:4,9 345:8,11 | 316:13, 15,17,18 | 3/10 418:22 |
| 311:16,19 319:22 | 345:25 346:3,5 | 317:14,16,17 | 460:24 |
| 331:12 333:3 | 347:4 360:6,16,21 | 318:3 319:24 | 3/10/16 450:6 |
| 336:2,15 340:13 | 361:13 362:7,21 | 265 264:16 316:14 | 30 290:17 291:18 |
| 347:11 348:3,6,8 | 363:7 364:3,14 | 316:15,19 319:8 | 291:22 292:8,9,11 |
| 348:12,15,18 | 368:16 369:6 | 267 263:5 | 292:12 338:21 |
| 355:5,7,10,13 | 411:3,11 | 26th 480:24 | 346:19 371:6 |
| 356:12,12 378:7 | 22 408:18 496:4,7 | 27 500:20 502:8 | 398:15 473:19,20 |
| 378:12 379:9,17 | 528:21 531:13 | 270 264:10 | 474:8,10,12,17,19 |
| 379:21 380:23 | 532:1,6,8 | 274 263:6 | 474:25,25 475:15 |
| 381:2 384:4,6,9,17 | 235,870 309:7 | 27th 498:15 502:2 | 475:25 476:1,5,11 |
| 393:5,9 394:2,9 | 23rd 502:20 | 28 494:3,8 499:3 | 300,000 434:11 |
| 395:18 402:9 | 508:15 | 508:20 | 306 264:14 |
| 403:18 411:14 | 24 306:7 | 280 486:18 487:5 | 31 534:21 |
| 412:14 419:24 | 240,000 363:2 | 488:13 | 316 264:15,16 |
| 420:1 421:10 | 249 353:13,15,19 | 287 264:11 | 3196606 259:24 |
| 440:22 441:16 | 354:2,6,23 356:24 | 29 297:5 480:22 | 31st 344:17 346:22 |
| 456:2,10,10 | 25 297:16,21 | 293 263:7 | 32 512:5 513:11 |
| 457:24 460:6 | 298:16,25 299:11 | 294 263:9 | 32,000 397:18 |
| 466:8 467:17 | 299:25 379:21 | 29th 515:10 | 321 263:10 |
| 472:11 507:15,18 | 435:24 529:20 | 2:00 462:17 | 325 263:11 |
| 507:22,25 508:3 | $\mathbf{2 5 , 0 0 0} 397: 23$ | 2b 309:3 393:19 | 33 277:18 |
| 513:4 | 399:10 453:23 | 394:11,17 395:4 | 33.05 356:7,14 |
| 2018 296:9,25 | 257 316:10 357:9 | 395:14,16,17 | 333 263:13 |
| 305:19 309:2,16 | 259 259:25 357:10 | 409:16,24 | 334 263:15 |
| 310:9 354:25 | 357:13 | 3 | 35 283:21 290 |
| 356:12 360:12 | 26 306:7 486:10 | 3 287:23 329:13,14 | 342:13 343:15 |
| 378:2 408:15 | 495:13,24 | $329: 15 \text { 365:2,4 }$ | 354:16,19,20 |
| 455:10,25 458:2 | 261 264:10 270:21 | $\begin{aligned} & 529: 15 \text { 505:2,4 } \\ & 367: 10418: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 385:15,16 386:9 |
| 472:11 500:18,21 | 270:25 275:1 | $428: 1430: 2432: 3$ | 386:13 387:12,13 |
| 501:21 502:8 | 280:11 304:1 | 28.1 430.2 432.3 | 387:17,18 388:11 |
| 504:6 507:16,23 | 342:6,8 | $433: 1743$ | 388:23 433:25 |
| 507:25 509:15 | 262 264:11 286:13 | 437:8 466: | 434:5,22 437:5,9 |
| 512:16,25 | 287:14 293:14 |  | 440:25 441:10 |
| $2019 \quad 259: 16$ | 413:12,18 414:4 | $437: 8$ | 445:5,6 487:10 |

Page 2

| $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \mathbf{3 6} & 267: 16 \\ \mathbf{3 6 0} & 263: 16 \\ \hline \mathbf{3 6 2}-7800 & 262: 17 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 492: 11,20497: 6 \\ & 509: 18 \\ & \mathbf{5 0 \quad 3 2 0 : 5} 358: 5 \end{aligned}$ | 7.2 $356: 1$ <br> 7.4 $434: 18$ <br> 702 $261: 6$ <br> $262: 9,17$  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { ability } 308: 17 \\ & 377: 20442: 24 \\ & 496: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | :1 399:16 | 7085 534:24 | able 352:12 398 |
|  | 412:9 517:14 | 70s 398:17 | 442:14 453:12 |
| 4 | $\begin{array}{ll} \mathbf{5 0 0} & 453: 22 \\ \mathbf{5 0 0 , 0 0 0} & 427: 12 \end{array}$ | 768-0591 261:2 | 1:21 462:1, |
| 432:14 433:19 |  | 786-1001 261:6 | 505:10,21 510:20 |
| 471:15,18 478:25 | 433:18 | 8 | 511:10,11,21 |
|  | 51 370:4, | 8 294:7 327:19,25 | 512:3 514:14,15 |
| 499:2 504:12,20 | $519 \text { 264: }$ | 369:20,23 408:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 528: 21 \\ & \text { absence } 431: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| 505:9 507:12 | $\begin{array}{cc} \mathbf{5 2 . 7} & 319: 4 \\ \mathbf{5 3 4} & 259: 25 \end{array}$ | 11:14 420:11 |  |
| 519:20 528:6 |  | 21:10 428:5 | 435:17 |
| 531:12 | $\mathbf{5 : 1 9} \quad 516: 2$ | 76:7 486:9 | $\begin{gathered} \text { absolute } 309: 7 \\ 459: 21 \end{gathered}$ |
| 4,470,000 383:23 | 6 | 04:13,20 507:12 |  |
| 4.5 433:20,21,23 | 6 358:3 397:1 | 12:16 531:23 | tely 28 |
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| 262:14,15 | 6.2. $370: 1$ | 89145 261:5 262:8 |  |
| 400,000 434:25437:7,9 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 455: 12 \text { 487:22 } \\ & 530: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $60 \quad 370: 10,15,17$ | 262:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { acceptable } 432: 6 \\ & 457: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| 409 263:17 | $\begin{gathered} 412: 10,11,14 \\ \text { 616,693.87. } 355: 20 \end{gathered}$ | 8th 419:23 420:1 |  |
| 413 263:18 |  | 9 | accepted 273:6282:23 344:15 |
| 415 263:20 | $646 \quad 261: 21$ | $\begin{gathered} 958: 5 \text { 397:13 } \\ 398: 5432: 5433: 9 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 42nd 261:18 | 65 336:16 388:22 |  | 437:18 |
| 438 263:21 | 445:1,3,6 | $\begin{aligned} & 398: 5432: 5433: 9 \\ & 433: 22434: 5,7,8 \end{aligned}$ | access 376:10 |
| 45 491:24 | 6:00 533:24 | 434:22 435:8 | $410: 23482: 8$ |
|  | 7 | $\mathbf{9 0 0 , 0 0 0} \quad 469: 14$ | 485:15 |
| 475 259:22 260:20 263:22 534:25 | 7 259:3 26 |  | account 409:18 |
| 476 263:23 | 380:7 419:14,16 | 71 | 455:9 456:23 |
| 478 264:4 | -18,20,2 | 9-5487 262: | 495:9 |
| 48 370:18 | 20:10,12 430:1 | 95 279:7 | accountant 478:21 |
| 5 |  |  | ants 479: |
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| 424.1 427.1 |  |  | 335:11,14 340:12 |
| 463:3 476:23 |  |  | 348:3 405:23 |

[accounting - ali]

| 478:16 505:20 | activity 489:17 | advantage 463:4 | $393: 24,25394: 1,7$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| accredited 479:9 | actual 388:2 430:9 | advice 394:13,14 | agreeing 307:9 |
| 479:10 | 466:18 471:5,17 | affect 431:13 | agreement 264:14 |
| accuracy 279:20 | 472:2,4,9 489:17 | 440:12 447:6,8,10 | 278:23 299:14,15 |
| 279:25 280:4 | 490:15 496:18 | 448:6,7,16 472:11 | 299:18 306:5 |
| 451:20 461:6,10 | 514:9 523:14 | 473:21 474:4,11 | 311:16,19,25 |
| 463:15 | actuality 490:23 | 475:1 476:6 | 318:4 320:20,23 |
| accurate 272:9 | add 266:17 283:8 | affiliated 271:24 | 331:22 332:8 |
| 288:14 341:4 | 288:18 301:22 | 334:12 384:9 | 333:9 336:18 |
| 348:2 356:24 | 377:21,23 378:4,8 | affiliation 334:17 | 337:6,10,16 |
| 374:24 375:8 | 378:13,19 437:9 | 335:3 | 340:21 349:6 |
| 405:1,5 406:5,13 | added 279:12 | afford 359:9 | 351:24 352:1 |
| 406:16 438:15 | 289:7 | afforded 359:9 | 357:7,13,19,19 |
| 490:18 | adding 289:14 | afield 468:6 | 358:7,21 359:6 |
| accurately 451:22 | addition 310:8 | aforementioned | 363:8 366:3,15 |
| 462:2 | 485:11 508:1 | 308:23,24 | 368:16,23 369:2 |
| achieve 486:1 | additional 324:25 | afraid 431:4 | 390:25 392:12,18 |
| acquire 318:5 | 491:18 522:24 | afternoon 438:3 | 392:20,21 394:2 |
| 410:5 | 528:13,17 529:14 | agent 335:15 | 394:17,23 395:14 |
| acquired 314:18 | additions 331:22 | 394:12 395:15,17 | 395:23,25 396:20 |
| 346:13 428:20 | 332:8 | 395:20 | 408:19 409:17,21 |
| acquisition 318:11 | address 424:17 | ago $275: 17,17,18$ | 410:1,4 433:24 |
| 324:7,13,15,19 | 497:11,16 498:3 | 360:6 400:21 | 448:24,25 449:8 |
| 352:9 | 513:13 | 416:1 461:23 | 449:10 495:15 |
| acquisitions | addressed 265:15 | 462:19,20 498:12 | 527:4,6 |
| 381:12 526:5 | 481:11 483:10 | 512:5 | agreements |
| acres 313:16,17 | 511:21,23 | agree 276:25 | 310:24 311:4 |
| 398:7 422:4 | addresses 488:8 | 288:8 291:21 | 409:4 |
| act 395:15,19 | 489:1 505:5 | 292:17 301:21 | ahead 270:15,19 |
| acting 395:17 | addressing 266:8 | 328:19,22,25 | 342:1 343:12 |
| action 295:13 | ade 388:7 | 329:4 349:17 | 344:3 347:1 |
| 349:3 489:4 | adjusted 486:9 | 366:1 376:21 | 353:12 444:13 |
| 534:17,18 | adjusting 486:6 | 385:25 387:25 | 481:7 497:21 |
| actions 268:7 | administration | 395:20 396:8 | 509:2 510:9 530:5 |
| 339:17 | 478:18 | 408:13,19 410:3 | aicpa 479:6,9 |
| active 506:21 | administrative | 459:23 482:12 | air 398:17 471:8 |
| 518:10 | 487: | 509:13 | 471:16 |
| actively $348: 18$ | admitted 270:16 | agreed 298:9 | airport 398:8,12 |
| 503:17 517:24 | 270:17 315:2 | 300:1 307:10 | akin 523:18 |
| 518:8 | 382:9 422:24 | 309:10 351:15 <br> 385:19,23 389:19 | ali 300:16 354:11 |


| allegations 295:17 | 429:15 443:19 | anthem 312:6,8,11 | applicable 495:1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| alleged 295:16 | 475:1 521:13 | 312:13 485:7 | 505:13 526:18 |
| 360:15 | 524:8 | 512:2,11,16,17 | application 482:4 |
| allegedly 363:5 | amounts 272:18 | anticipated 482:11 | 490:3,9 494:5,25 |
| alleging 471:20,20 | 272:19 289:18 | 482:18 | 505:11,20 506:13 |
| allen 278:5 371:20 | 343:25 347:12 | anticipating | 507:18 517:8 |
| 371:21 | 397:8 406:7,9 | 345:13 389:13 | 518:21 |
| allocate 388:2 | 489:3 | anticipation 293:5 | applied 470:4 |
| allocated 388:22 | ample 512:21 | 414:19 | 482:19,22 484:16 |
| allow 302:4 | analyses 519:16 | anxious 344:14 | 486:5 492:25 |
| 315:13 316:11 | analysis 459:13 | anybody 271:24 | 494:3 526:21 |
| 397:6 465:12 | 481:10 483:12,16 | 274:13 293:3 | applies 467:25 |
| 468:7 495:19 | 487:10 501:1,1,23 | 340:9 369:1 | 468:11 490:20 |
| 507:6 511:1,15 | 502:2,9 505:11 | 372:12 | 503:25 507:17 |
| 512:3 516:1,3 | 507:17 508:4 | anymore 443:24 | apply $454: 7$ |
| allowed 305:20 | 518:23 520:3 | anyway 532:7 | 481:22 501:24 |
| 315:12 486:19 | 533:8 | apex 299:20 311:1 | 502:6 525:8,9,10 |
| 487:8 511:4,13 | analysts 5 | 311:6,8,9,10,20 | applying 490:13 |
| 533:3 | announcement | 349:12,13 357:7 | 490:18 |
| allows 487:5 | 318:4 | 357:19,20,20,22 | appointment |
| alternative 434:13 | answer 297:19 | 357:24,25 358:10 | 414:8 |
| 491:10 | 320:18 337:20 | 396:23 397:16 | appraisal 264:10 |
| ambush 512:9 | 341:13 353:23 | 398:4 | 264:12 267:20 |
| 514:7,16 | 361:10 363:21 | apologies 326:16 | 268:18,20 269:6 |
| amenable 292:8 | 371:15 379:1 | apologize 302:21 | 269:10,14,25 |
| amended 385:22 | 396:1 406:1 | 305:23 434:1,8 | 270:3,11,13,15 |
| amendments | 429:23 430:6 | 532:19,21 533:16 | 271:2,9 272:4,7,19 |
| 333:5 | 445:22 446:16,24 | apparently $354: 24$ | 272:20 273:20 |
| american 259:1 | 446:25 459:5 | 370:7 | 274:1,5,6,9,25 |
| 260:1 479:4,11 | 460:15 461:21 | appear 484:18 | 275:10 278:10,25 |
| amount 309:6 | 462:1 465:12 | 485:12,20 491:19 | 279:2,11 280:11 |
| 312:19,21 323:14 | 467:2 471:21 | appearances | 280:19 282:9 |
| 323:14 324:9 | 475:13 498:19 | 261:11 262:1 | 285:9,9,21 287:6 |
| 342:17 343:15 | 499:13 526:14 | 265:7 | 287:23,24 288:1 |
| 344:5 345:11 | answered 378:24 | appeared 502:2 | 288:10 291:11 |
| 346:1 350:24 | 392:15 445:19,20 | appearing 343:4 | 292:24 293:23 |
| 351:7,15 355:24 | 448:20 456:21 | appears 481:11 | 303:15,23 338:24 |
| 356:21,23 358:19 | 499:8 | 533:8 | 339:3,15,24 |
| 394:16 398:7 | answers 353:21 | appendix 362:2,3 | 340:18,22 341:8 |
| 405:24 406:21 | 530:8 | 529:1 | 341:11 342:1,4 |
| 411:13 427:2 |  |  | 347:15,18 352:11 |

[appraisal - asked]

| 371:5,8 396:11 | 504:1 523:25 | 293:10 294:4,10 | 533:22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 402:1 410:5 | 524:7,13,16 525:9 | 294:13,15 295:22 | arbitrator's 498:8 |
| 411:18 | 525:11 | 301:7,10,13,19 | 498:11 |
| appraisals 268:13 | appropriate | 302:3 303:11 | area 369:6 374:12 |
| 273:14 277:17,18 | 482:19 | 306:11 314:23 | 417:16 446:23 |
| 278:1,2,3 282:11 | approval 344:11 | 315:11 316:8,11 | 526:5,6 |
| 282:20 521:15 | 496:8 | 317:6,17 320:13 | argue 316:5 |
| appraise 279:24 | approved 291:4,5 | 322:1 324:24 | 493:15 |
| 338:22 | 291:9 368:18,25 | 327:22 328:3,18 | argument 444:16 |
| appraiser 267:22 | 374:2,4,6 410:16 | 330:5 333:13,18 | 498:1,5 |
| 268:10 338:12,18 | 457:23 | 342:3 343:6 346:4 | argumentative |
| 338:22,22 339:3 | approving 368:25 | 346:10,16,20 | 305:5 |
| 341:4 479:10 | approximate | 347:1 354:5 357:6 | arguments 446:21 |
| 521:12,14 524:15 | 355:24 | 357:10 359:18,20 | 515:3 |
| appraisers 267:18 | approximately | 360:15 369:9,12 | arithmetic 391:2 |
| 268:1 410:16 | 267:15 268:19,25 | 373:11 378:25 | arizona 313:7,22 |
| 479:11 521:16 | 269:24 275:14,16 | 380:1,3 382:3,11 | 426:3 |
| appreciable | 279:7 288:17 | 392:16 394:5 | arranged 339:22 |
| 456:11 | 289:12 305:11 | 408:6 413:9,16 | 345:9 |
| appreciate 266:6 | 319:3 320:5 | 415:1,4,6 420:12 | arrangement |
| 440:20 450:21 | 345:22 346:13,21 | 422:10,11 423:12 | 309:15 |
| 462:3,5 465:15 | 348:10 384:2 | 423:23 424:2,8,15 | arrived 454:20 |
| approach 481:19 | 396:10 427:18 | 430:19,23 431:6 | 467:13 |
| 481:19,20,21,21 | 479:18 480:6 | 431:15,20 437:24 | arriving 456:1 |
| 482:4,9,10 483:19 | 499:25 523:1 | 443:17 445:25 | art 366:22 |
| 483:24 484:6,10 | 531:13 | 453:25 456:24 | article 264:15 |
| 484:18,19,22,22 | approximation | 459:1 460:11 | 315:10 316:18,22 |
| 484:23 485:1,23 | 312:20 | 466:20,21,24 | 319:23 382:6,9 |
| 491:7 493:1 | april 354:24 379:9 | 468:7,25 469:3 | 430:7,11 |
| 502:13,14,24,24 | 379:17,20 | 473:14,24 475:5 | articles 315:7,8 |
| 502:25 503:2,6,12 | arabia 398:15 | 475:10 476:19,22 | 421:8 430:4 |
| 504:3,4,8,9 505:12 | arbitration 259:1 | 477:21 478:11,24 | artificially 488:6,6 |
| 505:23 506:18 | 260:1,14 268:23 | 480:16 488:10 | asa 479:10 |
| 508:2 518:2,18,19 | 402:12 438:14 | 492:17 497:2 | aside 401:16 |
| 518:21 520:22 | arbitrator 259:15 | 498:14 506:16 | asked 284:9 |
| 523:22 524:3,4,5 | 261:1 263:18,23 | 507:6 508:6 | 297:10 326:2 |
| 524:12,12 525:7 | 265:4,14 266:4,5 | 509:11 510:6,9 | 339:21 340:2 |
| approached | 266:16,20,23 | 512:7514:18 | 378:24 384:20 |
| 493:19 | 267:2 284:10 | 515:2,24 516:11 | 385:6 392:15 |
| approaches | 286:3,8,13,18,22 | 516:22 518:25 | 403:6 405:17 |
| 481:16,18 502:23 | 287:1,3,7,11 292:1 | 532:14 533:2,19 | 411:21 424:14 |

[asked - bachelor]

| $445: 19447: 3$ | asset $283: 15$ | $448: 10,22449: 3,6$ | $384: 9,17402: 9$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $448: 20456: 20$ | $342: 13343: 16$ | $458: 18464: 3,7$ | $403: 18408: 15$ |
| $466: 1481: 3$ | $383: 19,19393: 9$ | $466: 7469: 21$ | $411: 14412: 14$ |
| $498: 16515: 6,11$ | $410: 12,19428: 10$ | $473: 18476: 14$ | $413: 22,24414: 11$ |
| $519: 10$ | $461: 13464: 19,23$ | assumed $487: 24$ | $419: 23420: 1$ |
| asking 283:1,3 | $469: 21,23470: 1,2$ | assuming $490: 17$ | $421: 10428: 5$ |
| $289: 14299: 5$ | $474: 24481: 19,21$ | $507: 15,17$ | $440: 22441: 16$ |
| $305: 15317: 8$ | $482: 4483: 24$ | assumptions | $456: 2460: 6$ |
| $323: 16329: 3$ | $484: 6,19,22,22$ | $466: 16488: 3$ | $467: 17476: 7$ |
| $363: 9,10366: 17$ | $485: 1,3502: 24$ | assured $464: 18$ | $507: 15,17,22,25$ |
| $366: 18,20367: 6$ | $503: 6,10518: 19$ | attached $365: 14$ | $508: 3$ |
| $373: 9375: 4,5,6$ | $520: 22,23521: 1,4$ | attain $267: 24$ | authenticity |
| $377: 14379: 13,24$ | $521: 6524: 5,12$ | attempt $437: 11$ | $315: 18316: 1$ |
| $380: 15400: 2$ | assets $264: 11$ | attention $317: 25$ | $382: 7$ |
| $405: 20408: 16$ | $272: 15,22,23$ | $347: 8351: 18$ | authored $455: 4$ |
| $411: 7421: 18$ | $273: 4,10281: 1$ | $357: 12370: 1$ | authorized $308: 18$ |
| $445: 17447: 9$ | $283: 8,21287: 20$ | $371: 7393: 11$ | authorship $293: 18$ |
| $451: 10465: 7,8,14$ | $290: 4307: 22$ | $405: 13410: 21$ | autumn $306: 4$ |
| $472: 8473: 5475: 8$ | $320: 10,16342: 12$ | $496: 20500: 2$ | available $379: 16$ |
| $506: 4514: 2,5$ | $347: 14,16,24$ | $509: 18$ | $395: 22474: 19$ |
| $532: 4$ | $373: 5,7,9428: 13$ | attest $280: 3,4$ | $506: 2507: 21,22$ |
| asks $275: 24317: 8$ | $432: 20,21435: 5,6$ | attorney $369: 3$ | avenue $301: 16$ |
| $318: 7326: 9353: 9$ | $451: 14,16452: 4$ | $534: 18$ | $349: 8$ |
| $356: 18$ | $465: 22466: 2,3$ | attorneys $265: 15$ | average $433: 15$ |
| aspect 445:13 | $469: 20470: 3$ | $265: 17,22266: 12$ | averaged $374: 13$ |
| aspects $391: 6$ | $473: 20474: 14$ | $295: 13368: 18$ | award $368: 16$ |
| assertion $356: 5$ | $503: 8,9521: 22$ | attract $429: 20$ | aware $311: 6,14$ |
| assess 458:8 | $522: 11$ | $443: 6$ | $379: 5,8,13,15,19$ |
| $487: 23$ | assist $271: 25$ | audit $340: 25407: 1$ | $379: 24380: 6,10$ |
| assessed $485: 20$ | $273: 20339: 24$ | $407: 5451: 2,4$ | $380: 22381: 2$ |
| assessing $526: 13$ | $340: 17341: 7$ | $461: 11$ | $402: 6,9,19403: 17$ |
| assessment $349: 17$ | assisted $270: 11$ | august $269: 7$ | $524: 17526: 12,23$ |
| $403: 4451: 6$ | $426: 1$ | $272: 7274: 12$ | $526: 24$ |
| $482: 22484: 15$ | assisting $526: 4,7$ | $277: 4,9290: 10,10$ |  |
| $485: 6,7486: 3$ | associated $335: 22$ | $290: 11291: 3,6$ | b $267: 12303: 13$ |
| $488: 11491: 3,19$ | $486: 3$ | $294: 5,6305: 22$ | $386: 12$ |
| $503: 4504: 9$ | association $259: 1$ | $306: 1307: 15$ | b.a. $415: 23$ |
| $508: 17517: 16$ | $260: 1479: 7$ | $311: 16336: 15$ | baba $300: 17$ |
| $522: 15$ | assume $317: 3$ | $347: 10348: 3,6,8$ | $354: 11$ |
| assessments $485: 2$ | $318: 13330: 23$ | $348: 15,18355: 5,7$ | bachelor $478: 16$ |
|  | $348: 23444: 7$ | $355: 10,13384: 3,6$ |  |

[back - basically]

| back 266:19 277:6 | $371: 22374: 17,18$ | $423: 12,23424: 2,8$ | balaouras $303: 7$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $298: 14320: 19$ | $374: 24375: 7$ | $424: 15430: 19,23$ | $313: 1,2,3314: 15$ |
| $323: 11325: 25$ | $376: 18385: 7,21$ | $431: 6,15,20$ | $315: 4317: 3$ |
| $334: 19,20350: 25$ | $395: 12401: 19,22$ | $437: 24443: 17$ | $318: 11,18422: 2,4$ |
| $359: 22362: 4,6$ | $409: 7412: 13$ | $445: 25453: 25$ | $422: 4425: 4,5,10$ |
| $363: 5367: 9$ | $424: 10,14454: 16$ | $456: 24459: 1$ | $425: 25426: 11$ |
| $368: 10369: 12,16$ | $454: 18$ | $460: 11466: 20,21$ | $452: 6454: 3$ |
| $378: 16,17,22,22$ | bady's $301: 24$ | $466: 24468: 7,25$ | ballpark $399: 22$ |
| $393: 7402: 8$ | $349: 14409: 5$ | $469: 3473: 14,24$ | bank $344: 23$ |
| $405: 13430: 7$ | bahri $295: 7,11,14$ | $475: 5,10476: 19$ | $375: 24376: 2,4,6$ |
| $433: 12,14434: 18$ | $295: 17,18296: 3$ | $476: 22477: 21$ | $376: 10,11$ |
| $441: 23464: 8$ | $297: 16,21,24$ | $478: 11,24492: 17$ | banker $429: 11$ |
| $465: 18471: 25$ | $298: 2,9,17,25$ | $497: 2498: 14$ | bankers $375: 19$ |
| $495: 15,17506: 9$ | $299: 6,17$ | $506: 16507: 6$ | bankruptcy |
| $506: 15512: 15,16$ | baker $259: 15$ | $508: 6509: 11$ | $459: 20$ |
| $512: 25516: 18$ | $261: 2,3263: 18,23$ | $510: 6,9512: 7$ | banks $375: 22$ |
| $520: 21531: 12$ | $265: 4,14266: 4,5$ | $514: 18515: 2,24$ | $376: 7,9,14$ |
| $533: 5,13$ | $266: 16,20,23$ | $516: 11,22518: 25$ | bargained $389: 11$ |
| background | $267: 2284: 10$ | $532: 14533: 2,19$ | bars $278: 19$ |
| $267: 13335: 11,14$ | $286: 3,8,13,18,22$ | $533: 22$ | base $270: 12$ |
| $415: 22416: 3$ | $287: 1,3,7,11292: 1$ | bal $422: 1$ | $447: 14448: 2$ |
| $417: 22426: 7$ | $293: 10294: 4,10$ | balance $270: 5,13$ | $490: 8516: 24$ |
| $478: 14$ | $294: 13,15295: 22$ | $270: 14272: 12,15$ | based $273: 8281: 6$ |
| backup $275: 9$ | $301: 7,10,13,19$ | $272: 24273: 17$ | $332: 17,18342: 18$ |
| bad $305: 3530: 10$ | $302: 3303: 11$ | $283: 11284: 3,7$ | $351: 12352: 9$ |
| badgering $445: 20$ | $306: 11314: 23$ | $285: 5,13,14,19,21$ | $382: 12396: 8$ |
| bady $262: 21263: 8$ | $315: 11316: 8,11$ | $288: 3289: 25$ | $422: 17428: 15$ |
| $294: 17,19,24$ | $317: 6,17320: 13$ | $290: 7294: 6,10$ | $430: 5,8436: 6,22$ |
| $295: 6297: 3,14$ | $322: 1324: 24$ | $302: 13340: 2$ | $463: 2464: 17$ |
| $298: 24300: 6$ | $327: 22328: 3,18$ | $341: 21344: 1$ | $469: 19470: 18$ |
| $301: 17303: 15$ | $330: 5333: 13,18$ | $380: 11382: 22,25$ | $497: 9,22498: 8$ |
| $304: 17305: 7$ | $342: 3343: 6346: 4$ | $383: 1,4,12401: 16$ | $503: 3507: 4$ |
| $306: 9,16307: 6$ | $346: 10,16,20$ | $414: 15,23421: 9$ | $510: 15511: 16$ |
| $310: 23312: 2$ | $347: 1357: 6,10$ | $421: 10,18,20,21$ | $532: 22$ |
| $314: 4317: 13$ | $359: 18,20360: 15$ | $422: 23,25423: 1,3$ | basic $416: 11$ |
| $320: 3,15,19321: 6$ | $369: 9,12373: 11$ | $433: 2,4436: 6,17$ | basically $288: 24$ |
| $325: 4326: 25$ | $378: 25380: 1,3$ | $450: 16451: 7,19$ | $335: 17405: 22$ |
| $328: 8,23329: 11$ | $382: 3,11392: 16$ | $460: 24461: 3$ | $470: 25486: 6,18$ |
| $331: 1332: 25$ | $394: 5408: 6413: 9$ | $463: 7469: 10,25$ | $487: 5,21489: 21$ |
| $336: 10,14337: 1$ | $413: 16415: 1,4,6$ | $522: 13$ | $490: 6493: 11$ |
| $344: 19,23364: 6,9$ | $420: 12422: 10,11$ | $494: 13495: 5$ |  |
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| 503:2,6 532:21,22 | 377:6 386:5 | bid 344:8,10,15,16 | 517:21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| basing 430:7 | 404:25 418:9 | big 397:16,19 | bought 280:21 |
| 447:22 471:17 | 424:10,12 425:5 | 456:8 494:1 | 476:2 |
| basis 274:6 374:9 | 425:15 434:18 | bill 312:16,18 | boulevard 344:9 |
| 382:11 420:7,16 | 438:15 439:2,25 | 350:21 | 354:18,20 362:21 |
| 420:19 429:23 | 443:3 449:11 | binder 480:12 | 364:14 |
| 430:15 440:13 | 450:5 457:8 | 502:19 | box 505:1 506:24 |
| 441:2,25 447:17 | 468:15 475:5 | bio 425:6,13,1 | 509:21 |
| 447:21 470:6 | 476:24 483:17,23 | 426:8 | boycott 513:5 |
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| follow 294:13 | 507:12 512:2 | full $321: 9,15,19$ | $352: 17,18426: 7$ |
| 415:1,2 445:17 | 534:6 | 322:5 350:4,8 | $450: 22 \text { 467:24 }$ |
| 475:23 | forward 389:8 | 408:19 409:8,14 | $468: 13506: 9$ |
| followed 507:3 | 428:22 429:3 | fully 499:8 | 517:7 527:3,5,15 |
| following 309:13 | 444:22 469:22 | function 395:22 | 529:12 |
| 429:23 444:12 | 489:8,23 507:7 | 459:4 | generally 459:2 |
| 453:15 | foundation 366:6 | functions 527:17 | 474:8 |
| follows 267:7 | 379:23 381:18 | fund $391: 11,12$ | generate $397: 7$ |
| 294:21 334:5 | foundatio | 460:5 | $486: 25 \text { 487:7 }$ |
| 415:13 478:4 | 497:5 | fundament | 488:13 |
| foot 329:21 399:9 | four 269:2 288:17 | 505:14,18 | generated 359:13 |
| 399:10,15,23 | 288:18 289:12,13 | funded 391:14 | 397:8,15 470:14 |
| 498:1 | 290:18 308:1 | funding 365:8 | 484:2 |
| footnote 477:11 | 339:1 355:5 | 443:10 464:16 | nerating 503:4 |
| footnotes 453:2 | 400:13,21 407:23 | funds $344: 18$ | generic 490:4,9 |
| force 311:25 321:9 | 481:12 500:1 | 345:7,13,15 | generous 298: |
| 321:15,19 322:5 | 504:25 509:22 | 395:16 409:24 | genesis $524 \cdot 2$ |
| 350:4,8 409:8,14 | 514:12 516:24 | 446:18 448:8 | genesis 524.2 |


| gentleman $302: 18$ | go $270: 15,19277: 6$ | $317: 11326: 24$ | goldstein $259: 4$ |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 425:3 | $296: 7297: 19$ | $329: 6,13333: 16$ | $260: 4261: 14$ |
| geographic 268:14 | $301: 16305: 18$ | $343: 9344: 20,21$ | $262: 20265: 6,16$ |
| george 402:4 | $306: 10,11310: 7$ | $353: 15354: 8$ | $274: 24278: 11$ |
| getting 338:1 | $314: 22317: 9$ | $359: 18361: 23$ | $303: 24304: 18$ |
| $385: 8387: 17$ | $318: 9319: 17$ | $363: 10365: 20$ | $305: 24337: 3,13$ |
| $429: 5464: 18$ | $320: 19342: 1$ | $378: 22379: 22$ | $345: 3352: 13,15$ |
| $465: 19491: 15$ | $343: 12344: 3$ | $382: 4,18383: 16$ | $352: 24355: 2$ |
| 525:17 533:17 | $346: 4347: 1$ | $387: 13393: 7$ | $368: 24393: 5$ |
| give 288:21 291:15 | $353: 12357: 21$ | $394: 3395: 1$ | $404: 7411: 19$ |
| $298: 11299: 7$ | $359: 23362: 15$ | $397: 12399: 20,22$ | $412: 8438: 5$ |
| $300: 25302: 17$ | $367: 9369: 16$ | $400: 3405: 14$ | $463: 25496: 6,22$ |
| $306: 16310: 5$ | $378: 22391: 9$ | $406: 4412: 6$ | $497: 24512: 4$ |
| $389: 21,24394: 19$ | $393: 15406: 18$ | $413: 14415: 8$ | goldstein's $266: 7$ |
| $401: 17,20,22$ | $419: 12,14421: 15$ | $416: 12420: 4$ | $336: 2,5,9337: 15$ |
| $412: 23415: 21$ | $421: 24424: 19$ | $422: 12423: 25$ | $337: 23339: 4$ |
| $433: 20434: 12$ | $425: 21,24428: 18$ | $424: 15429: 22$ | $352: 19408: 13,22$ |
| $445: 1,6446: 24,25$ | $428: 21,25429: 3$ | $431: 13,21432: 15$ | $455: 13473: 19$ |
| $465: 1,2,8,16$ | $432: 5,11,18$ | $435: 18436: 6,19$ | $509: 14,17512: 14$ |
| $497: 20516: 5,21$ | $433: 12,14437: 4,8$ | $437: 13438: 23$ | $516: 10519: 8$ |
| given $279: 12,25$ | $442: 13444: 13$ | $441: 16442: 1,8$ | good $274: 21,22$ |
| $280: 3,5283: 12$ | $447: 13449: 25$ | $444: 2,21445: 10$ | $275: 1294: 24,25$ |
| $285: 6286: 17$ | $460: 21461: 20,24$ | $446: 10,23,25$ | $294: 25321: 1$ |
| $287: 1288: 23$ | $464: 7468: 3481: 7$ | $447: 10448: 16$ | $376: 19429: 18$ |
| $301: 10382: 5$ | $488: 21493: 18$ | $450: 14,21451: 7$ | $438: 3439: 8$ |
| $425: 22426: 8$ | $509: 2510: 9$ | $457: 14459: 6$ | $473: 25474: 5$ |
| $427: 6,6433: 3,13$ | $514: 11516: 18$ | $465: 12,16468: 6,7$ | $519: 3$ |
| $435: 2441: 4$ | $522: 3528: 6,7$ | $469: 19,22470: 11$ | goods $486: 21,24$ |
| $443: 15454: 4$ | $530: 5533: 12,22$ | $470: 12471: 24$ | $487: 6$ |
| $468: 5476: 6,8$ | goes $309: 13398: 7$ | $472: 6474: 24$ | gotten $515: 9$ |
| $497: 5519: 11$ | $459: 21501: 9$ | $475: 22476: 25$ | graduated $267: 16$ |
| $533: 3534: 12$ | $505: 2$ | $487: 7488: 21$ | granted $479: 4$ |
| gives $434: 23$ | going $266: 24$ | $493: 4,20,21$ | graph $317: 18$ |
| giving $266: 19$ | $270: 16271: 6$ | $496: 14498: 3,24$ | great $303: 11$ |
| $298: 5377: 16$ | $276: 16281: 16$ | $510: 11,19511: 1$ | $341: 22442: 3$ |
| $391: 4394: 25$ | $286: 3294: 8$ | $513: 3514: 8,10$ | $455: 21$ |
| $395: 13401: 16$ | $295: 16296: 7,24$ | $515: 12,16,25$ | greater $412: 13$ |
| glad $309: 3393: 19$ | $297: 5299: 7,21,24$ | $516: 1,3,4,18519: 5$ | $494: 18$ |
| $394: 11,17395: 4$ | $300: 22301: 4,5,16$ | $520: 20527: 16$ | greatly $400: 3$ |
| $395: 14,16,17$ | $302: 4,4306: 16$ | $530: 4532: 13$ | green $381: 21$ |
| $409: 16,24$ | $314: 25316: 2,3$ | $533: 4,5,6,12,13$ | $398: 9,17,22,25$ |
|  |  |  |  |

[green - hypothetical]

| 399:7,8 407:9,24 | 454:14 531:12 | 322:12 326:4 | 319:9,14 322:21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| greenhouse | hand 270:15 | 327:17,25 343:1 | holds 359:1,2 |
| 328:23 | 319:14 459:22 | 498:13 529:18,23 | 370:23 473:8 |
| gross 309:4 | handed 271:17 | hearsay 342:24 | home 277:13 |
| grounding 484:7 | handle 499:7 | heath 259:21 | 309:3 393:19 |
| group 278:14 | handwriting | 260:18 | 394:11,17 395:4 |
| 311:6 312:5 345:3 | 288:2,4,6 | heavily 416:17 | 395:15,16,17 |
| 349:7 351:25 | handwritten | held 260:15 | 409:16,24 |
| 360:7 | 293:19 | 343:20 350:22 | honest 309:22 |
| grow 483:8 493:8 | hanyie 379:6 | 358:22 373:5 | 327:1 |
| growing 290:25 | happen 291:2 | 433:10 441:10 | honestly 332:4 |
| 407:24 408:1 | 313:20 371:21,24 | 453:14 477:14 | honor 297:7 510:7 |
| 490:20 | 383:3 457:19 | 495:6,7 509:24 | 532:19 |
| grown 493:16 | 466:15 475:14 | help 296:20 | hope 408:2 462:3 |
| growth 448:8 | 478:22 493:21 | 326:18 436:5 | 462:5 |
| 482:11,12 488:9 | happened 306:2 | 462:4 469:23 | horizontal 452:2 |
| 488:15,17 490:4,5 | 374:10 395:21 | 474:21 530:5 | hour 454:14 |
| 490:6,10,14,18,22 | 423:16 467:5 | helping 382:17 | 461:20 |
| 492:10,20 493:5 | 510:18 | hereto 365:14 | hours 288:17,18 |
| 493:10,13,17,25 | happens 327:12 | hey $510: 13,18,19$ | 289:12,14 290:18 |
| guaranteed | 467:3 | high 267:14 | 401:7,9 |
| 307:23 377:3,4 | happy 296:6 | 415:22 434:19,20 | house 398:9,22 |
| guarantor 446:17 | 359:25 | 478:15 488:6 | 399:1,7,8 400:22 |
| guaranty 328:23 | hard 526:14,15 | 492:11,16 | houses 398:17 |
| guess 310:4,5 | harvest 329:18 | higher 399:14 | 407:25 |
| 369:17 380:22 | hashed 515:4 | 434:15 494:21 | huh 308:4 319:20 |
| 405:14 451:10 | hate 468:5 | highest 344:16 | humorous 513:14 |
| 471:6,15 | header 278:13 | hijack 305:1 | hundred 268:21 |
| guideline 503:13 | heading 477:12 | hired 510:16 | 386:24 387:1,4 |
| 503:15 504:15,24 | 504:15 | historical 319:18 | 399:8 417:1,7 |
| 506:16 507:19 | hear 266:24 | history 486:15 | 426:1 503:23 |
| 517:3,25 | 276:13 317:11 | 499:15 | hundreds 480:7 |
| guy 313:25 530:10 | 324:6 394:7 | hold 338:6,9 | hypothet 465:10 |
| guys 332:1 359:21 | 424:16 469:11 | holder 318:23 | 471:13 |
| h | heard 314:4 317:7 | holders 319:3 | hypothetical |
| h 303:12 334:10 | 7:10 343:1 | holding 310:10 | 291:15,25 435: |
|  | 376:2,4,6 380:17 | 432:23 | 435:23 436:3 |
| half 299:21,23 | 380:25 381:11 | holdings 259:3 | 443:7 444:2,12 |
| $\begin{array}{r} 299: 21,20 \\ 350: 22351: 11 \end{array}$ | 449:11 510:7,25 | 260:3 314:8,10,11 | 445:21,22,24 |
| $352: 4380: 7$ | hearing 265:5 | 314:16,18 315:3 | 446:4 460:9 464:8 |
| 417:15 427:18 | 292:20,23 293:6 | 318:5,18,21 319:4 | 465:9 470:15 |

[hypothetical - information]

| 473:23 475:6,8,25 | improperly 506:1 <br> improved 461:23 <br> improvement 367:18 <br> improvements | incomplete 459:24 inconsistencies 421:5 | individuals 266:13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 484:12 487:20,23 |  |  | 349:12,13 350:10 |
| 488:4 521:17 |  |  | :1 |
|  |  | incorporate 450:3 | 528:16 |
| idea 277:2 290:6 |  | 467:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { indoor } 399: 1,13 \\ & 399: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | improvements 365:10,16,24,25 | incorporate$365 \cdot 14$ |  |
| 320:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 365: 10,16,24,25 \\ & 366: 2,5,20367: 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 9: | 367:17 368:4 | increase 376:23,25 | industrial 366:4 <br> industry 290:21 |
| $2: 20$ 454:18 | inability 483:8 | 488:9 | $302: 18305: 14,16$$305: 17313: 6,25$ |
| 527:18 | $494: 14$ |  |  |
| den | inaccurate 459:24 inception 349:19 | increased 434:12 | 75:9,21,25 425:2 |
|  |  | increases 408:12 | 425:12 482:7 |
| 7:15 306:1 | inception 349:19 incidentally 391:9 | 490:8 | 487:25 488:23 |
| 5:1 316:16 | include 344:11 | increment 490 | 90:4,10,13,13,18 |
| 381:6 | 66:6 469: | 1:18 492:4 | 90:20,21 506:25 |
| identify | included 333:19 | incur 488:14 | 26:1 |
| 115 | 347:17 355:7,10 | red 487: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { influx } 431: 3 \\ & 440: 15442: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| red | 60:7 368:13,1 | independent |  |
| 86:18 | 83. |  | formation 270:1 |
| ga | 533:1 | 90:20 338:21 | 270:6,9,13 275:9 |
| :14 488 | includes 324:1 |  | 279:11,20 281:6,7 |
| : 2 | 398:6 531:1 | $457: 12519: 7$ | 300:23 301:18 |
| ge | $\begin{gathered} \text { including } 346: 2 \\ 499: 21526: 9 \end{gathered}$ | independent | 302:17,20 317:4 |
|  |  | 424:24 | 339:23 340:4,6,16 |
| mediat | inclusion 488:8 |  | 341:4,6 342:25 |
| 290:13 33 | income 359:11,13 |  | $412: 3421: 15$ |
| peach | 2:22 385:1 | indicated 423:18 |  |
| portant | $\begin{aligned} & 388: 14 \text { 401:18 } \\ & 435: 25481: 19 \end{aligned}$ | 429:4,9 432:14 | 430:9 433:2,3,6,13 |
| $451: 5,17,22$ |  | 483:17 485:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 435: 19437: 12 \\ & 441: 4,6445: 12,17 \end{aligned}$ |
| 95 | $\begin{aligned} & 482: 10,25484: 9 \\ & 484: 23485: 6,8,9 \end{aligned}$ | indicates 492:6 <br> indicating 286:2,5 |  |
| 527:24 |  |  | $445: 18,24446: 2$ |
|  | 485:19,23,25 | indication 495:13 | 446:12,24 452:22 |
| 11: | 486:1,2,3,6,22 | indications 484:24 | 452:24 453:6 |
| 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 488: 9,22 \text { 490:15 } \\ & 490: 17 \text { 491:7,9 } \end{aligned}$ | 526:8,9 | $\begin{aligned} & 461: 3,7468: 5 \\ & 474: 7,19475: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| $0: 94$ |  | indicative |  |
|  | 492:10,20 493:1 | 455:16 | 475:18 477:4,8,16 |
|  | 502:13,24 503:2 | indigo 262:6 | $\begin{aligned} & 477: 17479: 2 \\ & 501: 4,5,12,16,22 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 4:3,8 518:19 |  |  |
| $514: 25 \text { 518:23 }$ | $524: 2,4526: 10$ <br> incomes 489:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 265: 19 \text { 300:7 } \\ & 335: 21,25395: 11 \\ & 402: 16502: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 505: 12,16506: 1 \\ & 508: 3511: 4 \\ & 514: 17515: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 52 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

[information - january]

| 520:2 528:13,17 | intents 502:3 | investigation | 492:24 495:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 529:13,14 | intercompany | 273:23 452:8,9 | 496:3 498:25 |
| informed 428:19 | 359:6 | investing 430:4 | 500:18,20 504:24 |
| 515:19 | interest 295:11 | 447:16 491:11 | 506:5,7 510:1 |
| inherent 491:8 | 297:16,21 299:10 | investment 267:17 | 511:20 512:1,19 |
| 494:14 | 306:6,6 334:25 | 383:19 391:22 | 512:20,22,23,25 |
| initial 346:5,16 | 335:2 336:14,24 | 429:20 431:3 | 513:8,9 514:20 |
| 367:16,16,22 | 337:2 338:13,18 | 491:11 | 515:2 517:12 |
| 478:25 483:1 | 339:4 341:1 345:4 | investments | 522:23 526:18 |
| 506:13 508:20 | 345:25 350:16,23 | 428:25 429:3,5 | 533:14,17 |
| 509:8 | 350:25 351:2,7 | 431:22 443:19 | issued 303:23 |
| initially 418:7 | 352:4,5,13,16 | investor 429:12,12 | 335:23 480:19 |
| injunction 326:4 | 354:9,10,11,13 | 430:14,20 431:7 | 500:8,15,17 |
| 326:21 529:18,22 | 358:10,14,16 | 447:16 470:7,17 | issues 295:18 |
| inputs 439:8 | 361:2,9 370:12 | 470:23,24 | 482:8 483:7,9 |
| inquiry 342:19 | 386:14 394:20 | investors 344:5,20 | 484:21,25 485:6 |
| inserted 516:15 | 408:11,22 410:6 | 345:8 346:1,6 | 485:13,16 486:4 |
| instance 412:25 | 412:8,14 439:15 | 347:4 349:7 360:7 | 490:15 492:3 |
| 413:1 | 439:17 441:1,10 | 360:22 361:13 | 494:20 497:11,16 |
| instances 525:21 | 445:1 448:25 | 411:4,12 431:10 | 505:22 506:3 |
| instigation 447:19 | 455:13 473:2 | 443:6 447:20 | 507:18 508:1,19 |
| institute 267:17,25 | 495:7 496:2,4,5,7 | 470:9 | 520:22 |
| 79:4 | 496:10,11,18 | invited 400:22 | issuing 451:5,20 |
| institution 375:24 | 501:2 502:4 | involve 339:1 | 531:16,18 |
| instruct 530:7 | 503:23 504:7 | involved 302:18 | italics 278:15 |
| instruction 267:23 | 509:14,17 519:8 | 313:16,17 314:12 | items 421:22 |
| insurance 360:25 | 519:11 | 314:15 318:18,19 | 446:15 452:4 |
| 361:7,12,16 | interested 534 | 318:20 382:16 | j |
| 363:16,17 364:2 | interesting 520:15 | 402:18 446:21 | j 334:10 |
| $368: 9$ 3620, 3 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { interests } & 473: 8 \\ \text { interior } & 345: 19\end{array}$ | 448:23 480:1 | j249 355:8,11,14 |
| intangible 522:16 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { interior } & 345: 19 \\ \end{array}$ | 499:20 507:2 | j261 270:23 |
| integrated 377:20 | internet 375:17 | 523: | 271:18 |
| 8:13 467:20 | interpreted | involvem | j263 321:7,11 |
| 468:11,17,22 | 385:25 | 425:11 | $322: 15,18,21$ |
| intellectual 471:22 | interrupt 442:20 | issue 265:15,2 | january 259:16 |
| intend 438:20 | 443:2 | 267:20 304:5,6,8 | $260: 15 \text { 265:2 }$ |
| intended 395:16 | invest 430:15,15 | 317:9 353:18 | $296: 9,25309: 2,16$ |
| intent 395:14 | 431:10 491:12,13 | 386:13 407:10 | $310: 9327: 19,25$ |
| 528:8 | 491:13 | 450:11 452:3 | 331:11 333:3 |
| intention 281:19 | invested 345:4 | 488:13 489:1,4 | $348: 12455: 9,9,25$ |
|  | 387:20 | 491:16,17 492:22 | $534: 21$ |


[knowledge - licenses]

| 525:1 526:1 | 354:18,20 355:25 | 516:23 519:3 | 341:18 344:4,6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| knowledgeable | 360:19 362:21 | leave 280:21 316:4 | 347:9 358:18 |
| 313:24 425:2,16 | 364:14 395:11 | 450:14 495:19 | 361:19 412:21 |
| known 275:13 | 397:4 398:8 | led 336:2 | 435:2 464:5 |
| 282:2 311:6 | 407:16,18 | left 287:17 319:14 | liable 387:12 |
| 313:24 400:17 | lastly 398:13 | 341:25 433:18 | liaison 404:1 |
| 402:24 474:8 | late 368:15 385:5 | legal 328:2 372:14 | license 275:7 |
| 501:13 505:13,16 | laughter 479:14 | 446:21,21 474:1 | 278:20,20 292:24 |
| 507:24 527:9 | 526:16 530:11,15 | 486:16 | 318:24 320:6,11 |
| knows 266:2 | launch 426:3 | legalese 474:2 | 324:7,10,13,16,19 |
| kolesar 260:16 | law 265:21 | legalization 507:1 | 324:20 342:21 |
| 262:12 439:20 | lawful 308:17 | lengthy 396:19,20 | 343:14,19,23,24 |
| kulick 261:15 | laws 467:4 | lent 347:12 | 344:12 348:18,19 |
| 1 | lawsuit 298:20 | lesser 434:16 | 348:21 349:4 |
| l 303: | 360:16 | letter 294:5 528:8 | 358:22 372:21,23 |
| - 415:20 478:8 | lawsuits 3 | letterhead 278:13 | 373:2,24,24,25 |
| lack 308:9 494:3,4 | lawyer 327:3, | 279:4 | 374:1,3,6 377:20 |
| 494:10,11,13,23 | 378:10 438:4 | letting 511:7 | 378:13 384:20 |
| 495:2,4,25 496:12 | lawyers 293:1 | level 442:12,15,18 | 397:6 401:20 |
| 499:2,2 508:21,21 | 402:4 528:16 | 443:6 482:20 | 411:22 412:19 |
| lacks 379:22 | lay 291:25 381: | 488:17 496:11 | 428:24 432:23 |
| lahoney 401:3 | lead 493:2 | 521:11 522:3 | 434:10 436:4 |
| land 299:20 | leading 337:14 | levels 491 | 450:20 454:6 |
| 357:20,22,22 | 492:15 | 492:12,21 | 470:4,11,12,17,17 |
| 358:11,17 398:7 | learn | liabilites 264:1 | 470:20,25 471:1 |
| 474:11 | learned 377:25 | liabilities 272:16 | 471:12 522:18,18 |
| language 495:15 | lease 345:9,15,21 | 272:21,25 273:4 | 522:22 |
| 495:18 496:25 | 345:22 346:14 | 281:2 283:9 | licensed 268:15,15 |
| 498:6 512:1 | 360:21,25 361:4 | 287:20 304:15 | 338:22 477:17 |
| large 345:3 | 361:11 366:13,17 | 341:10,25 344:4 | licenses 298:15 |
| 488:9 491:13 | leasehold 439:15 | 347:14,16,19,23 | 302:16,23 308:7,8 |
| 507:3 | 439:17 463:4,9 | 347:24 361:22 | 308:9,14,16,18,23 |
|  | leases 360:17 | 362:5,7 373:8,14 | 308:24,24 342:18 |
| larger 456: | 366:11,16 | 373:16 412:24 | 342:20,22 343:22 |
|  | leatham 260:17 | 420:24 421:16 | 348:7,24,24 |
| $261: 5262: 8,16$ | 262:12 439:20 | 428:11,12 432:21 | 358:16 359:1,2 |
| 265:1 267:16 | leauanae 264:3 | 435:2,5,7 451:14 | 373:18 375:1 |
| 311:21 320:6 | 401:4,14 478:2,12 | 452:3,6 474:15 | 376:22 377:7,11 |
| 343:20,22 34 | 478:14 487:14 | 503:9,10 521:22 | 379:8 380:10 |
| 344:9,13 3 | 497:4 499:14 | liability 259:8 | 384:6,15,16,18,19 |
| 348:11,24 349:7 | 507:10 512:3 | 260:9 335:20 | 384:22 425:19 |

[licenses - looking]

| 426:12,13 428:20 | 431:14 432:6 | 480:4 | 407:21 418:1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 434:14 435:16,20 | 435:4 437:17 | litigations 341:19 | 454:13 479:18 |
| 436:1,20,22 437:5 | 440:13 441:25 | little 275:3 279:8 | 486:15 511:2 |
| 440:23 441:1,11 | 442:6 445:10 | 287:22 296:16 | 520:5,10 |
| 441:17,19 444:23 | 446:11 447:11 | 301:25 319:17 | longer 321:14 |
| 445:1 452:5 453:8 | 450:6 451:8,12 | 329:12 359:23 | 409:8 419:13 |
| 453:10,13,14 | 458:10,12,20 | 382:18 396:22 | look 270:24 271:7 |
| 454:4,5 455:16,25 | 459:16,25 465:18 | 399:14 400:8 | 284:11,13 285:15 |
| 456:1 457:20,21 | 465:20 467:17 | 439:9 455:19 | 289:21 296:6 |
| 457:21,22,24 | 524:12 | 471:11 512:8 | 304:10 306:9,18 |
| 458:2 461:14,16 | liquor 278:20 | 515:13 | 307:25 308:1 |
| 464:10 466:13 | list 272:15 306:17 | lives 395:11 | 312:9 317:13,25 |
| 468:22,23 470:5,9 | 361:22 422:8,9,18 | llc 259:3,7 260:3,8 | 319:7 326:17 |
| 471:23,25 472:10 | 422:20 423:5,6,7,9 | 262:3 265:6 | 331:15 342:1 |
| 473:2,8 477:14 | 423:11,13,18,24 | 283:21 287:20 | 353:12 357:4 |
| 523:20 524:21 | 424:3,8,22,25 | 294:6 308:14 | 359:15 362:12,18 |
| 525:2,5 | 426:12,16 427:6 | 309:3 323:25 | 363:18 364:25 |
| light 426:16,24 | 430:9 446:15,15 | 342:13 344:5 | 365:5 380:14 |
| limine 301:23 | 451:1 452:15,18 | 345:8 357:21 | 383:7,8 386:5,7,17 |
| 422:14 | 452:22,25 453:6 | 395:4,22 409:16 | 393:6 413:12 |
| limited 259:7 | 453:13 461:12 | 434:1 | 414:14,24 418:12 |
| 260:8 335:20 | 466:1 485:13 | llp 261:15 | 419:16 422:25 |
| 442:24 482:6,7 | 507:21 517:10 | load 296:21 | 425:16 427:10 |
| 485:15 | listed 347:15 | loan 299:23 358:8 | 430:1 431:9 433:1 |
| line 283:21 288:9 | 429:25 | 531:11 | 433:25 436:4,11 |
| 329:13,14,15 | listen 511:14 | loaned 299:19,19 | 436:12,19 437:4 |
| 330:8 371:2 | 513:23 | loans 358:6 463:23 | 452:6,18 456:7,8 |
| 385:20 393:19 | literally 316:2 | located 269:3 | 460:23 463:9,21 |
| 411:23 472:18,22 | literature 448:14 | 477:17 | 471:23 477:12 |
| 488:21 516:24 | 448:18 | location 374:2 | 509:2 515:14,15 |
| 526:21 531:7,8 | litigation 267:21 | locations 349:22 | 515:21 516:4 |
| lines 344:22 | 301:5 341:15,16 | lodged 499:10 | 518:3,5,7 523:25 |
| link 382:7 | 403:9,11 420:16 | logic 398:1 | 530:17 531:6,6 |
| liquidate 470:22 | 429:6,9,16 430:12 | loi 531:21,22,24 | 532:12 |
| liquidated 442:19 | 430:16,17 431:2,2 | 531:25 | looked 414:15,22 |
| 465:4 467:15 | 431:4,11,11,12 | long 275:13 | 428:10 449:22 |
| liquidating 281:23 | 432:17 435:17,21 | 288:16 289:10,15 | 461:25 481:18 |
| 428:15 459:3 | 440:8,11,12,14 | 302:24 348:10 | 526:8 |
| liquidation 420:7 | 442:13,13,22,24 | 353:20 369:9 | looking 271:4 |
| 420:19 428:4,16 | 443:5 447:15,19 | 372:4 374:5 382:6 | 281:24 284:21 |
| 429:17 430:13,18 | 448:1,2,4,4,11,15 | 396:13,16 400:17 | 321:6 342:8 |

[looking - math]

[matt - million]

| matt $332: 5420: 8$ | measuring $292: 16$ | $464: 4474: 23$ | $498: 4505: 6$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 428:18 473:5 | medical 291:4 | $475: 9520: 13$ | methodology |
| matter 265:5 | $311: 5354: 12,14$ | membership | $273: 6,9410: 11,16$ |
| $282: 1291: 10,11$ | $354: 18384: 7$ | $351: 2386: 14$ | $428: 8483: 25$ |
| $315: 8406: 16$ | $434: 25437: 6,10$ | $448: 25$ | $501: 8,9502: 13$ |
| $422: 21427: 24$ | $457: 20$ | memorandum | $505: 19506: 15$ |
| $465: 11$ | medicinal $291: 3$ | $372: 15$ | $507: 5511: 23$ |
| matters $365: 12$ | $349: 5357: 20$ | memorialized | $518: 16523: 23$ |
| 523:7,10,12 | $457: 25458: 3$ | $392: 23$ | methods $283: 10$ |
| matthew $262: 13$ | meet $275: 1,2,15$ | memory $296: 5$ | $503: 13$ |
| matures $506: 25$ | $275: 20278: 16$ | $461: 23$ | metric $406: 21$ |
| mcclairis $369: 3$ | $293: 1312: 2,5,8$ | mention $528: 24$ | $407: 10$ |
| mdushoff $262: 18$ | $382: 20400: 12$ | $531: 23532: 24$ | metrics $507: 24$ |
| mean $271: 6289: 5$ | $401: 5422: 7$ | $533: 1$ | michael $263: 4$ |
| $307: 8318: 19$ | $424: 20462: 11,14$ | mentioned $277: 16$ | $264: 10,12267: 4$ |
| $319: 10346: 10$ | $462: 16520: 13$ | $312: 25361: 18$ | $267: 12340: 15$ |
| $348: 24,25366: 23$ | meeting $336: 4$ | $368: 4371: 11$ | $420: 6,15$ |
| $370: 8389: 14$ | $338: 6,9339: 22$ | $505: 10522: 25$ | michelle $395: 7,9$ |
| $398: 22408: 15$ | $393: 1414: 19$ | $528: 5$ | $395: 10$ |
| $428: 24439: 6$ | $421: 25422: 4$ | mergers $526: 5$ | mid $268: 11$ |
| $442: 7443: 2$ | $423: 15$ | messages $404: 13$ | million $283: 22$ |
| $447: 23452: 20$ | meetings $269: 22$ | met $272: 8290: 9$ | $288: 9291: 19,22$ |
| $465: 7472: 3502: 5$ | $300: 21404: 9$ | $293: 3300: 7,11,15$ | $292: 8,9297: 17,21$ |
| $513: 4516: 12$ | member $280: 21$ | $300: 17302: 25$ | $298: 17,17,25$ |
| $521: 25531: 9$ | $334: 24336: 24$ | $400: 10,24404: 4$ | $299: 11,20,25$ |
| meaning $482: 5$ | $338: 19,24,25$ | $414: 1424: 11$ | $303: 21304: 18$ |
| $483: 18485: 13$ | $340: 23341: 2$ | $425: 3452: 2$ | $306: 7,7310: 6$ |
| $491: 11493: 7$ | $355: 6370: 5,10,23$ | $462: 15$ | $319: 4320: 2,4,5$ |
| $501: 4503: 22$ | $371: 14463: 23$ | method $282: 23$ | $342: 14,20,21$ |
| $526: 5527: 13$ | member's $338: 13$ | $377: 4410: 12,19$ | $343: 8344: 5,10,15$ |
| meaningful | $338: 20410: 6$ | $428: 16432: 6,6$ | $344: 24346: 17$ |
| $484: 13518: 13$ | members $269: 11$ | $437: 14,18446: 10$ | $356: 1,6,7,14358: 4$ |
| means $282: 12$ | $269: 17,20281: 19$ | $446: 11447: 10,11$ | $358: 5368: 11$ |
| $307: 5310: 17$ | $307: 20,21,21$ | $458: 20459: 10$ | $372: 21373: 6,25$ |
| $330: 23367: 21$ | $310: 25336: 5,8$ | $491: 10,15493: 2,2$ | $374: 7,14379: 10$ |
| $368: 4393: 21,23$ | $345: 1349: 18$ | $503: 14,15,16,21$ | $379: 16,21380: 7$ |
| $393: 24439: 7$ | $350: 14368: 20$ | $504: 16,24506: 17$ | $380: 24381: 25$ |
| $489: 12$ | $370: 9,9,16389: 1$ | $507: 19517: 3$ | $384: 2394: 18$ |
| meant $290: 4$ | $389: 18391: 7,8$ | $518: 1$ | $397: 12,13398: 5$ |
| measures $406: 21$ | $394: 24395: 4,5$ | methodologies | $399: 11408: 16,18$ |
|  | $396: 14449: 7$ | $481: 17497: 7$ | $426: 1427: 18,18$ |

[million - named]

| 429:10 433:9,19 | 331:13,16 333:5 | 464:7 466:7 | move 382:4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 433:20,21,23 | 350:2,3,4,7 353:4 | 473:18 | 416:16 429:22 |
| 434:5,7,8,22 463:2 | 361:22,25 362:1,4 | monday 462:20 | 432:1 442:5 |
| 463:3 471:10,13 | 362:12 364:7,23 | monetary 416:12 | 462:22 496:14 |
| 472:4,5,11 473:20 | 365:2 366:19 | money 298:13 | 499:12 508:6 |
| 474:8,18,20,25 | 368:2 373:5,12,13 | 299:17,24 309:23 | 515:12 516:8,18 |
| 475:15 476:1,5,12 | 373:17 385:7,18 | 310:1 323:13 | 530:14 |
| 522:16 528:22 | 385:22,23 386:4,5 | 329:19 345:5 | moved 400:21 |
| 531:12,13 532:1,6 | 386:5 389:11,14 | 346:6,8 385:8 | 489:8 |
| 532:9 | 390:5 409:13 | 388:16 394:16 | movement 349:1 |
| millions 472:2,5 | 412:17,20 434:2 | 395:2 429:13,15 | moving 489:22 |
| mind 296:25 | 449:1 526:25 | 430:15 446:9 | 507:7 |
| 413:16 469:18 | mis 390:19 | 447:25 464:18 | multiple 472:5 |
| mine 405:10 | mismanaged | monies 322:17 | 480:1 503:19 |
| minimis 448:13 | 494:20 | 323:6 325:24 | 512:10 |
| minimize 530:6 | mismanagemen | 409:17 443:23 | multiples 503:24 |
| minimum 309:7 | 492:3 | monitor 405:18 | 526:9,10,12,17 |
| 309:15,19 310:2 | mismatch 4 | month 270:4 | multiplication |
| 394:16 | misstates 456:18 | 306:3 309:7 | 320:1 |
| minimus 460:2,3,6 | 456:22 | 324:22 345:6 | multiplied 320:2 |
| minority 495:7 | mistaken 462: | 346:10,20 396:10 | multiplier 510:3 |
| 496:2 | mixed 285:20 | 474:17 | 511:20,23 512:13 |
| minus 273:4,10 | mj 314:8,10,11,16 | monthly 309:3 | 512:13,20,21 |
| 311:3 373:6 435:5 | 314:18 315:3 | 310:8 329:21 | 513:9 516:25 |
| 435:6 | 318:4,18,20 319:4 | months 332:18,20 | 517:14 525:14,17 |
| minute 328:21 | 319:8,14 406:20 | 345:14 355:5 | 525:21 526:21 |
| 408:7 437:22 | 406:20 407:11 | 396:18 400:21 | multipliers 283:18 |
| 500:10 510:13 | model 445:10,11 | 407:23 462:1 | n |
| 532:14 | 488:15,19 | 507:23 | n 334:11,11,11 |
| minutes 289:16 | modification | moot 511:8 | 379:6 478: |
| 290:17 359:19,24 | 489:22 | morning 274:21 | name 267:10 |
| 359:24 372:6 | modified 517:10 | 274:22 294:24,25 | 276:10 303 |
| 392:25 393:2 | mohajer 262:22 | 369:18 404:4 | 334:9 345: |
| 454:14 | 306:23 336:10,14 | moss 416:5 | 375:13 415:18 |
| mipa 264:14 | 337:2 345:2 | motion 422:14 | 425:1 438:3 477:1 |
| 307:16 308:11 | 412:13 | 497:23 498:2 | $478: 7 \text { 527:2 }$ |
| 320:22,22 321:18 | moment 316:7 | 510:10,12,25 | $534: 20$ |
| 321:24 322:4,24 | 317:24 320:19 | 511:5 515:5 | named $300: 7$ |
| 323:6,10 325:5,21 | 358:1,15 360:6 | 532:23 | $312: 25350: 10$ |
| 325:23 328:7,13 | 393:16 395:6 | motions 301:23 | 379:6 |
| 329:9,25 330:14 | 422:13 444:7 |  |  |

[nancy - nuveda]

[nuveda - okay]

| 305:14 310:25 | 467:17 470:8 | 315:6,13,25 316:3 | obtain 272:22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 322:24,24 323:5 | 471:5,18,20 473:7 | 317:11,21 320:8 | obvious 446:16 |
| 334:13,17,22 | 473:19 474:23 | 321:25 327:14,20 | obviously 403:12 |
| 335:7 336:17 | 475:9 477:15 | 328:1,10 330:3,4 | 518:22 |
| 337:6 338:2,9,17 | 513:18 518:3 | 330:17 342:23 | occasions 300:12 |
| 339:2,14,24 340:9 | 520:14 523:19 | 343:10 382:2 | occur 338:7 |
| 340:12,17 344:8 | 524:19,22 525:2 | 392:15 422:11 | 358:14 504:11 |
| 345:1,10,20,25 | 526:25 527:25 | 423:16 424:16 | occurred 276:12 |
| 347:5,12 348:3,18 | 528:8,16 | 431:21 443:14 | 324:20 412:15 |
| 349:18 350:14,20 | nuveda's 306:6 | 445:19 453:24 | 504:10 |
| 350:25 352:12,15 | 343:25 380:11 | 455:15 456:18,22 | odor 398:11 |
| 353:2 354:7,8,9,10 | 402:14 408:11 | 457:16 458:21 | offer 291:17 |
| 354:11,16,19,21 | 440:22 464:9 | 460:8 466:14 | 438:20 496:24 |
| 355:13,24 356:6 | 527:13 | 468:2 473:22 | offered 380:14 |
| 356:14,20 360:16 | nv 261:5 262:8,16 | 475:3 497:5 | 476:1,2,11 |
| 360:22 361:6,8,23 | 534:25 | 499:10 505:2 | offering 519:22 |
| 362:9 363:6,11 | nye 307:21 308:3 | 507:8 508:5 | offers 291:18 |
| 368:20 369:21 | 308:5,13,15,25 | 509:10 510:4 | office 271:25 |
| 372:12 373:5,16 | 309:10 320:21 | 516:5 533:12 | 277:11 300:18 |
| 386:9 388:9,10,23 | 322:17 349:1 | objections 468:6 | 455:1 487:3 529:3 |
| 389:1,18,22 390:3 | 386:19 390:16 | 533:4 | 532:1 |
| 391:14 394:24 | 391:14 397:19 | obligated 331:4 | officer 405:18 |
| 396:14 401:17 | 453:20 | 361:7 385:16 | offices 260:16 |
| 402:15 403:5 | 0 | 386:17 | 300:16 |
| 404:2 405:18 | o 303:13 | obligation 325:19 | offset 385:13,14 |
| 408:20 410:5 | o'clock $369 \cdot 10$ | 331:10,11 332:22 | 385:23 389:4,7 |
| 412:21 413:5 | $462: 17$ | 332:25 333:6,9 | 390:12,13,13,14 |
| 418:6,7 419:3,8,23 |  | 360:24 364:10 | 390:15 391:3 |
| 419:25 420:7,16 | oakridge $354: 10$ | 368:7,8,10 385:8 | oh 299:9 330:12 |
| 421:9 422:9 | $\text { oath } 369: 13$ | 385:11 388:11 | 417:9 446:25 |
| 423:14 424:24 | $\text { obiect } 301: 4317: 8$ | 389:23 390:7,11 | 452:24 473:6 |
| 427:24 428:20 | $379: 22394: 3$ | 390:19,20,21,23 | oil $474: 11$ |
| 435:14 437:19 | $\begin{aligned} & 3 / 9: 22 \\ & 422 \cdot 12 \end{aligned}$ | 391:5,16,18 444:8 | okay 271:4,14 |
| 441:10 443:10 | objected 533:10 | obligations 322:14 | 275:1 277:10 |
| 444:7,19,25 445:3 | objecting 423:2,3 | 325:5,6 333:8 | 279:5 285:16 |
| 446:5,8 447:16 | objecting 423:2,3 | 335:6 364:6 | 291:16 292:14 |
| 448:24 449:7 |  | 409:20 446:19 | 297:1,6,11 300:3 |
| 452:15 453:14 |  | 465:4 527:11,12 | 305:22 317:19 |
| 454:4,7 460:4 | $4284: 10.12$ | 527:13,14 | 318:2 319:1 |
| 463:13 464:4,16 | 291.24 | obligor 465:6 | 326:22 333:19 |
| 464:17 465:21 | 302:5 305:5,13 |  | 349:1 351:19 |

[okay - overview]

| 354:8 355:15,19 | 470:9 | 422:18 429:24 | ordinary 426:21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 362:17 365:1,4,6 | operated 267:19 | 430:7,8,14,19 | original 346:9 |
| 367:9,13 370:2 | operating 331:22 | 431:12 437:17 | 477:2 505:11 |
| 378:18 382:14 | 332:8 333:9 | 442:4 443:9 447:1 | originally 300:2 |
| 386:7 388:21 | 336:17 337:6,10 | 454:6 457:3 458:5 | 398:14 |
| 390:13 393:14 | 337:15 340:21 | 458:15,25 459:10 | otc 517:18 518:9 |
| 396:24 399:6 | 348:19 369:21 | 471:19 472:12 | ought 283:25 |
| 408:6 413:11 | 386:23 387:21 | 481:22 487:18 | 284:2 459:16 |
| 414:3 418:11 | 391:25 392:3 | 489:13 495:17 | outcome 524:9 |
| 424:2,2,17 433:12 | 410:4 433:24 | 496:16,16,18 | outdoor 399:2,5 |
| 436:8,10 438:8,12 | 444:10 449:8,10 | 497:9 505:3 | outlier 427:9 |
| 443:3 452:1,13 | 458:6,16,18 | 506:20 514:25 | outs 413:1 527:21 |
| 453:17 456:15,24 | 470:18 471:1 | 516:13,23 518:15 | outside 340:12 |
| 462:6,11 465:14 | 487:1 495:1,14 | 519:22 522:2,10 | 343:4 394:3 |
| 466:9,10 467:7 | 523:19 527:20 | 525:12,13 531:19 | 421:14 425:20 |
| 469:3,16 470:2 | 528:2 | 531:20 532:7 | 429:24 458:17 |
| 472:16 481:9 | operation 442:4 | 533:14 | 460:5 464:11,15 |
| 513:23 533:19 | operational | opinions 438:16 | 496:23 506:11 |
| old 513:5 | 328:24 384:12,17 | 438:20 450:4 | 523:5 |
| once $300: 16,17$ | 384:23 407:19,22 | 496:17 497:21 | outstanding 358:5 |
| 346:12 358:16 | 441:20 442:2 | 524:2,18 528:17 | 358:13 386:14 |
| 387:20 442:4 | 524:19,22 | opportunity | overall 322:23 |
| ones 414:16 | operations 311:11 | 265:20 266:6 | 458:23,24 |
| 514:13 524:1 | 311:12,20 357:24 | 315:24 497:19,20 | overbroad 458:21 |
| 525:25 | 386:19 429:14 | 498:17 499:16 | overcome 483:7 |
| ongoing 281:23 | 432:15 439:18 | 509:5 512:12 | overhead 487:2 |
| 429:6,6,8,21 | 440:16 442:7,11 | 513:21 514:1 | overrule 302:5 |
| 435:10 440:14 | 442:15,17 443:11 | 515:7,21 | 316:11 343:10 |
| 459:3,8,17 467:14 | 443:23 446:7 | opposed 491:25 | overruled 292:1 |
| 470:6,6,21 508:10 | 460:6 482:5,6 | 494:1 507:25 | 295:22 378:25 |
| online 315:22,22 | 484:3 487:25 | ops 357:20,25 | 380:1 392:16 |
| open $348: 7,10,14$ | 489:15 494:15 | 358:10 | 394:5 443:17 |
| 349:21 369:20 | 523:5 | option 381:21 | 445:25 453:25 |
| 412:20 465:7,13 | opine 497:19 | options 398:23,24 | 459:1 460:11 |
| 497:18 | 505:22 511:22,25 | 398:25 463:4,10 | 468:8 473:24 |
| opened 362:13 | 512:3 | order 265:22 | 475:5 507:8 |
| 480:11 | opined 477:13 | 270:2 281:20 | oversee 426:2 |
| opening 332:18,20 | 481:4 505:24 | 338:6 389:22 | overview 335:13 |
| operate 353:2,3 | 506:10 | 414:18 422:22 | 348:2,5 357:16 |
| 388:17 442:25 | opinion 281:3 | 434:20 443:12 | 358:20 412:23 |
| 443:6 464:10 | 338:2 420:25 | 488:13 532:22 | 478:19 488:11 |

[owed - passed]

| owed 363:5 412:24 | 365:2,4 367:10 | 318:11 421:25 | 06 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| owned 267:18 | 383:9 386:12 | 422:4 424:20 | 54:12 496:15,16 |
| 308:15 313:13,14 | 388:15 393:17,17 | 425:4,5,9,10,11,20 | 501:8 511:3 524:6 |
| 345:2 351:9 | 396:3 413:18 | 426:9 452:6 | partial 264:12 |
| 394:25 433:22 | 414:4,10 418:13 | 454:11,15,22,24 | partially 364:18 |
| 474:10 | 420:5,9,10 424:1 | 476:25 477:5 | participate 337:5 |
| owner 308:16 | 425:8 427:1 428:1 | park 261:4 | 368:23 |
| 344:12 | 430:1,2,25 431:1 | parker 312:9 | participating |
| ownership 313:15 | 432:5,14 435:8,22 | 356:21 450:12 | 336:4 |
| 334:25 335:2 | 436:8,11 444:18 | 467:8 481:4,18 | particular 401:24 |
| 496:11 | 450:6 452:23 | 482:9,16 484:9 | 422:16 429:8 |
| owns 468:18 | 460:20,24 462:23 | 487:10 488:14 | 448:6 452:2 |
| p | 462:23,25 463:18 | 489:5 491:9 | 555:24 456:3 |
|  | 463:19,21,21 | 492:25 493:9 | 65:3 490:12,14 |
| p\&l | 469:5 472:7,14,17 | 494:3 495:11 | 490:19 491:9,16 |
| p\&ls | 476:23 477:5 | 496:21 497:25 | 503:7 531:8 |
|  | 481:7 485:5 491:2 | 501:2,21 502:12 | particularly 448:7 |
| dgett | 497:4,14 504:12 | 502:21 505:9,25 | parties 265:8,20 |
| 322:11 326 | 504:20 505:1 | 510:1 511:21 | 65:24 343:4 |
| 326:25 327 | 507:12 509:18,21 | 512:10 513:15 | 346:2 347:3 358:7 |
| 32 | 519:19 528:7 | 514:10 517:12 | 359:8 395:20 |
|  | 531:3,4,7,23 | parker's 356:2,5 | 397:10 402:10 |
| 375:14 396:6,15 | pages 259:25 | 356:11 481:5,11 | 03:10,14 409:21 |
| 397:22 433:25 | 285:20 287:19 | 481:15 482:2 | 09:25 412:12 |
| 29:17 530:20 | 315:13,16,16 | 483:10 484:25 | 27:10,1 |
|  | 382:6 | 485:5 487:15 | partner 387:18 |
| padgett's 396:7 | paid 323:113 | 488:8,18 489:2 | 495:16,18,19 |
| page 263:3 264:2,9 | 345:11,12 350:24 | 490:3,9 491: | partnership 387:9 |
| 284:22 285:7,7,15 | 361:6 363:15 | 492:10,19 498:18 | 387:10 |
| 286:23,23 287:3 | 413:2,5 474:14 | 498:22 500:25 | parts 369: |
| 287:21,22,23,24 | 495:19 | 501:8 502:9 | 419:22 |
| 287:25 288:1,3 | paper 393:13 | 504:12,25 506:14 | party 270 |
| 293:15,19,22,23 | paragraph 308:2 | 507:5,11,16 | 322:14 342:25 |
| 293:25 294:7 | 309:13,14 310:7 | 508:14 509:2 | 347:4 361:1 363:7 |
| 297:3, | 318:10 371:7 | 513:3 515:3 517:9 | 444:20,21 445:2 |
| $308: 21,21 \quad 326: 22$ | 462:24 463:22 | 518:13,15 528:22 | 46:6,6 527:19 |
| 326:23,23 329:11 | 497:6 505:9 | 531:21 | 532:5 534:18 |
| 329:13,13 331:17 | parentheses | part 266:10 287:5 | pass 293:8321:3 |
| $331: 20,22332: 9$ | 367:22 | 314:19 315:12 | 359:16 437:21 |
| 332:11 342:12 | paris 303:7 312:25 | 328:16 3 | passed 393:4 |
| 344:3 362:15 | 314:11 315:4 | 366:10,10 368:14 |  |

[passes - pledge]

[pledged - privileged]

| pledged 295:11 | possible 341:24 | prepare 269:25 | 296:2 297:15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 297:16 298:15,21 | 436:18 447:12 | 270:2 286:24 | 308:2 378:2 405:4 |
| 298:25 308:10 | possibly 437:13 | 287:4 290:13 | 480:3 508:25 |
| pledging 295:18 | 494:21 500:1 | 292:20,22 335:9 | price 316:19 |
| 296:3 297:20 | 523:9 529:5,6 | 335:19 337:10 | 324:16 342:19 |
| plot 474:10 | post $267: 14$ | 338:24 340:9 | 377:12 468:23 |
| plural 438:10 | 456:10 478:15 | 413:21 414:13,18 | prices 264:16 |
| plus 305:1 311:3 | 486:12 501:4,21 | 419:25 497:21 | 380:15 456:9 |
| 373:6 413:3 | 506:2,2 508:2 | 510:2 512:22 | 503:18 |
| pod 385:3,4 | 514:24 | 513:4,5,12 | primarily 339:2 |
| point 298:24 300:6 | potential 295:17 | prepared 266:11 | 486:23 |
| 318:25 319:2 | 358:16 361:22 | 267:21 271:20 | primary 485:24 |
| 367:1 369:5 | 362:5 429:15 | 274:1,5 284:19 | prime 347:9,10 |
| 375:22 385:19 | 447:20 483:8 | 285:3,4,8 286:1,5 | principal 531:1 |
| 386:2 389:17 | 487:18 492:3 | 286:16 290:10 | principals 374:19 |
| 390:4 406:19 | 503:19 526:6 | 335:15 339:22 | 422:9 424:11,24 |
| 430:23 432:2 | potentially 376:24 | 352:11 413:19,20 | 428:19 434:4 |
| 445:20 462:23 | 524:8 | 414:4,10,19 | 447:24 448:22,23 |
| 472:9 482:6 | pouya 262 | 418:19,21 481:3 | 463:13 465:21 |
| 488:19 493:6,7 | 306:23 | 489:6 | 505:20 532:5 |
| 503:7 515:22 | power 398: | preparer 271:22 | principles 522:8 |
| 516:16,21 528:10 | 399:23,25 | preparing 273:13 | printed 314:2 |
| 528:19 530:23 | practical 3 | 335:17,18 377:4 | 319:24 |
| pointed 370:22 | pre 456:10 | 392:22 433:16 | printing 315:8,19 |
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ARBITRATOR BAKER: This is the last day of the final hearing in the Goldstein versus NuVeda matter. Again, rather than going around the table and making appearances, will counsel stipulate that the same individuals that were here yesterday and the first day are also present?

MR. FEUERSTEIN: Confirmed.
MR. WILEY: Confirmed.
ARBITRATOR BAKER: I don't want to interrupt closing arguments. I have a couple fairly broad issues I would like counsel to briefly touch on during their closings, and I ask that no one read into the questions.

I know that's something that I always tend to do when a judge asks, or an arbitrator asks me questions and $I$ try to read the tea leaves. Please don't do that.

These are just some overall issues that, you know, $I$ was thinking about last night and this morning and that $I$ would like just briefly touched on in your closings.

First, section 2 of the operating agreement
states, in pertinent part, quote, "Upon the expulsion or death of a member, the member's successor in interest, estate or beneficiaries, as the case may be, shall be entitled to receive from the company, in exchange for all of the former member's ownership interest, the fair market value of that member's ownership interest, adjusted for profits and losses to the date of the expulsion or death."

I noted in both the prehearing arbitration briefs, the parties quoted that sentence up to the point of -- then it goes on to say, "Adjusted for profits and losses to the date of the expulsion or death."

In other words, it seemed to be on both sides that that was omitted in the parties' briefs. So I would like the parties to briefly address if and how the expert opinions and Mr. Webster's appraisal comply or do not comply with the entirety of that sentence, not just the fair market value, but the fair market value as adjusted for profits and losses to the date of expulsion or both. That's the first one.

The second issue that I've been going over is that the expert witnesses have opined, and I'm going to paraphrase, the term "fair market value" means the amount a willing buyer would pay and a willing seller
would accept.
Understanding that there's disagreement as to which approach should be used for the fair market value analysis, $I$ would like a brief explanation as to if and how the values determined in the expert opinions and Mr. Webster's appraisal comply or do not comply with this definition of fair market value.

Then the last thing, and I would like a statement on the record now or from the parties, whether they agree or disagree.

But $I$ understand from the parties arguments in evidence that for purposes of making a decision in this arbitration, $I$ am to assume, without deciding, that the subsidiaries, Clark NMSD, LLC, Clark Natural Medicinal Solutions, LLC, and Nye Natural Medicinal Solutions, LLC are wholly-owned by NuVeda.

And in determining Ms. Goldstein's fair market value of her ownership interest in NuVeda, I am to include the value of those licenses.

So in other words, I'm not making a decision as to whether NuVeda -- as to whether those subsidiaries are, in fact, wholly-owned, that is an assumption I'm supposed to use in my opinion. And that the licenses held by these subsidiaries are included in the fair market value.

So my question is, is that correct?
MR. FEUERSTEIN: I think that's correct from our professional perspective.

MR. WILEY: That's correct from NuVeda as well.

ARBITRATOR BAKER: Thank you.
Now, Mr. Feuerstein.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: It's my turn first?
ARBITRATOR BAKER: You are the claimant.
MR. DUSHOFF: Burden of proof.
CLAIMANT'S CLOSING ARGUMENT
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Good morning, Arbitrator Baker. And I would say on the record, thank you for your professionalism and conduct in the arbitration.

I think you've been fair and listened to all of the parties and have been obviously very patient. I think that $I$ would be remiss not to thank you ahead of time because I'm going to get up caught up in the argument here in a moment.

I think there are two main issues for you to decide in this arbitration. The first is whether in expelling Ms. Goldstein from NuVeda, whether NuVeda actually attempted to acquire a, quote/unquote, fair market value of her seven percent nondilutable interest.

Section 6.2 of the operating agreement provides that in the event all of the voting members cannot come to an informal agreement to the fair market value of the expulsed member's interest, the voting members shall hire an appraiser to determine the fair market value of the shares.

As I'll explain in a moment, there's simply no question that the disinterested members of NuVeda did nothing to try and reach an agreement with Ms. Goldstein and get an actual appraisal of the fair market value of her shares.

In fact, the evidence that we've elicited at this hearing shows that what the disinterested members did was that they valued the assets of NuVeda themselves and then simply asked Mr. Webster to form a simple calculation.

Mr. Webster did absolutely nothing to confirm any of the numbers provided to him by Mr. Kennedy. He just spent 10 minutes adding and subtracting certain numbers that Mr . Kennedy provided upon request.

That's not what section 2 is intended to accomplish. It wasn't intended to allow the disinterested members to make up their own valuation of the assets and then just have a third party add and subtract the numbers.

The point of the appraisal is to have someone independently value NuVeda's assets so that the expulsed member could receive a fair market value of her shares.

What makes this whole situation even worse, in our view, is that how arbitrary NuVeda's valuation actually was. The balance -- for example, the balance sheets that Mr. Kennedy provided to Dr. Clauretie for his reports revealed that NuVeda actually determined that the fair market value of NuVeda's licenses went down from March 2016 to August 2017, even though virtually every witness testified that those values should have gone up, given the enactment of the rec in Nevada.

Thus, in our view, the appraisal provided by Mr. Webster has to be disregarded. It doesn't comply with section 6.2. And once that happened, the second question is what's the actual fair market value of Ms. Goldstein's shares as of August 8, 2017.

The parties have submitted no less than a dozen expert reports. And I hate to break the news to you, none of them is an exciting read.

While the paid experts predictably do not agree with each other's methodologies or their approaches, there are a few absolutes that I think you
can take from the reports and the expert's testimony. First, respondent's experts do not provide any legitimate number for the fair market value of NuVeda or Ms. Goldstein's shares, nor do they provide even the tools for you as the decider of fact to even begin to arrive at a number.

In fact, Anthem -- I'm not going to try to pronounce his name -- did not even provide any valuation of NuVeda. And Dr. Clauretie's calculations and opinions should be entirely excluded or disregarded for the reasons I'll get to in a few moments.

Second, NuVeda and its members withheld critical information from their experts that plainly would have affected their conclusions. They never told them about the MIPA. They never told them about the operation. They never told them that the dispensary licenses were actually earning more than $\$ 7$ million in annualized revenue.

Third, while Anthem takes issues with some of Mr. Parker's conclusions and his assumptions, there are multiple ways for Mr. Parker and Ms. Goldstein to establish that the fair market value of her interest is worth anywhere from 2 million to $\$ 2.8$ million, assuming, assuming that the MIPA is honored and
considered in a truly intellectually and honest matter.

Fourth, the contemporaneous evidence, factual evidence, corroborates Mr. Parker's calculations and refutes the opinions of NuVeda's witnesses and experts. So with that said, let's dig in just a little bit.

As I said, the first issue today is whether NuVeda complied with section 6.2 of the operating agreement. Initially, I would note that there's no dispute that respondents did not attempt to reach an informal agreement with Ms. Goldstein about the fair market value of her interest.

Instead, it appears that Mr. Kennedy reached out to Mr. Webster and asked him to perform what NuVeda now calls an appraisal. Well, what the testimony yesterday confirmed is that Mr. Webster literally did nothing to appraise the value of NuVeda.

Instead, he asked Mr. Kennedy to provide him with a balance sheet of NuVeda's assets and liabilities, and then spent approximately 10 minutes, 10 minutes adding and subtracting the numbers that Mr. Kennedy had provided to arrive at his valuation of approximately $\$ 1.6$ million.

Leaving everything else aside for a moment,
to suggest that a company like NuVeda that held 35 percent in two operating recreational dispensaries in Las Vegas, Nevada, with a combined annual revenue of \$7.2 million, with two cultivation licenses, either in whole or fractional, and two production licenses, in whole and fractional, had a fair market value of $\$ 1.6$ million, which is just absurd on its face.

Of course, Mr. Webster did not care about that because he was not asked to make any independent assessment of whether the numbers Mr. Kennedy provided were correct or reflective of NuVeda's fair market value.

In fact, he specifically disclaimed doing so, both in his actual appraisal and in his testimony. And he had no prior experience with cannabis companies to determine independently whether Mr. Kennedy's assessments of value were actually accurate.

Before we get to the numbers, the process itself seems to be a breach of section 6.2's purpose. Indeed, NuVeda essentially rendered 6.2 superfluous because all that happened here is that NuVeda itself valued the assets of the company, and then just asked Mr. Webster to do nothing more than serve as a human calculator.

Even worse, Mr. Kennedy admitted yesterday
that he had created the balance sheet after Mr. Webster had asked for one. In other words, the document was not one kept in the usual course of business. It wasn't something that was routinely updated, it was done after they decided to expel Ms. Goldstein.

Mr. Kennedy further confirmed that the source of the valuation he used for CWNV was Pej Bady, who is the largest shareholder in NuVeda, had the most to gain by depressing the value of NuVeda in Ms. Goldstein's interest.

Mr. Kennedy then did nothing, literally nothing to confirm whether the valuation numbers he had provided were at all reasonable to an independent individual. The process cannot be consistent with what section 6.2 was intended to do.

Indeed, the parties were first supposed to meet together to see if they could arrive at a number that they believe was the fair market value.

Then, if they couldn't come to an agreement, the idea was to send it to an appraiser, an arbitrator, if you will, to determine what was the fair market value of NuVeda's assets such that you can then deduct what the expelled member's interest were.

That's not what they did here. What they did
here is they picked the number themselves, arbitrarily in our view, and just gave it to an appraiser and said add and subtract these numbers.

Of course in this case, as $I$ just mentioned, the conduct seems that much more egregious because virtually all the evidence indicates that the four licenses contributed to CWNV were worth far more than \$10 million.

For example, prior to Nevada converting to a rec state, Dr. Bady and his friend, Dr. Bahri, agreed that Dr. Bady would pledge two percent of his interest in NuVeda at a $\$ 25$ million valuation.

Shane Terry testified that he thought the valuation in NuVeda was anywhere between $\$ 35$ million and $\$ 50$ million. Brian Padgett from CW Nevada, who is a lawyer, testified under oath that CW Nevada was providing $\$ 22$ million of value to CWNV for 65 percent of the licenses in Nye and Clark and MSD, meaning that those four licenses alone were worth approximately $\$ 34$ million in or around December of 2015.

Virtually every witness testified that upon the conversion to a rec state, license values would increase. In fact, Mr. Terry testified that he thought license values would increase by a factor of five, given the additional customer count anticipated
for rec as deducted by RAND and other evidence in Washington, and I believe Colorado.

Thus, whatever the license values were in 2016 should only have gone up in 2017. But as I said in the opening, Mr. Kennedy's valuations actually went down. Virtually every witness testified that the valuation of licenses would increase if they sold them as a vertical enterprise rather than single licenses.

And perhaps most tellingly, the members of NuVeda entered into September 20, 2017, purchase and sale agreement marked as Exhibit 263, wherein one month after expelling Ms. Goldstein and telling Mr. Webster that the value of their interest in CWNV were worth three and a half million dollars, the members of NuVeda agreed to sell 100 percent of the interest in Clark and Nye to CW for more than seven times that amount.

The purchase and sale agreement offered more than $\$ 22$ million in cash payments. It offered a two percent interest in CW, with, if you did some simple math using the documents that are in evidence, you can approximate the three and a half million dollars in present day, and a promise of indemnification in a Forefront litigation, which obviously has some value. There is not a single piece of paper, not
one, that respondents have provided that corroborates Mr. Kennedy's self-serving testimony. Just like there's not a single piece of paper that corroborates Mr. Kennedy's claim that NuVeda somehow agreed to, quote/unquote, offset the money that $C W$ owes to NuVeda, because NuVeda was concerned that it would have to pay 35 percent of the operating capital despite the plain and unambiguous terms of the MIPA.

Despite all of this evidence, NuVeda would still have you believe that it somehow followed the letter of the operating agreement and to not breach the covenant of good faith and fair dealing.

The other purpose of section 6.2 is clear: It was supposed to ensure that if the parties couldn't reach agreement to a fair market value, that there would be appraisal to arrive at that number.

It simply defies common sense in our view to suggest that 6.2 could be satisfied by selecting the values yourselves and then giving those values to a third party to simply add and subtract, to make no independent judgment as to whether or not those values are at all reasonable, but that's what happened here.

Without ever speaking to Ms. Goldstein, NuVeda and its remaining members agreed among themselves and only themselves to a valuation and then
asked Mr. Webster to put it on his letterhead.
In fact, when Ms. Goldstein requested underlying information, she went completely unanswered.

Now, I suspect that NuVeda will argue that Mr. Kennedy's valuation was made in good faith and corroborated by perhaps Exhibit 257, the 2018 article about the sale of Terra Tech dispensary, and it will also be corroborated by Shane Terry's acquisition of the cultivation and production license.

But as Mr. Terry testified, there are extenuating circumstances to the Terra Tech sale. What's more, if you're inclined to consider the sale of Terra Tech's one dispensary as probative to the value of dispensary licenses held by CWNV, then we submit that you also have to consider the Essence transaction, where Essence sold a vertical operation with three dispensaries for almost $\$ 300$ million.

Mr. Terry also testified about the extenuating circumstances concerning his acquisition or his company's acquisition, including the fact that they were provisional licenses.

Moreover, Mr. Terry explained that within 30 days, literally 30 days of acquiring these two licenses, he raised money at a $\$ 3$ million post
valuation.
So with respect to the first issue,
Arbitrator Baker, we think there's no question that the Webster report cannot satisfy the purpose of section 6.2 .

The next question then is what is the actual valuation of Ms. Goldstein's interest. As I said earlier, there's literally 12 experts in this case, and yet among those 12 experts, NuVeda does not provide one credible valuation of Ms. Goldstein's shares. Anthem Street reports do not provide any evidence of the fair market value of Ms. Goldstein's shares, and yesterday Joe testified that he's not offering a value.

And Dr. Clauretie's three reports should either be excluded or given very little weight. In fact, Dr. Clauretie admitted yesterday that his report is based entirely -- not somewhat, entirely -- on hearsay evidence.

Specifically, he testified that the source for his market value of the licenses was none other than Dr. Bady, who evidently gave him a document that did not provide to us, despite our discovery request, even though Dr. Bady testified that he had no recollection of giving Dr. Clauretie a document.

Dr. Clauretie also testified that he confirmed the accuracy and applicability of that list with an individual who was never brought before the arbitrator and asked to testify as to his bona fides or why he thought the valuations were reasonable.

Beyond that single 20 to 30 -minute conversation, Dr. Clauretie did nothing to call -nothing, literally nothing, to confirm the accuracy of the so-called list that he was provided. So there's not a single reliable data point in his report that should merit it being considered expert testimony.

Even if it were to be considered, the calculation contains numerous assumptions that are belied by the record evidence.

For example, Dr. Clauretie concedes that he never heard of the MIPA. Never considered the MIPA as an asset to his calculation of liquidation value of NuVeda, that his opinion and conclusions depended in part on NuVeda's inability to raise money from outside investors, even though NuVeda didn't have to raise any money from outside investors because it was CW's responsibility and Apex's responsibility. And that he had never valued another cannabis company before.

In short, Dr. Clauretie is nothing more than a more educated version of Mr. Webster. He did
virtually nothing more than add and subtract the same valuations that Mr. Kennedy arbitrarily provided, without providing his own independent confirmation of those numbers.

As Mr. Dushoff likes to say, garbage in, garbage out. Even worse, if that were -- I gave you credit.

MR. DUSHOFF: I do like to say that.
MR. FEUERSTEIN: Even worse, if that were possible, is that NuVeda other expert, Anthem, made clear that in order to be reliable, experts should conduct some due diligence to determine whether the numbers provided by the client are accurate. Here, as I said, Dr. Clauretie admitted that he did none of that. So Anthem is actually making the argument for me.

I understand that Anthem takes its shots at Mr. Parker's reports and that there's a dispute as to whether to apply the going concern method, which we think applies, or the liquidation method which respondents choose.

But neither NuVeda or its members ever provided any credible data points to its experts for them to make an informed decision as to which methodology to apply.

For example, none of NuVeda's experts knew that the dispensary licenses were operational, that the dispensaries were earning $\$ 7$ million in top line revenue. They didn't know that there was a MIPA that was allowing or providing that some other party had to provide the operating capital for the operations.

But even if you were going to say that you wanted to apply the liquidation method, so long as you used proper inputs, you would end up at roughly the same number.

So while Anthem is critical of Mr. Parker, it's really throwing stones in glass houses because it, too, didn't have the data to make the proper underlying assumptions. However, Anthem conspicuously does not provide its own valuation of NuVeda, or even can correct a number that Mr. Parker provides.

What's more, there's plenty of evidence in this record that supports Mr. Parker's conclusion, assuming again that the MIPA is honored in an intellectually honest fashion that Ms. Goldstein's shares are worth approximately $\$ 2.8$ million, that is, 35 percent of the $\$ 8$ million that Mr. Parker concluded.

For example, as I mentioned, Brian Padgett testified that $C W$ is providing $\$ 22$ million of capital
to earn 65 percent of CWNV, leaving NuVeda with \$12 million of equity in the enterprise.

If you credit Shane Terry's testimony, he corroborated that number and believe that the value of NuVeda's licenses should have increased by a factor of five after rec became legal in Nevada because how many more customers you would expect, you would end up with a valuation of $\$ 2.72$ million for Ms. Goldstein's interest.

That is, you would take the $\$ 12$ million of equity, multiply it by five, and then reduce it by seven percent to reduce Ms. Goldstein's interest, and then another 28 percent for lack of control and a lack of marketability.

You also have Mr. Parker's calculation that he did on the record where he testified that if we use the actual rec numbers for CWNV's dispensaries in July 2017, which Mr. Kennedy claimed were accurate, and then use the actual numbers for CW's production and cultivation facilities as a proxy to what NuVeda should be entitled to under the terms of the MIPA, and then you use the number six as the revenue multiplier, as Anthem confirmed has done with private cannabis companies, you get approximately $\$ 2.1$ million as the valuation for Ms. Goldstein's interest.

Finally and perhaps most tellingly, you have the purchase and sale agreement that was marked as Exhibit 263. I'm sure NuVeda will argue that the document should not be considered because it was never performed, it was ultimately rescinded, it's dated beyond the date of the expulsion and so on.

Of course, NuVeda's own expert, Dr. Clauretie date post expulsion, so NuVeda cannot have it both ways. Moreover, whether the agreement was ever performed or not or ultimately rescinded does not change the fact that the parties that entered into the agreement 32 days after Webster issued his appraisal.

The agreement reflects that the parties, including NuVeda and its members, had a meeting of the minds and had agreed that the fair market value of NuVeda's interest in CW would be worth at least $\$ 22$ million in monthly payments, approximately three and a half million dollars in $C W$ stock, and an additional valuation for the indemnification in the Forefront litigation.

In other words, there was at least -- well, there was at that moment, a willing buyer and a willing seller, willing to pay more than 25 and a half million dollars cash, plus additional value.

This agreement reflects that NuVeda did not
itself believe that its interest in CWNV was worth only three and a half million dollars. It's beyond credible to suggest that any member of NuVeda truly believed that its assets were worth almost seven times less than they actually were.

That the parties later had buyer's or seller's remorse or realized that they had entered into an agreement that wholly undermined their litigation position is no consequence.

The simple point is that they cannot reasonably claim that they believed in good faith that the valuation of CWNV was three and a half million dollars on August 7, 2018, and then literally sit here and claim that that agreement somehow morphed, or that interest somehow morphed seven times in 32 days without any explanation.

So even if you conclude that you can't use the data point to truly value NuVeda, we would submit that the purchase and sale agreement is terrific evidence to discredit respondent's ipse dixit claims that they deem in good faith believe NuVeda's interest was only three and a half million dollars.

Of course in our view, the evidence shows that NuVeda actually had reason to believe that the agreement or its terms was probable or likely to
happen when Ms. Goldstein was being expelled.
This was an act of cold blood. The fact is recreational sales began in 2017 . One month later, the members of NuVeda decided to expel Ms. Goldstein. Remember, Ms. Goldstein sued the company in 2015. Only months later the members expelled Mr. Terry, but they waited more than a year and a half to expel Ms. Goldstein.

And that timing just so happened to coincide with the onset of rec sales, and it just so happened to come one month after this phony -- one month before they sold their interest to CW for over 25 and a half million dollars.

To be sure, no one from respondents denied that they knew about the agreement of August 2017. In fact, when Mr. Wiley and Mr. Dushoff redirected the witnesses and asked them about the purchase agreement, they never once asked the question, when did you start discussing the agreements? When did you think those agreements were going to come into existence? Nothing.

I happened to ask Mr. Kennedy how long it took to negotiate 263 , or the purchase and sale agreement. He didn't really answer. He said it could have taken over a month.

And given some of Mr. Kennedy's other testimony, including his claim that operating capital is somehow different than working capital, his lack of commitment speaks volumes.

If there was any way Mr. Kennedy could have said in good faith that the agreement had been conceived after Ms. Goldstein had been expulsed, he would have surely done so.

Similarly, Pej Bady testified that the decision to enter into 263 was not just happenstance, rather, there was a conscious decision to, in his words, streamline NuVeda's business. I cannot imagine such a decision was made lightly and they just came up with the idea right before executing the agreement.

By using the purchase and sale agreement to estimate the value of NuVeda's assets as of August 8, 2017, you again arrive at a number of $\$ 2.1$ million. And just to note, this does not include the member loan or expenses that Ms. Goldstein has in the total of $\$ 47,000$ and change as reflected in Dr. Clauretie's report.

Now, you asked us to consider two separate issues at the outset of this hearing, the first -I'll take them in reversal order. The first question was a willing buyer and willing seller and how the
experts either considered that or valued that to comply with that determination.

I think quite frankly that the -- Mr. Parker applies both the discount for lack of marketability and discount for minority interest at combined 28 percent to account for the fact that it is not necessarily a freely tradable interest.

As for the first question with respect to adjusted for profits and losses, as far as $I$ can tell, there have not yet been profits and losses at NuVeda. Whatever losses there were incurred are now the responsibility of $C W$ pursuant to the terms of the MIPA.

And one final note before $I$ conclude, the fact is here, that Ms. Goldstein had a nondilutable interest of seven percent. That interest in negotiations with Pej Bady were evidenced to be even more valuable than a straight equity interest.

If you recall, there were discussions about providing her with more equity to compensate the fact that you have to actually dilute her when investment came in. So any investor who would be in the fair market buying a nondilutable interest would obviously get some minor value.

With that, Your Honor, we would rest our
closing. Thank you.
RESPONDENT'S CLOSING ARGUMENT
MR. DUSHOFF: Arbitrator Baker, I want to thank you again for also being here and being very patient with us and taking the time to look over all these documents and hanging with us with the machinations in this case over the past year with us, because it is definitely a lot going on back and forth.

I'm going to start off with this, what they don't mention. Burden of proof is not with us. The burden of proof is with them. The burden of proof is with Ms. Goldstein, and the number she put out is $\$ 8$ million. That's the number her expert testified to and that's her burden of proof. Her burden of proof is to come forward with that number.

Computation. Remember, we talked about this, a computation of damages. We can't just throw it in here and go and start throwing 12, 13, 14 different numbers. She had her number from her expert.

Her expert said her value is \$8 million, and she has to meet that burden. And I'm going to tell later on as we go through this, not even close, and not able to do so.

Judge Gonzalez ruled that on the operating
agreement, that it was the plain meaning of the operating agreement should be taken into place. And under the operating agreement, which you quoted this morning under section $6.2,6.2$ does govern the expulsions.

There was disinterested voting members 60 percent to expel Ms. Goldstein, not challenged. Mr. Kennedy testified that Dr. Bady and Dr. Mohajer had that 60 percent. And only upon -- and there was an issue, only upon expulsion, then you have the right to get to -- for the appraisal for the fair market value.

You don't have -- once expelled, you don't have that right as they had in their brief to suddenly become a voting member once you're expelled to be able to vote on who the appraiser is. That's not your right, and you brought this out. You are expelled.

Any ambiguity in that, as Ms. Goldstein testified, for a clause that you brought out was ambiguous would be construed against her. Why? Because she was the drafter of the operating agreement.

We acknowledge that Ms. Goldstein needs to be compensated for her seven percent interest. Section 6.2 doesn't state we need to hire an expert. Section 6.2 says we need to have an appraisal done.

Ms. Goldstein is arguing, or argued in her brief, again, as we talked about, needed to be included with the choice, but we know that didn't have merit. So what did we do? Mr. Kennedy hired an appraiser, hired Mr. Webster.

Mr. Webster has been a certified appraiser for over 30 years. You can't challenge his experience. Has done hundreds of business appraisals. Mr. Webster asked for the balance sheet. Mr. Kennedy provided it.

Now, they question, well, that's just a simple number you do as -- Mr. Feuerstein, well, that's just balance sheet, you just do assets minus liabilities equals what we call an asset methodology, and says that is incorrect.

Well, I think all of the experts beg to differ because all the experts said an asset methodology, what we call liquidation, is a proper way to determine value.

I'm sorry that it's simple. I'm sorry that it didn't involve a 145 page expert opinion to do so, but it didn't need to do so. You have your assets, liabilities. That's what you do in asset -- when you do an asset methodology, and that's what was done here.

Once the appraisal was done, Mr. Butell contacted Ms. Goldstein. She testified that she received that appraisal. Had the numbers in front of her. She didn't like the numbers.

And we know that because two months later after she went radio silent on the numbers, she filed her second amended complaint again and charged 18 causes of action, not against and -- well, and 18 of them against my clients in their individual capacity.

We hired -- under 6.2, she was expelled properly. Upon that point, we hired the appraiser. She wouldn't talk with us. She didn't want to be anywhere near them. You could tell there was whole bunch of animosity between these people. I get it and I understand that when you expel a member, that that's the case.

We hired the appraiser. Appraiser just met Mr. Kennedy. It wasn't like he was not an old friend of his. The appraiser says, Okay. In order to be able to properly perform this, I need the balance sheet. I need the liabilities.

Now, you're right, Mr. Webster didn't do an audit on this. Dr. Clauretie didn't do an audit on this. You know who also didn't do an audit on this?

Their expert. Nobody did an audit on this. They relied on the numbers that were given them.

Mr. Kennedy testified that those were accurate numbers. Never challenged whether those numbers were accurate. At that point, we should be done. We followed our operating agreement. We followed 6.2 to the letter.

Now, you talked about and you brought this up, and I'm going to bring it up here, is that you know what, but where's the lost profit? Where's the profit of her loss into the fair market value?

And you heard testimony, there was no profit. Everything was a loss. But you know what you didn't do? Didn't subtract the losses. Didn't say, you know what, you make 116. We're evaluating at 116 or 105 -I apologize, I think it was 116, but we're subtracting $\$ 50,000$ because we haven't made any money. As a matter of fact, we're in a deficit.

We gave her that extra. We didn't subtract it. But yet, still now and for the first time in this case, literally at here she said there was a breach of good faith against NuVeda for failure to bring -- for the numbers, however, saying that those numbers are improper.

However, we didn't go to Kinkos for this.

There were three numbers that you heard here, the only three numbers that you heard here that are completely unbiased. They put forth numbers through their witness.

We put forth numbers through the witnesses and our experts and their experts, but there were three numbers here that you heard that were completely unbiased, not from either side, and they are 6.25, 200 and 200. These are the known numbers.

How do we know that? Well, we know in October of 2018, and this is the only numbers that are in evidence, by the way. They pull out Essential saying well, Essential sold for $\$ 90$ million in a vertical (unintelligible.)

Where's that evidence before you? Somebody said it. There was no proof. There was nothing before you saying that. We could say a lot of things, but there was no proof. This is evidence. 6.25 three months ago.

Three months ago, Terra Tech bought an asset sale for 6.25 million of a distribution center -dispensary. I apologize. I keep calling it a distribution. Of a dispensary.

Now, this was an asset purchase, so this just wasn't the license, but this was everything. So at

