

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

SUPERPUMPER, INC., an Arizona corporation; EDWARD BAYUK, individually and as Trustee of the EDWARD BAYUK LIVING TRUST; SALVATORE MORABITO, an individual; and SNOWSHOE PETROLEUM, INC., a New York corporation,

Petitioners,

vs.

THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK; AND THE HONORABLE CONNIE J. STEINHEIMER,

Respondents,

and

WILLIAM A. LEONARD, Trustee for the Bankruptcy Estate of Paul Anthony Morabito,

Real Party in Interest.

Case No.

Electronically Filed
Dec 03 2020 12:01 p.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

PETITIONERS' APPENDIX,

VOLUME 4
(Nos. 575–725)

Micah S. Echols, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 8437
CLAGGETT & SYKES LAW FIRM
4101 Meadows Lane, Suite 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89107
Telephone: (702) 655-2346
Facsimile: (702) 655-3763
micah@claggettlaw.com

Jeffrey L. Hartman, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 1607
HARTMAN & HARTMAN
510 West Plumb Lane, Suite B
Reno, Nevada 89509
Telephone: (775) 324-2800
Facsimile: (775) 324-1818
jlh@bankruptcyreno.com

Attorneys for Petitioners, Superpumper, Inc.; Edward Bayuk, individually and as Trustee of the Edward Bayuk Living Trust; Salvatore Morabito; and Snowshoe Petroleum, Inc.

INDEX TO PETITIONERS' APPENDIX

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Complaint (filed 12/17/2013)		Vol. 1, 1–17
Declaration of Salvatore Morabito in Support of Snowshoe Capital's Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction (filed 05/12/2014)		Vol. 1, 18–21
Defendant Snowshoe Petroleum, Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss Complaint for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction NRCP 12(b)(2) (filed 05/12/2014)		Vol. 1, 22–30
JH, Inc., Jerry Herbst, and Berry Hinckley Industries Opposition to Motion to Dismiss (filed 05/29/2014)		Vol. 1, 31–43
Exhibits to Opposition to Motion to Dismiss		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Affidavit of John P. Desmond (filed 05/29/2014)	Vol. 1, 44–48
2	Fifth Amendment and Restatement of the Trust Agreement for the Arcadia Living Trust (dated 09/30/2010)	Vol. 1, 49–88
3	Unanimous Written Consent of the Directors and Shareholders of CWC (dated 09/28/2010)	Vol. 1, 89–92
4	Unanimous Written Consent of the Board of Directors and Sole Shareholder of Superpumper (dated 09/28/2010)	Vol. 1, 93–102
5	Plan of Merger of Consolidated Western Corporation with and into Superpumper, Inc. (dated 09/28/2010)	Vol. 1, 103–107
6	Articles of Merger of Consolidated Western Corporation with and into Superpumper, Inc. (dated 09/29/2010)	Vol. 1, 108–110
7	2009 Federal Income Tax Return for P. Morabito	Vol. 1, 111–153

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Opposition to Motion to Dismiss (cont.)		
8	May 21, 2014 printout from New York Secretary of State	Vol. 1, 154–156
9	May 9, 2008 Letter from Garrett Gordon to John Desmond	Vol. 1, 157–158
10	Shareholder Interest Purchase Agreement (dated 09/30/2010)	Vol. 1, 159–164
11	Relevant portions of the January 22, 2010 Deposition of Edward Bayuk	Vol. 1, 165–176
13	Relevant portions of the January 11, 2010 Deposition of Salvatore Morabito	Vol. 1, 177–180
14	October 1, 2010 Grant, Bargain and Sale Deed	Vol. 1, 181–187
15	Order admitting Dennis Vacco (filed 02/16/2011)	Vol. 1, 188–190
JH, Inc., Jerry Herbst, and Berry Hinckley Industries, Errata to Opposition to Motion to Dismiss (filed 05/30/2014)		Vol. 2, 191–194
Exhibit to Errata to Opposition to Motion to Dismiss		
Exhibit	Document Description	
12	Grant, Bargain and Sale Deed for APN: 040-620-09, dated November 10, 2005	Vol. 2, 195–198
Answer to Complaint of P. Morabito, individually and as trustee of the Arcadia Living Trust (filed 06/02/2014)		Vol. 2, 199–208
Defendant, Snowshow Petroleum, Inc.’s Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss Complaint for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction NRCP 12(b)(2) (filed 06/06/2014)		Vol. 2, 209–216

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibit to Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss Complaint for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction NRCP 12(b)(2)		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Declaration of Salvatore Morabito in Support of Snowshow Petroleum, Inc.'s Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss Complaint for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction (filed 06/06/2014)	Vol. 2, 217–219
Defendant, Superpumper, Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss Complaint for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction NRCP 12(b)(2) (filed 06/19/2014)		Vol. 2, 220–231
Exhibit to Motion to Dismiss Complaint for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction NRCP 12(b)(2)		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Declaration of Salvatore Morabito in Support of Superpumper, Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction (filed 06/19/2014)	Vol. 2, 232–234
JH, Inc., Jerry Herbst, and Berry Hinckley Industries, Opposition to Motion to Dismiss (filed 07/07/2014)		Vol. 2, 235–247
Exhibits to Opposition to Motion to Dismiss		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Affidavit of Brian R. Irvine (filed 07/07/2014)	Vol. 2, 248–252
2	Fifth Amendment and Restatement of the Trust Agreement for the Arcadia Living Trust (dated 09/30/2010)	Vol. 2, 253–292
3	BHI Electronic Funds Transfers, January 1, 2006 to December 31, 2006	Vol. 2, 293–294

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Opposition to Motion to Dismiss (cont.)		
4	Legal and accounting fees paid by BHI on behalf of Superpumper; JH78636-JH78639; JH78653-JH78662; JH78703-JH78719	Vol. 2, 295–328
5	Unanimous Written Consent of the Directors and Shareholders of CWC (dated 09/28/2010)	Vol. 2, 329–332
6	Unanimous Written Consent of the Board of Directors and Sole Shareholders of Superpumper (dated 09/28/2010)	Vol. 2, 333–336
7	Plan of Merger of Consolidated Western Corporation with and into Superpumper, Inc. (dated 09/28/2010)	Vol. 2, 337–341
8	Articles of Merger of Consolidated Western Corporation with and into Superpumper, Inc. (dated 09/29/2010)	Vol. 2, 342–344
9	2009 Federal Income Tax Return for P. Morabito	Vol. 2, 345–388
10	Relevant portions of the January 22, 2010 Deposition of Edward Bayuk	Vol. 2, 389–400
11	Grant, Bargain and Sale Deed for APN: 040-620-09, dated November 10, 2005	Vol. 2, 401–404
12	Relevant portions of the January 11, 2010 Deposition of Salvatore Morabito	Vol. 2, 405–408
13	Printout of Arizona Corporation Commission corporate listing for Superpumper, Inc.	Vol. 2, 409–414
Defendant, Superpumper, Inc.’s Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss Complaint for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction NRCP 12(b)(2) (filed 07/15/2014)		Vol. 3, 415–421
Order Denying Motion to Dismiss as to Snowshoe Petroleum, Inc.’s (filed 07/17/2014)		Vol. 3, 422–431

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Notice of Entry of Order Denying Motion to Dismiss as to Snowshoe Petroleum, Inc.'s (filed 07/17/2014)		Vol. 3, 432–435
Exhibit to Notice of Entry of Order Denying Motion to Dismiss as to Snowshoe Petroleum, Inc.'s		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Order Denying Motion to Dismiss as to Snowshoe Petroleum, Inc.'s	Vol. 3, 436–446
Order Denying Superpumper, Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss Complaint for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction NRCP 12(b)(2) (filed 07/22/2014)		Vol. 3, 447–457
Notice of Entry of Order Denying Superpumper, Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss Complaint for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction NRCP 12(b)(2) (filed 07/22/2014)		Vol. 3, 458–461
Exhibit to Notice of Entry of Order Denying Superpumper, Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss Complaint		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Order Denying Superpumper, Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss Complaint for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction NRCP 12(b)(2) (filed 07/22/2014)	Vol. 3, 462–473
Answer to Complaint of Superpumper, Inc., and Snowshoe Petroleum, Inc. (filed 07/28/2014)		Vol. 3, 474–483
Answer to Complaint of Defendants, Edward Bayuk, individually and as trustee of the Edward William Bayuk Living Trust, and Salvatore Morabito (filed 09/29/2014)		Vol. 3, 484–494
Notice of Bankruptcy of Consolidated Nevada Corporation and P. Morabito (filed 2/11/2015)		Vol. 3, 495–498

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Supplemental Notice of Bankruptcy of Consolidated Nevada Corporation and P. Morabito (filed 02/17/2015)		Vol. 3, 499–502
Exhibits to Supplemental Notice of Bankruptcy of Consolidated Nevada Corporation and P. Morabito		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Involuntary Petition; Case No. BK-N-13-51236 (filed 06/20/2013)	Vol. 3, 503–534
2	Involuntary Petition; Case No. BK-N-13-51237 (06/20/2013)	Vol. 3, 535–566
3	Order for Relief Under Chapter 7; Case No. BK-N-13-51236 (filed 12/17/2014)	Vol. 3, 567–570
4	Order for Relief Under Chapter 7; Case No. BK-N-13-51237 (filed 12/17/2014)	Vol. 3, 571–574
Stipulation and Order to File Amended Complaint (filed 05/15/2015)		Vol. 4, 575–579
Exhibit to Stipulation and Order to File Amended Complaint		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	First Amended Complaint	Vol. 4, 580–593
William A. Leonard, Trustee for the Bankruptcy Estate of P. Morabito, First Amended Complaint (filed 05/15/2015)		Vol. 4, 594–607
Stipulation and Order to Substitute a Party Pursuant to NRCP 17(a) (filed 05/15/2015)		Vol. 4, 608–611
Substitution of Counsel (filed 05/26/2015)		Vol. 4, 612–615
Defendants' Answer to First Amended Complaint (filed 06/02/2015)		Vol. 4, 616–623

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Amended Stipulation and Order to Substitute a Party Pursuant to NRCP 17(a) (filed 06/16/2015)		Vol. 4, 624–627
Motion to Partially Quash, or, in the Alternative, for a Protective Order Precluding Trustee from Seeking Discovery Protected by the Attorney-Client Privilege (filed 03/10/2016)		Vol. 4, 628–635
Exhibits to Motion to Partially Quash, or, in the Alternative, for a Protective Order Precluding Trustee from Seeking Discovery Protected by the Attorney-Client Privilege		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	March 9, 2016 Letter from Lippes	Vol. 4, 636–638
2	Affidavit of Frank C. Gilmore, Esq., (dated 03/10/2016)	Vol. 4, 639–641
3	Notice of Issuance of Subpoena to Dennis Vacco (dated 01/29/2015)	Vol. 4, 642–656
4	March 10, 2016 email chain	Vol. 4, 657–659
Minutes of February 24, 2016 Pre-trial Conference (filed 03/17/2016)		Vol. 4, 660–661
Transcript of February 24, 2016 Pre-trial Conference		Vol. 4, 662–725
Plaintiff's (Leonard) Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Partially Quash, or, in the Alternative, for a Protective Order Precluding Trustee from Seeking Discovery Protected by the Attorney-Client Privilege (filed 03/25/2016)		Vol. 5, 726–746
Exhibits to Opposition to Motion to Partially Quash or, in the Alternative, for a Protective Order Precluding Trustee from Seeking Discovery Protected by the Attorney-Client Privilege		

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Declaration of Teresa M. Pilatowicz in Support of Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Partially Quash (filed 03/25/2016)	Vol. 5, 747–750
2	Application for Commission to take Deposition of Dennis Vacco (filed 09/17/2015)	Vol. 5, 751–759
3	Commission to take Deposition of Dennis Vacco (filed 09/21/2015)	Vol. 5, 760–763
4	Subpoena/Subpoena Duces Tecum to Dennis Vacco (09/29/2015)	Vol. 5, 764–776
5	Notice of Issuance of Subpoena to Dennis Vacco (dated 09/29/2015)	Vol. 5, 777–791
6	Dennis C. Vacco and Lippes Mathias Wexler Friedman LLP, Response to Subpoena (dated 10/15/2015)	Vol. 5, 792–801
7	Condensed Transcript of October 21, 2015 Deposition of Dennis Vacco	Vol. 5, 802–851
8	Transcript of the Bankruptcy Court's December 22, 2015, oral ruling; Case No. BK-N-13-51237	Vol. 5, 852–897
9	Order Granting Motion to Compel Responses to Deposition Questions; Case No. BK-N-13-51237 (filed 02/03/2016)	Vol. 5, 898–903
10	Notice of Continued Deposition of Dennis Vacco (filed 02/18/2016)	Vol. 5, 904–907
11	Debtor's Objection to Proposed Order Granting Motion to Compel Responses to Deposition Questions; Case No. BK-N-13-51237 (filed 01/22/2016)	Vol. 5, 908–925

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Reply in Support of Motion to Modify Subpoena, or, in the Alternative, for a Protective Order Precluding Trustee from Seeking Discovery Protected by the Attorney-Client Privilege (filed 04/06/2016)		Vol. 6, 926–932
Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel Production of Documents (filed 04/08/2016)		Vol. 6, 933–944
Exhibits to Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel Production of Documents		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Declaration of Teresa M. Pilatowicz in Support of Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel (filed 04/08/2016)	Vol. 6, 945–948
2	Bill of Sale – 1254 Mary Fleming Circle (dated 10/01/2010)	Vol. 6, 949–953
3	Bill of Sale – 371 El Camino Del Mar (dated 10/01/2010)	Vol. 6, 954–958
4	Bill of Sale – 370 Los Olivos (dated 10/01/2010)	Vol. 6, 959–963
5	Personal financial statement of P. Morabito as of May 5, 2009	Vol. 6, 964–965
6	Plaintiff’s First Set of Requests for Production of Documents to Edward Bayuk (dated 08/14/2015)	Vol. 6, 966–977
7	Edward Bayuk’s Responses to Plaintiff’s First Set of Requests for Production (dated 09/23/2014)	Vol. 6, 978–987
8	Plaintiff’s First Set of Requests for Production of Documents to Edward Bayuk, as trustee of the Edward William Bayuk Living Trust (dated 08/14/2015)	Vol. 6, 988–997

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Production of Documents (cont.)		
9	Edward Bayuk, as trustee of the Edward William Bayuk Living Trust's Responses to Plaintiff's First Set of Requests for Production (dated 09/23/2014)	Vol. 6, 998–1007
10	Plaintiff's Second Set of Requests for Production of Documents to Edward Bayuk (dated 01/29/2016)	Vol. 6, 1008–1015
11	Edward Bayuk's Responses to Plaintiff's Second Set of Requests for Production (dated 03/08/2016)	Vol. 6, 1016–1020
12	Plaintiff's Second Set of Requests for Production of Documents to Edward Bayuk, as trustee of the Edward William Bayuk Living Trust (dated 01/29/2016)	Vol. 6, 1021–1028
13	Edward Bayuk, as trustee of the Edward William Bayuk Living Trust's Responses to Plaintiff's Second Set of Requests for Production (dated 03/08/2016)	Vol. 6, 1029–1033
14	Correspondences between Teresa M. Pilatowicz, Esq., and Frank Gilmore, Esq. (dated 03/25/2016)	Vol. 6, 1034–1037
Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Production of Documents (filed 04/25/2016)		Vol. 7, 1038–1044
Reply in Support of Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Production of Documents (filed 05/09/2016)		Vol. 7, 1045–1057
Exhibits to Reply in Support of Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Production of Documents		

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Declaration of Gabrielle A. Hamm, Esq., in Support of Reply in Support of Plaintiff's Motion to Compel (filed 05/09/2016)	Vol. 7, 1058–1060
2	Amended Findings, of Fact and Conclusion of Law in Support of Order Granting Motion for Summary Judgment; Case No. BK-N-13-51237 (filed 12/22/2014)	Vol. 7, 1061–1070
3	Order Compelling Deposition of P. Morabito dated March 13, 2014, in <i>Consolidated Nevada Corp., et al v. JH. et al.</i> ; Case No. CV07-02764 (filed 03/13/2014)	Vol. 7, 1071–1074
4	Emergency Motion Under NRCP 27(e); Petition for Writ of Prohibition, <i>P. Morabito v. The Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada in and for the County of Washoe</i> ; Case No. 65319 (filed 04/01/2014)	Vol. 7, 1075–1104
5	Order Denying Petition for Writ of Prohibition; Case No. 65319 (filed 04/18/2014)	Vol. 7, 1105–1108
6	Order Granting Summary Judgment; Case No. BK-N-13-51237 (filed 12/17/2014)	Vol. 7, 1109–1112
Recommendation for Order RE: <i>Defendants' Motion to Partially Quash</i> , filed on March 10, 2016 (filed 06/13/2016)		Vol. 7, 1113–1124
Confirming Recommendation Order from June 13, 2016 (filed 07/06/2016)		Vol. 7, 1125–1126
Recommendation for Order RE: <i>Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Production of Documents</i> , filed on April 8, 2016 (filed 09/01/2016)		Vol. 7, 1127–1133

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Confirming Recommendation Order from September 1, 2016 (filed 09/16/2016)		Vol. 7, 1134–1135
Plaintiff's Application for Order to Show Cause Why Defendant, Edward Bayuk Should Not Be Held in Contempt of Court Order (filed 11/21/2016)		Vol. 8, 1136–1145
Exhibits to Plaintiff's Application for Order to Show Cause Why Defendant, Edward Bayuk Should Not Be Held in Contempt of Court Order		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Order to Show Cause Why Defendant, Edward Bayuk Should Not Be Held in Contempt of Court Order (filed 11/21/2016)	Vol. 8, 1146–1148
2	Confirming Recommendation Order from September 1, 2016 (filed 09/16/2016)	Vol. 8, 1149–1151
3	Recommendation for Order RE: <i>Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Production of Documents</i> , filed on April 8, 2016 (filed 09/01/2016)	Vol. 8, 1152–1159
4	Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Production of Documents (filed 04/08/2016)	Vol. 8, 1160–1265
5	Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Production of Documents (filed 04/25/2016)	Vol. 8, 1266–1273
6	Reply in Support of Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Production of Documents (filed 05/09/2016)	Vol. 8, 1274–1342
7	Correspondences between Teresa M. Pilatowicz, Esq., and Frank Gilmore, Esq. (dated 09/22/2016)	Vol. 8, 1343–1346
8	Edward Bayuk's Supplemental Responses to Plaintiff's Second Set of Requests for Production (dated 10/25/2016)	Vol. 8, 1347–1352

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Opposition to Plaintiff's Application for Order to Show Cause Why Defendant Should Not Be Held in Contempt of Court Order (filed 12/19/2016)		Vol. 9, 1353–1363
Exhibits to Opposition to Plaintiff's Application for Order to Show Cause Why Defendant Should Not Be Held in Contempt of Court Order		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Declaration of Edward Bayuk in Support of Opposition to Plaintiff's Application for Order to Show Cause (filed 12/19/2016)	Vol. 9, 1364–1367
2	Declaration of Frank C. Gilmore, Esq., in Support of Opposition to Plaintiff's Application for Order to Show Cause (filed 12/19/2016)	Vol. 9, 1368–1370
3	Redacted copy of the September 6, 2016, correspondence of Frank C. Gilmore, Esq.	Vol. 9, 1371–1372
Order to Show Cause Why Defendant, Edward Bayuk Should Not Be Held in Contempt of Court Order (filed 12/23/2016)		Vol. 9, 1373–1375
Response: (1) to Opposition to Application for Order to Show Cause Why Defendant Should Not Be Held in Contempt of Court Order and (2) in Support of Order to Show Cause (filed 12/30/2016)		Vol. 9, 1376–1387
Minutes of January 19, 2017 Deposition of Edward Bayuk in RE: insurance policies (filed 01/19/2017)		Vol. 9, 1388
Minutes of January 19, 2017 hearing on Order to Show Cause (filed 01/30/2017)		Vol. 9, 1389
Motion to Quash Subpoena, or, in the Alternative, for a Protective Order Precluding Trustee from Seeking Discovery from Hodgson Russ LLP (filed 07/18/2017)		Vol. 9, 1390–1404

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Motion to Quash Subpoena, or, in the Alternative, for a Protective Order Precluding Trustee from Seeking Discovery from Hodgson Russ LLP		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Correspondence between Teresa M. Pilatowicz, Esq., and Frank Gilmore, Esq., dated March 8, 2016	Vol. 9, 1405–1406
2	Correspondence between Teresa M. Pilatowicz, Esq., and Frank Gilmore, Esq., dated March 8, 2016, with attached redlined discovery extension stipulation	Vol. 9, 1407–1414
3	Jan. 3 – Jan. 4, 2017, email chain from Teresa M. Pilatowicz, Esq., and Frank Gilmore, Esq.	Vol. 9, 1415–1416
4	Declaration of Frank C. Gilmore, Esq., in Support of Motion to Quash (filed 07/18/2017)	Vol. 9, 1417–1420
5	January 24, 2017 email from Teresa M. Pilatowicz, Esq.,	Vol. 9, 1421–1422
6	Jones Vargas letter to HR and P. Morabito, dated August 16, 2010	Vol. 9, 1423–1425
7	Excerpted Transcript of July 26, 2011 Deposition of Sujata Yalamanchili, Esq.	Vol. 9, 1426–1431
8	Letter dated June 17, 2011, from Hodgson Russ (“HR”) to John Desmond and Brian Irvine on Morabito related issues	Vol. 9, 1432–1434
9	August 9, 2013, transmitted letter to HR	Vol. 9, 1435–1436
10	Excerpted Transcript of July 23, 2014 Deposition of P. Morabito	Vol. 9, 1437–1441
11	Lippes Mathias Wexler Friedman LLP, April 3, 2015 letter	Vol. 9, 1442–1444

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Motion to Quash Subpoena (cont.)		
12	Lippes Mathias Wexler Friedman LLP, October 20, 2010 letter RE: Balance forward as of bill dated 09/19/2010 and 09/16/2010	Vol. 9, 1445–1454
13	Excerpted Transcript of June 25, 2015 Deposition of 341 Meeting of Creditors	Vol. 9, 1455–1460
(1) Opposition to Motion to Quash Subpoena, or, in the Alternative, for a Protective Order Precluding Trustee from Seeking Discovery from Hodgson Russ LLP; and (2) Countermotion for Sanctions and to Compel Resetting of 30(b)(3) Deposition of Hodgson Russ LLP (filed 07/24/2017)		Vol. 10, 1461–1485
Exhibits to (1) Opposition to Motion to Quash Subpoena, or, in the Alternative, for a Protective Order Precluding Trustee from Seeking Discovery from Hodgson Russ LLP; and (2) Countermotion for Sanctions and to Compel Resetting of 30(b)(3) Deposition of Hodgson Russ LLP		
Exhibit	Document Description	
A	Declaration of Teresa M. Pilatowicz, Esq., in Support of (1) Opposition to Motion to Quash Subpoena, or, in the Alternative, for a Protective Order Precluding Trustee from Seeking Discovery from Hodgson Russ LLP (filed 07/24/2017)	Vol. 10, 1486–1494
A-1	Defendants' NRCP Disclosure of Witnesses and Documents (dated 12/01/2014)	Vol. 10, 1495–1598
A-2	Order Granting Motion to Compel Responses to Deposition Questions; Case No. BK-N-13-51237 (filed 02/03/2016)	Vol. 10, 1599–1604

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to (1) Opposition to Motion to Quash Subpoena; and (2) Countermotion for Sanctions (cont.)		
A-3	Recommendation for Order RE: <i>Defendants' Motion to Partially Quash</i> , filed on March 10, 2016 (filed 06/13/2016)	Vol. 10, 1605–1617
A-4	Confirming Recommendation Order from September 1, 2016 (filed 09/16/2016)	Vol. 10, 1618–1620
A-5	Subpoena – Civil (dated 01/03/2017)	Vol. 10, 1621–1634
A-6	Notice of Deposition of Person Most Knowledgeable of Hodgson Russ LLP (filed 01/03/2017)	Vol. 10, 1635–1639
A-7	January 25, 2017 Letter to Hodgson Russ LLP	Vol. 10, 1640–1649
A-8	Stipulation Regarding Continued Discovery Dates (Sixth Request) (filed 01/30/2017)	Vol. 10, 1650–1659
A-9	Stipulation Regarding Continued Discovery Dates (Seventh Request) (filed 05/25/2017)	Vol. 10, 1660–1669
A-10	Defendants' Sixteenth Supplement to NRCP Disclosure of Witnesses and Documents (dated 05/03/2017)	Vol. 10, 1670–1682
A-11	Rough Draft Transcript of Garry M. Graber, Dated July 12, 2017 (Job Number 394849)	Vol. 10, 1683–1719
A-12	Sept. 15-Sept. 23, 2010 emails by and between Hodgson Russ LLP and Other Parties	Vol. 10, 1720–1723
Reply in Support of Motion to Quash Subpoena, or, in the Alternative, for a Protective Order Precluding Trustee from Seeking Discovery from Hodgson Russ LLP, and Opposition to Motion for Sanctions (filed 08/03/2017)		Vol. 11, 1724–1734

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Reply in Support of Countermotion for Sanctions and to Compel Resetting of 30(b)(6) Deposition of Hodgson Russ LLP (filed 08/09/2017)		Vol. 11, 1735–1740
Minutes of August 10, 2017 hearing on Motion to Quash Subpoena, or, in the Alternative, for a Protective Order Precluding Trustee from Seeking Discovery from Hodgson Russ LLP, and Opposition to Motion for Sanctions (filed 08/11/2017)		Vol. 11, 1741–1742
Recommendation for Order RE: <i>Defendants’ Motion to Quash Subpoena, or, in the Alternative, for a Protective Order Precluding Trustee from Seeking Discovery from Hodgson Russ LLP</i> , filed on July 18, 2017 (filed 08/17/2017)		Vol. 11, 1743–1753
Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (filed 08/17/2017)		Vol. 11, 1754–1796
Statement of Undisputed Facts in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (filed 08/17/2017)		Vol. 11, 1797–1825
Exhibits to Statement of Undisputed Facts in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Declaration of Timothy P. Herbst in Support of Separate Statement of Undisputed Facts in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment	Vol. 12, 1826–1829
2	Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Judgment in <i>Consolidated Nevada Corp., et al v. JH. et al.</i> ; Case No. CV07-02764 (filed 10/12/2010)	Vol. 12, 1830–1846
3	Judgment in <i>Consolidated Nevada Corp., et al v. JH. et al.</i> ; Case No. CV07-02764 (filed 08/23/2011)	Vol. 12, 1847–1849

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Statement of Undisputed Facts (cont.)		
4	Excerpted Transcript of July 12, 2017 Deposition of Garry M. Graber	Vol. 12, 1850–1852
5	September 15, 2015 email from Yalamanchili RE: Follow Up Thoughts	Vol. 12, 1853–1854
6	September 23, 2010 email between Garry M. Graber and P. Morabito	Vol. 12, 1855–1857
7	September 20, 2010 email between Yalamanchili and Eileen Crotty RE: Morabito Wire	Vol. 12, 1858–1861
8	September 20, 2010 email between Yalamanchili and Garry M. Graber RE: All Mortgage Balances as of 9/20/2010	Vol. 12, 1862–1863
9	September 20, 2010 email from Garry M. Graber RE: Call	Vol. 12, 1864–1867
10	September 20, 2010 email from P. Morabito to Dennis and Yalamanchili RE: Attorney client privileged communication	Vol. 12, 1868–1870
11	September 20, 2010 email string RE: Attorney client privileged communication	Vol. 12, 1871–1875
12	Appraisal of Real Property: 370 Los Olivos, Laguna Beach, CA, as of Sept. 24, 2010	Vol. 12, 1876–1903
13	Excerpted Transcript of March 21, 2016 Deposition of P. Morabito	Vol. 12, 1904–1919
14	P. Morabito Redacted Investment and Bank Report from Sept. 1 to Sept. 30, 2010	Vol. 12, 1920–1922
15	Excerpted Transcript of June 25, 2015 Deposition of 341 Meeting of Creditors	Vol. 12, 1923–1927
16	Excerpted Transcript of December 5, 2015 Deposition of P. Morabito	Vol. 12, 1928–1952

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Statement of Undisputed Facts (cont.)		
17	Purchase and Sale Agreement between Arcadia Trust and Bayuk Trust entered effective as of Sept. 27, 2010	Vol. 12, 1953–1961
18	First Amendment to Purchase and Sale Agreement between Arcadia Trust and Bayuk Trust entered effective as of Sept. 28, 2010	Vol. 12, 1962–1964
19	Appraisal Report providing market value estimate of real property located at 8355 Panorama Drive, Reno, NV as of Dec. 7, 2011	Vol. 12, 1965–1995
20	An Appraisal of a vacant .977± Acre Parcel of Industrial Land Located at 49 Clayton Place West of the Pyramid Highway (State Route 445) Sparks, Washoe County, Nevada and a single-family residence located at 8355 Panorama Drive Reno, Washoe County, Nevada 89511 as of October 1, 2010 a retrospective date	Vol. 13, 1996–2073
21	APN: 040-620-09 Declaration of Value (dated 12/31/2012)	Vol. 14, 2074–2075
22	Sellers Closing Statement for real property located at 8355 Panorama Drive, Reno, NV 89511	Vol. 14, 2076–2077
23	Bill of Sale for real property located at 8355 Panorama Drive, Reno, NV 89511	Vol. 14, 2078–2082
24	Operating Agreement of Baruk Properties LLC	Vol. 14, 2083–2093
25	Edward Bayuk, as trustee of the Edward William Bayuk Living Trust's Answer to Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories (dated 09/14/2014)	Vol. 14, 2094–2104
26	Summary Appraisal Report of real property located at 1461 Glenneyre Street, Laguna Beach, CA 92651, as of Sept. 25, 2010	Vol. 14, 2105–2155

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Statement of Undisputed Facts (cont.)		
27	Appraisal of Real Property as of Sept. 23, 2010: 1254 Mary Fleming Circle, Palm Springs, CA 92262	Vol. 15, 2156–2185
28	Appraisal of Real Property as of Sept. 23, 2010: 1254 Mary Fleming Circle, Palm Springs, CA 92262	Vol. 15, 2186–2216
29	Membership Interest Transfer Agreement between Arcadia Trust and Bayuk Trust entered effective as of Oct. 1, 2010	Vol. 15, 2217–2224
30	PROMISSORY NOTE [Edward William Bayuk Living Trust (“Borrower”) promises to pay Arcadia Living Trust (“Lender”) the principal sum of \$1,617,050.00, plus applicable interest] (dated 10/01/2010)	Vol. 15, 2225–2228
31	Certificate of Merger dated Oct. 4, 2010	Vol. 15, 2229–2230
32	Articles of Merger Document No. 20100746864-78 (recorded date 10/04/2010)	Vol. 15, 2231–2241
33	Excerpted Transcript of September 28, 2015 Deposition of Edward William Bayuk	Vol. 15, 2242–2256
34	Grant Deed for real property 1254 Mary Fleming Circle, Palm Springs, CA 92262; APN: 507-520-015 (recorded 11/04/2010)	Vol. 15, 2257–2258
35	General Conveyance made as of Oct. 31, 2010 between Woodland Heights Limited (“Vendor”) and Arcadia Living Trust (“Purchaser”)	Vol. 15, 2259–2265
36	Appraisal of Real Property as of Sept. 24, 2010: 371 El Camino Del Mar, Laguna Beach, CA 92651	Vol. 15, 2266–2292

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Statement of Undisputed Facts (cont.)		
37	Excerpted Transcript of December 6, 2016 Deposition of P. Morabito	Vol. 15, 2293–2295
38	Page intentionally left blank	Vol. 15, 2296–2297
39	Ledger of Edward Bayuk to P. Morabito	Vol. 15, 2298–2300
40	Loan Calculator: Payment Amount (Standard Loan Amortization)	Vol. 15, 2301–2304
41	Payment Schedule of Edward Bayuk Note in Favor of P. Morabito	Vol. 15, 2305–2308
42	November 10, 2011 email from Vacco RE: Baruk Properties, LLC/P. Morabito/Bank of America, N.A.	Vol. 15, 2309–2312
43	May 23, 2012 email from Vacco to Steve Peek RE: Formal Settlement Proposal to resolve the Morabito matter	Vol. 15, 2313–2319
44	Excerpted Transcript of March 12, 2015 Deposition of 341 Meeting of Creditors	Vol. 15, 2320–2326
45	Shareholder Interest Purchase Agreement between P. Morabito and Snowshoe Petroleum, Inc. (dated 09/30/2010)	Vol. 15, 2327–2332
46	P. Morabito Statement of Assets & Liabilities as of May 5, 2009	Vol. 15, 2333–2334
47	March 10, 2010 email from Naz Afshar, CPA to Darren Takemoto, CPA RE: Current Personal Financial Statement	Vol. 15, 2335–2337
48	March 10, 2010 email from P. Morabito to Jon RE: ExxonMobil CIM for Florida and associated maps	Vol. 15, 2338–2339

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Statement of Undisputed Facts (cont.)		
49	March 20, 2010 email from P. Morabito to Vacco RE: proceed with placing binding bid on June 22nd with ExxonMobil	Vol. 15, 2340–2341
50	P. Morabito Statement of Assets & Liabilities as of May 30, 2010	Vol. 15, 2342–2343
51	June 28, 2010 email from P. Morabito to George R. Garner RE: ExxonMobil Chicago Market Business Plan Review	Vol. 15, 2344–2345
52	Plan of Merger of Consolidated Western Corp. with and into Superpumper, Inc. (dated 09/28/2010)	Vol. 15, 2346–2364
53	Page intentionally left blank	Vol. 15, 2365–2366
54	BBVA Compass Proposed Request on behalf of Superpumper, Inc. (dated 12/15/2010)	Vol. 15, 2367–2397
55	Business Valuation Agreement between Matrix Capital Markets Group, Inc. and Superpumper, Inc. (dated 09/30/2010)	Vol. 15, 2398–2434
56	Expert report of James L. McGovern, CPA/CFF, CVA (dated 01/25/2016)	Vol. 16, 2435–2509
57	June 18, 2014 email from Sam Morabito to Michael Vanek RE: SPI Analysis	Vol. 17, 2510–2511
58	Declaration of P. Morabito in Support of Opposition to Motion of JH, Inc., Jerry Herbst, and Berry-Hinckley Industries for Order Prohibiting Debtor from Using, Acquiring, or Disposing of or Transferring Assets Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 105 and 303(f) Pending Appointment of Trustee; Case No. BK-N-13-51237 (filed 07/01/2013)	Vol. 17, 2512–2516

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Statement of Undisputed Facts (cont.)		
59	State of California Secretary of State Limited Liability Company – Snowshoe Properties, LLC; File No. 201027310002 (filed 09/29/2010)	Vol. 17, 2517–2518
60	PROMISSORY NOTE [Snowshoe Petroleum (“Maker”) promises to pay P. Morabito (“Holder”) the principal sum of \$1,462,213.00] (dated 11/01/2010)	Vol. 17, 2519–2529
61	PROMISSORY NOTE [Superpumper, Inc. (“Maker”) promises to pay Compass Bank (the “Bank” and/or “Holder”) the principal sum of \$3,000,000.00] (dated 08/13/2010)	Vol. 17, 2530–2538
62	Excerpted Transcript of October 21, 2015 Deposition of Salvatore R. Morabito	Vol. 17, 2539–2541
63	Page intentionally left blank	Vol. 17, 2542–2543
64	Edward Bayuk’s Answers to Plaintiff’s First Set of Interrogatories (dated 09/14/2014)	Vol. 17, 2544–2557
65	October 12, 2012 email from Stan Bernstein to P. Morabito RE: 2011 return	Vol. 17, 2558–2559
66	Page intentionally left blank	Vol. 17, 2560–2561
67	Excerpted Transcript of October 20, 2015 Deposition of Dennis C. Vacco	Vol. 17, 2562–2564
68	Snowshoe Petroleum, Inc.’s letter of intent to set out the framework of the contemplated transaction between: Snowshoe Petroleum, Inc.; David Dwelle, LP; Eclipse Investments, LP; Speedy Investments; and TAD Limited Partnership (dated 04/21/2011)	Vol. 17, 2565–2572

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Statement of Undisputed Facts (cont.)		
69	Excerpted Transcript of July 10, 2017 Deposition of Dennis C. Vacco	Vol. 17, 2573–2579
70	April 15, 2011 email from P. Morabito to Christian Lovelace; Gregory Ivancic; Vacco RE: \$65 million loan offer from Cerberus	Vol. 17, 2580–2582
71	Email from Vacco to P. Morabito RE: \$2 million second mortgage on the Reno house	Vol. 17, 2583–2584
72	Email from Vacco to P. Morabito RE: Tim Haves	Vol. 17, 2585–2586
73	Settlement Agreement, Loan Agreement Modification & Release dated as of Sept. 7, 2012, entered into by Bank of America and P. Morabito	Vol. 17, 2587–2595
74	Page intentionally left blank	Vol. 17, 2596–2597
75	February 10, 2012 email from Vacco to Paul Wells and Timothy Haves RE: 1461 Glenneyre Street, Laguna Beach – Sale	Vol. 17, 2598–2602
76	May 8, 2012 email from P. Morabito to Vacco RE: Proceed with the corporate set-up with Ray, Edward and P. Morabito	Vol. 17, 2603–2604
77	September 4, 2012 email from Vacco to Edward Bayuk RE: Second Deed of Trust documents	Vol. 17, 2605–2606
78	September 18, 2012 email from P. Morabito to Edward Bayuk RE: Deed of Trust	Vol. 17, 2607–2611
79	October 3, 2012 email from Vacco to P. Morabito RE: Term Sheet on both real estate deal and option	Vol. 17, 2612–2614
80	March 14, 2013 email from P. Morabito to Vacco RE: BHI Hinckley	Vol. 17, 2615–2616
81	Page intentionally left blank	Vol. 17, 2617–2618

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Statement of Undisputed Facts (cont.)		
82	November 11, 2011 email from Vacco to P. Morabito RE: Trevor's commitment to sign	Vol. 17, 2619–2620
83	November 28, 2011 email string RE: Wiring \$560,000 to Lippes Mathias	Vol. 17, 2621–2623
84	Page intentionally left blank	Vol. 17, 2624–2625
85	Page intentionally left blank	Vol. 17, 2626–2627
86	Order for Relief Under Chapter 7; Case No. BK-N-13-51236 (filed 12/22/2014)	Vol. 17, 2628–2634
87	Report of Undisputed Election (11 U.S.C § 702); Case No. BK-N-13-51237 (filed 01/23/2015)	Vol. 17, 2635–2637
88	Amended Stipulation and Order to Substitute a Party to NRCP 17(a) (filed 06/11/2015)	Vol. 17, 2638–2642
89	Membership Interest Purchase Agreement, entered into as of Oct. 6, 2010 between P. Morabito and Edward Bayuk	Vol. 17, 2643–2648
90	Complaint; Case No. BK-N-13-51237 (filed 10/15/2015)	Vol. 17, 2649–2686
91	Fifth Amendment and Restatement of the Trust Agreement for the Arcadia Living Trust (dated 09/30/2010)	Vol. 17, 2687–2726
Objection to Recommendation for Order filed August 17, 2017 (filed 08/28/2017)		Vol. 18, 2727–2734
Exhibit to Objection to Recommendation for Order		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Plaintiff's counsel's Jan. 24, 2017, email memorializing the discovery dispute agreement	Vol. 18, 2735–2736

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Opposition to Objection to Recommendation for Order filed August 17, 2017 (filed 09/05/2017)		Vol. 18, 2737–2748
Exhibit to Opposition to Objection to Recommendation for Order		
Exhibit	Document Description	
A	Declaration of Teresa M. Pilatowicz, Esq., in Support of Opposition to Objection to Recommendation for Order (filed 09/05/2017)	Vol. 18, 2749–2752
Reply to Opposition to Objection to Recommendation for Order filed August 17, 2017 (dated 09/15/2017)		Vol. 18, 2753–2758
Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiff’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (filed 09/22/2017)		Vol. 18, 2759–2774
Defendants’ Separate Statement of Disputed Facts in Support of Opposition to Plaintiff’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (filed 09/22/2017)		Vol. 18, 2775–2790
Exhibits to Defendants’ Separate Statement of Disputed Facts in Support of Opposition to Plaintiff’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Judgment in <i>Consolidated Nevada Corp., et al v. JH. et al.</i> ; Case No. CV07-02764 (filed 08/23/2011)	Vol. 18, 2791–2793
2	Excerpted Transcript of October 20, 2015 Deposition of Dennis C. Vacco	Vol. 18, 2794–2810
3	Order Denying Motion to Dismiss Involuntary Chapter 7 Petition and Suspending Proceedings Pursuant to 11 U.S.C §305(a)(1); Case No. BK-N-13-51237 (filed 12/17/2013)	Vol. 18, 2811–2814

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Defendants' Separate Statement of Disputed Facts (cont.)		
4	Excerpted Transcript of March 21, 2016 Deposition of P. Morabito	Vol. 18, 2815–2826
5	Excerpted Transcript of September 28, 2015 Deposition of Edward William Bayuk	Vol. 18, 2827–2857
6	Appraisal	Vol. 18, 2858–2859
7	Budget Summary as of Jan. 7, 2016	Vol. 18, 2860–2862
8	Excerpted Transcript of March 24, 2016 Deposition of Dennis Banks	Vol. 18, 2863–2871
9	Excerpted Transcript of March 22, 2016 Deposition of Michael Sewitz	Vol. 18, 2872–2879
10	Excerpted Transcript of April 27, 2011 Deposition of Darryl Noble	Vol. 18, 2880–2883
11	Copies of cancelled checks from Edward Bayuk made payable to P. Morabito	Vol. 18, 2884–2892
12	CBRE Appraisal of 14th Street Card Lock Facility (dated 02/26/2010)	Vol. 18, 2893–2906
13	Bank of America wire transfer from P. Morabito to Salvatore Morabito in the amount of \$146,127.00; and a wire transfer from P. Morabito to Lippes for \$25.00 (date 10/01/2010)	Vol. 18, 2907–2908
14	Excerpted Transcript of October 21, 2015 Deposition of Christian Mark Lovelace	Vol. 18, 2909–2918
15	June 18, 2014 email from Sam Morabito to Michael Vanek RE: Analysis of the Superpumper transaction in 2010	Vol. 18, 2919–2920
16	Excerpted Transcript of October 21, 2015 Deposition of Salvatore R. Morabito	Vol. 18, 2921–2929

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Defendants' Separate Statement of Disputed Facts (cont.)		
17	PROMISSORY NOTE [Snowshoe Petroleum ("Maker") promises to pay P. Morabito ("Holder") the principal sum of \$1,462,213.00] (dated 11/01/2010)	Vol. 18, 2930–2932
18	TERM NOTE [P. Morabito ("Borrower") promises to pay Consolidated Western Corp. ("Lender") the principal sum of \$939,000.00, plus interest] (dated 09/01/2010)	Vol. 18, 2933–2934
19	SUCCESSOR PROMISSORY NOTE [Snowshoe Petroleum ("Maker") promises to pay P. Morabito ("Holder") the principal sum of \$492,937.30, plus interest] (dated 02/01/2011)	Vol. 18, 2935–2937
20	Edward Bayuk's wire transfer to Lippes in the amount of \$517,547.20 (dated 09/29/2010)	Vol. 18, 2938–2940
21	Salvatore Morabito Bank of Montreal September 2011 Wire Transfer	Vol. 18, 2941–2942
22	Declaration of Salvatore Morabito (dated 09/21/2017)	Vol. 18, 2943–2944
23	Edward Bayuk bank wire transfer to Superpumper, Inc., in the amount of \$659,000.00 (dated 09/30/2010)	Vol. 18, 2945–2947
24	Edward Bayuk checking account statements between 2010 and 2011 funding the company with transfers totaling \$500,000	Vol. 18, 2948–2953
25	Salvatore Morabito's wire transfer statement between 2010 and 2011, funding the company with \$750,000	Vol. 18, 2954–2957
26	Payment Schedule of Edward Bayuk Note in Favor of P. Morabito	Vol. 18, 2958–2961

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Defendants' Separate Statement of Disputed Facts (cont.)		
27	September 15, 2010 email from Vacco to Yalamanchili and P. Morabito RE: Follow Up Thoughts	Vol. 18, 2962–2964
Reply in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (dated 10/10/2017)		Vol. 19, 2965–2973
Order Regarding Discovery Commissioner's Recommendation for Order dated August 17, 2017 (filed 12/07/2017)		Vol. 19, 2974–2981
Order Denying Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (filed 12/11/2017)		Vol. 19, 2982–2997
Defendants' Motions in Limine (filed 09/12/2018)		Vol. 19, 2998–3006
Exhibits to Defendants' Motions in Limine		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Plaintiff's Second Supplement to Amended Disclosures Pursuant to NRCP 16.1(A)(1) (dated 04/28/2016)	Vol. 19, 3007–3016
2	Excerpted Transcript of March 25, 2016 Deposition of William A. Leonard	Vol. 19, 3017–3023
3	Plaintiff, Jerry Herbst's Responses to Defendant Snowshoe Petroleum, Inc.'s Set of Interrogatories (dated 02/11/2015); and Plaintiff, Jerry Herbst's Responses to Defendant, Salvatore Morabito's Set of Interrogatories (dated 02/12/2015)	Vol. 19, 3024–3044
Motion in Limine to Exclude Testimony of Jan Friederich (filed 09/20/2018)		Vol. 19, 3045–3056

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Motion in Limine to Exclude Testimony of Jan Friederich		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Defendants' Rebuttal Expert Witness Disclosure (dated 02/29/2016)	Vol. 19, 3057–3071
2	Condensed Transcript of March 29, 2016 Deposition of Jan Friederich	Vol. 19, 3072–3086
Opposition to Defendants' Motions in Limine (filed 09/28/2018)		Vol. 19, 3087–3102
Exhibits to Opposition to Defendants' Motions in Limine		
Exhibit	Document Description	
A	Declaration of Teresa M. Pilatowicz, Esq. in Support of Opposition to Defendants' Motions in Limine (filed 09/28/2018)	Vol. 19, 3103–3107
A-1	Plaintiff's February 19, 2016, Amended Disclosures Pursuant to NRCP 16.1(A)(1)	Vol. 19, 3108–3115
A-2	Plaintiff's January 26, 2016, Expert Witnesses Disclosures (without exhibits)	Vol. 19, 3116–3122
A-3	Defendants' January 26, 2016, and February 29, 2016, Expert Witness Disclosures (without exhibits)	Vol. 19, 3123–3131
A-4	Plaintiff's August 17, 2017, Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (without exhibits)	Vol. 19, 3132–3175
A-5	Plaintiff's August 17, 2017, Statement of Undisputed Facts in Support of his Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (without exhibits)	Vol. 19, 3176–3205
Defendants' Reply in Support of Motions in Limine (filed 10/08/2018)		Vol. 20, 3206–3217

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibit to Defendants' Reply in Support of Motions in Limine		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Chapter 7 Trustee, William A. Leonard's Responses to Defendants' First Set of Interrogatories (dated 05/28/2015)	Vol. 20, 3218–3236
Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Motions in Limine to Exclude the Testimony of Jan Friederich (filed 10/08/2018)		Vol. 20, 3237–3250
Exhibits to Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Motions in Limine to Exclude the Testimony of Jan Friederich		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Excerpt of Matrix Report (dated 10/13/2010)	Vol. 20, 3251–3255
2	Defendants' Rebuttal Expert Witness Disclosure (dated 02/29/2016)	Vol. 20, 3256–3270
3	November 9, 2009 email from P. Morabito to Daniel Fletcher; Jim Benbrook; Don Whitehead; Sam Morabito, etc. RE: Jan Friederich entered consulting agreement with Superpumper	Vol. 20, 3271–3272
4	Excerpted Transcript of March 29, 2016 Deposition of Jan Friederich	Vol. 20, 3273–3296
Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Pretrial Disclosures (filed 10/12/2018)		Vol. 20, 3297–3299
Objections to Defendants' Pretrial Disclosures (filed 10/12/2018)		Vol. 20, 3300–3303
Reply to Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion in Limine to Exclude the Testimony of Jan Friederich (filed 10/12/2018)		Vol. 20, 3304–3311

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Minutes of September 11, 2018, Pre-trial Conference (filed 10/19/2018)		Vol. 20, 3312
Stipulated Facts (filed 10/29/2018)		Vol. 20, 3313–3321
Defendants’ Points and Authorities RE: Objection to Admission of Documents in Conjunction with the Depositions of P. Morabito and Dennis Vacco (filed 10/30/2018)		Vol. 20, 3322–3325
Plaintiff’s Points and Authorities Regarding Authenticity and Hearsay Issues (filed 10/31/2018)		Vol. 20, 3326–3334
Clerk’s Trial Exhibit List (filed 02/28/2019)		Vol. 21, 3335–3413
Exhibits to Clerk’s Trial Exhibit List		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Certified copy of the Transcript of September 13, 2010 Judge’s Ruling; Case No. CV07-02764	Vol. 21, 3414–3438
2	Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Judgment; Case No. CV07-02764 (filed 10/12/2010)	Vol. 21, 3439–3454
3	Judgment; Case No. CV07-0767 (filed 08/23/2011)	Vol. 21, 3455–3456
4	Confession of Judgment; Case No. CV07-02764 (filed 06/18/2013)	Vol. 21, 3457–3481
5	November 30, 2011 Settlement Agreement and Mutual Release	Vol. 22, 3482–3613
6	March 1, 2013 Forbearance Agreement	Vol. 22, 3614–3622

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Clerk's Trial Exhibit List (cont.)		
8	Order Denying Motion to Dismiss Involuntary Chapter 7 Petition and Suspending Proceedings, Case 13-51237. ECF No. 94, (filed 12/17/2013)	Vol. 22, 3623–3625
19	Report of Undisputed Election– Appointment of Trustee, Case No. 13-51237, ECF No. 220	Vol. 22, 3626–3627
20	Stipulation and Order to Substitute a Party Pursuant to NRCp 17(a), Case No. CV13-02663, May 15, 2015	Vol. 22, 3628–3632
21	Non-Dischargeable Judgment Regarding Plaintiff's First and Second Causes of Action, Case No. 15-05019-GWZ, ECF No. 123, April 30, 2018	Vol. 22, 3633–3634
22	Memorandum & Decision; Case No. 15-05019-GWZ, ECF No. 124, April 30, 2018	Vol. 22, 3635–3654
23	Amended Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law in Support of Judgment Regarding Plaintiff's First and Second Causes of Action; Case 15-05019-GWZ, ECF No. 122, April 30, 2018	Vol. 22, 3655–3679
25	September 15, 2010 email from Yalamanchili to Vacco and P. Morabito RE: Follow Up Thoughts	Vol. 22, 3680–3681
26	September 18, 2010 email from P. Morabito to Vacco	Vol. 22, 3682–3683
27	September 20, 2010 email from Vacco to P. Morabito RE: Spirit	Vol. 22, 3684–3684
28	September 20, 2010 email between Yalamanchili and Crotty RE: Morabito -Wire	Vol. 22, 3685–3687
29	September 20, 2010 email from Yalamanchili to Graber RE: Attorney Client Privileged Communication	Vol. 22, 3688–3689

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Clerk's Trial Exhibit List (cont.)		
30	September 21, 2010 email from P. Morabito to Vacco and Cross RE: Attorney Client Privileged Communication	Vol. 22, 3690–3692
31	September 23, 2010 email chain between Graber and P. Morabito RE: Change of Primary Residence from Reno to Laguna Beach	Vol. 22, 3693–3694
32	September 23, 2010 email from Yalamanchili to Graber RE: Change of Primary Residence from Reno to Laguna Beach	Vol. 22, 3695–3696
33	September 24, 2010 email from P. Morabito to Vacco RE: Superpumper, Inc.	Vol. 22, 3697–3697
34	September 26, 2010 email from Vacco to P. Morabito RE: Judgment for a fixed debt	Vol. 22, 3698–3698
35	September 27, 2010 email from P. Morabito to Vacco RE: First Amendment to Residential Lease executed 9/27/2010	Vol. 22, 3699–3701
36	November 7, 2012 emails between Vacco, P. Morabito, C. Lovelace RE: Attorney Client Privileged Communication	Vol. 22, 3702–3703
37	Morabito BMO Bank Statement – September 2010	Vol. 22, 3704–3710
38	Lippes Mathias Trust Ledger History	Vol. 23, 3711–3716
39	Fifth Amendment & Restatement of the Trust Agreement for the Arcadia Living Trust dated September 30, 2010	Vol. 23, 3717–3755
42	P. Morabito Statement of Assets & Liabilities as of May 5, 2009	Vol. 23, 3756–3756

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Clerk's Trial Exhibit List (cont.)		
43	March 10, 2010 email chain between Afshar and Takemoto RE: Current Personal Financial Statement	Vol. 23, 3757–3758
44	Salazar Net Worth Report (dated 03/15/2011)	Vol. 23, 3759–3772
45	Purchase and Sale Agreement	Vol. 23, 3773–3780
46	First Amendment to Purchase and Sale Agreement	Vol. 23, 3781–3782
47	Panorama – Estimated Settlement Statement	Vol. 23, 3783–3792
48	El Camino – Final Settlement Statement	Vol. 23, 3793–3793
49	Los Olivos – Final Settlement Statement	Vol. 23, 3794–3794
50	Deed for Transfer of Panorama Property	Vol. 23, 3795–3804
51	Deed for Transfer for Los Olivos	Vol. 23, 3805–3806
52	Deed for Transfer of El Camino	Vol. 23, 3807–3808
53	Kimmel Appraisal Report for Panorama and Clayton	Vol. 23, 3809–3886
54	Bill of Sale – Panorama	Vol. 23, 3887–3890
55	Bill of Sale – Mary Fleming	Vol. 23, 3891–3894
56	Bill of Sale – El Camino	Vol. 23, 3895–3898
57	Bill of Sale – Los Olivos	Vol. 23, 3899–3902
58	Declaration of Value and Transfer Deed of 8355 Panorama (recorded 12/31/2012)	Vol. 23, 3903–3904
60	Baruk Properties Operating Agreement	Vol. 23, 3905–3914
61	Baruk Membership Transfer Agreement	Vol. 24, 3915–3921
62	Promissory Note for \$1,617,050 (dated 10/01/2010)	Vol. 24, 3922–3924

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Clerk's Trial Exhibit List (cont.)		
63	Baruk Properties/Snowshoe Properties, Certificate of Merger (filed 10/04/2010)	Vol. 24, 3925–3926
64	Baruk Properties/Snowshoe Properties, Articles of Merger	Vol. 24, 3927–3937
65	Grant Deed from Snowshoe to Bayuk Living Trust; Doc No. 2010-0531071 (recorded 11/04/2010)	Vol. 24, 3938–3939
66	Grant Deed – 1461 Glenneyre; Doc No. 2010000511045 (recorded 10/08/2010)	Vol. 24, 3940–3941
67	Grant Deed – 570 Glenneyre; Doc No. 2010000508587 (recorded 10/08/2010)	Vol. 24, 3942–3944
68	Attorney File re: Conveyance between Woodland Heights and Arcadia Living Trust	Vol. 24, 3945–3980
69	October 24, 2011 email from P. Morabito to Vacco RE: Attorney Client Privileged Communication	Vol. 24, 3981–3982
70	November 10, 2011 email chain between Vacco and P. Morabito RE: Baruk Properties, LLC/Paul Morabito/Bank of America, N.A.	Vol. 24, 3983–3985
71	Bayuk First Ledger	Vol. 24, 3986–3987
72	Amortization Schedule	Vol. 24, 3988–3990
73	Bayuk Second Ledger	Vol. 24, 3991–3993
74	Opposition to Motion for Summary Judgment and Declaration of Edward Bayuk; Case No. 13-51237, ECF No. 146 (filed 10/03/2014)	Vol. 24, 3994–4053
75	March 30, 2012 email from Vacco to Bayuk RE: Letter to BOA	Vol. 24, 4054–4055

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Clerk's Trial Exhibit List (cont.)		
76	March 10, 2010 email chain between P. Morabito and jon@aim13.com RE: Strictly Confidential	Vol. 24, 4056–4056
77	May 20, 2010 email chain between P. Morabito, Vacco and Michael Pace RE: Proceed with placing a Binding Bid on June 22nd with ExxonMobil	Vol. 24, 4057–4057
78	Morabito Personal Financial Statement May 2010	Vol. 24, 4058–4059
79	June 28, 2010 email from P. Morabito to George Garner RE: ExxonMobil Chicago Market Business Plan Review	Vol. 24, 4060–4066
80	Shareholder Interest Purchase Agreement	Vol. 24, 4067–4071
81	Plan of Merger of Consolidated Western Corporation with and Into Superpumper, Inc.	Vol. 24, 4072–4075
82	Articles of Merger of Consolidated Western Corporation with and Into Superpumper, Inc.	Vol. 24, 4076–4077
83	Unanimous Written Consent of the Board of Directors and Sole Shareholder of Superpumper, Inc.	Vol. 24, 4078–4080
84	Unanimous Written Consent of the Directors and Shareholders of Consolidated Western Corporation	Vol. 24, 4081–4083
85	Arizona Corporation Commission Letter dated October 21, 2010	Vol. 24, 4084–4091
86	Nevada Articles of Merger	Vol. 24, 4092–4098
87	New York Creation of Snowshoe	Vol. 24, 4099–4103
88	April 26, 2012 email from Vacco to Afshar RE: Ownership Structure of SPI	Vol. 24, 4104–4106
90	September 30, 2010 Matrix Retention Agreement	Vol. 24, 4107–4110

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Clerk's Trial Exhibit List (cont.)		
91	McGovern Expert Report	Vol. 25, 4111–4189
92	Appendix B to McGovern Report – Source 4 – Budgets	Vol. 25, 4190–4191
103	Superpumper Note in the amount of \$1,462,213.00 (dated 11/01/2010)	Vol. 25, 4192–4193
104	Superpumper Successor Note in the amount of \$492,937.30 (dated 02/01/2011)	Vol. 25, 4194–4195
105	Superpumper Successor Note in the amount of \$939,000 (dated 02/01/2011)	Vol. 25, 4196–4197
106	Superpumper Stock Power transfers to S. Morabito and Bayuk (dated 01/01/2011)	Vol. 25, 4198–4199
107	<i>Declaration of P. Morabito in Support of Opposition to Motion of JH, Inc., Jerry Herbst, and Berry- Hinckley Industries for Order Prohibiting Debtor from Using, Acquiring or Transferring Assets Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 105 and 303(f) Pending Appointment of Trustee, Case 13-51237, ECF No. 22 (filed 07/01/2013)</i>	Vol. 25, 4200–4203
108	October 12, 2012 email between P. Morabito and Bernstein RE: 2011 Return	Vol. 25, 4204–4204
109	Compass Term Loan (dated 12/21/2016)	Vol. 25, 4205–4213
110	P. Morabito – Term Note in the amount of \$939,000.000 (dated 09/01/2010)	Vol. 25, 4214–4214
111	Loan Agreement between Compass Bank and Superpumper (dated 12/21/2016)	Vol. 25, 4215–4244
112	Consent Agreement (dated 12/28/2010)	Vol. 25, 4245–4249
113	Superpumper Financial Statement (dated 12/31/2007)	Vol. 25, 4250–4263

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Clerk's Trial Exhibit List (cont.)		
114	Superpumper Financial Statement (dated 12/31/2009)	Vol. 25, 4264–4276
115	Notes Receivable Interest Income Calculation (dated 12/31/2009)	Vol. 25, 4277–4278
116	Superpumper Inc. Audit Conclusions Memo (dated 12/31/2010)	Vol. 25, 4279–4284
117	Superpumper 2010 YTD Income Statement and Balance Sheets	Vol. 25, 4285–4299
118	March 12, 2010 Management Letter	Vol. 25, 4300–4302
119	Superpumper Unaudited August 2010 Balance Sheet	Vol. 25, 4303–4307
120	Superpumper Financial Statements (dated 12/31/2010)	Vol. 25, 4308–4322
121	Notes Receivable Balance as of September 30, 2010	Vol. 26, 4323
122	Salvatore Morabito Term Note \$2,563,542.00 as of December 31, 2010	Vol. 26, 4324–4325
123	Edward Bayuk Term Note \$2,580,500.00 as of December 31, 2010	Vol. 26, 4326–4327
125	April 21, 2011 Management letter	Vol. 26, 4328–4330
126	Bayuk and S. Morabito Statements of Assets & Liabilities as of February 1, 2011	Vol. 26, 4331–4332
127	January 6, 2012 email from Bayuk to Lovelace RE: Letter of Credit	Vol. 26, 4333–4335
128	January 6, 2012 email from Vacco to Bernstein	Vol. 26, 4336–4338
129	January 7, 2012 email from Bernstein to Lovelace	Vol. 26, 4339–4343
130	March 18, 2012 email from P. Morabito to Vacco	Vol. 26, 4344–4344

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Clerk's Trial Exhibit List (cont.)		
131	April 21, 2011 Proposed Acquisition of Nella Oil	Vol. 26, 4345–4351
132	April 15, 2011 email chain between P. Morabito and Vacco	Vol. 26, 4352
133	April 5, 2011 email from P. Morabito to Vacco	Vol. 26, 4353
134	April 16, 2012 email from Vacco to Morabito	Vol. 26, 4354–4359
135	August 7, 2011 email exchange between Vacco and P. Morabito	Vol. 26, 4360
136	August 2011 Lovelace letter to Timothy Halves	Vol. 26, 4361–4365
137	August 24, 2011 email from Vacco to P. Morabito RE: Tim Haves	Vol. 26, 4366
138	November 11, 2011 email from Vacco to P. Morabito RE: Getting Trevor's commitment to sign	Vol. 26, 4367
139	November 16, 2011 email from P. Morabito to Vacco RE: Vacco's litigation letter	Vol. 26, 4368
140	November 28, 2011 email chain between Vacco, S. Morabito, and P. Morabito RE: \$560,000 wire to Lippes Mathias	Vol. 26, 4369–4370
141	December 7, 2011 email from Vacco to P. Morabito RE: Moreno	Vol. 26, 4371
142	February 10, 2012 email chain between P. Morabito Wells, and Vacco RE: 1461 Glenneyre Street - Sale	Vol. 26, 4372–4375
143	April 20, 2012 email from P. Morabito to Bayuk RE: BofA	Vol. 26, 4376
144	April 24, 2012 email from P. Morabito to Vacco RE: SPI Loan Detail	Vol. 26, 4377–4378

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Clerk's Trial Exhibit List (cont.)		
145	September 4, 2012 email chain between Vacco and Bayuk RE: Second Deed of Trust documents	Vol. 26, 4379–4418
147	September 4, 2012 email from P. Morabito to Vacco RE: Wire	Vol. 26, 4419–4422
148	September 4, 2012 email from Bayuk to Vacco RE: Wire	Vol. 26, 4423–4426
149	December 6, 2012 email from Vacco to P. Morabito RE: BOA and the path of money	Vol. 26, 4427–4428
150	September 18, 2012 email chain between P. Morabito and Bayuk	Vol. 26, 4429–4432
151	October 3, 2012 email chain between Vacco and P. Morabito RE: Snowshoe Properties, LLC	Vol. 26, 4433–4434
152	September 3, 2012 email from P. Morabito to Vacco RE: Wire	Vol. 26, 4435
153	March 14, 2013 email chain between P. Morabito and Vacco RE: BHI Hinckley	Vol. 26, 4436
154	Paul Morabito 2009 Tax Return	Vol. 26, 4437–4463
155	Superpumper Form 8879-S tax year ended December 31, 2010	Vol. 26, 4464–4484
156	2010 U.S. S Corporation Tax Return for Consolidated Western Corporation	Vol. 27, 4485–4556
157	Snowshoe form 8879-S for year ended December 31, 2010	Vol. 27, 4557–4577
158	Snowshoe Form 1120S 2011 Amended Tax Return	Vol. 27, 4578–4655
159	September 14, 2012 email from Vacco to P. Morabito	Vol. 27, 4656–4657

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Clerk's Trial Exhibit List (cont.)		
160	October 1, 2012 email from P. Morabito to Vacco RE: Monday work for Dennis and Christian	Vol. 27, 4658
161	December 18, 2012 email from Vacco to P. Morabito RE: Attorney Client Privileged Communication	Vol. 27, 4659
162	April 24, 2013 email from P. Morabito to Vacco RE: BHI Trust	Vol. 27, 4660
163	Membership Interest Purchases, Agreement – Watch My Block (dated 10/06/2010)	Vol. 27, 4661–4665
164	Watch My Block organizational documents	Vol. 27, 4666–4669
174	October 15, 2015 Certificate of Service of copy of Lippes Mathias Wexler Friedman's Response to Subpoena	Vol. 27, 4670
175	Order Granting Motion to Compel Responses to Deposition Questions ECF No. 502; Case No. 13- 51237-gwz (filed 02/03/2016)	Vol. 27, 4671–4675
179	Gursey Schneider LLP Subpoena	Vol. 28, 4676–4697
180	Summary Appraisal of 570 Glenneyre	Vol. 28, 4698–4728
181	Appraisal of 1461 Glenneyre Street	Vol. 28, 4729–4777
182	Appraisal of 370 Los Olivos	Vol. 28, 4778–4804
183	Appraisal of 371 El Camino Del Mar	Vol. 28, 4805–4830
184	Appraisal of 1254 Mary Fleming Circle	Vol. 28, 4831–4859
185	Mortgage – Panorama	Vol. 28, 4860–4860
186	Mortgage – El Camino	Vol. 28, 4861
187	Mortgage – Los Olivos	Vol. 28, 4862
188	Mortgage – Glenneyre	Vol. 28, 4863

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Clerk's Trial Exhibit List (cont.)		
189	Mortgage – Mary Fleming	Vol. 28, 4864
190	Settlement Statement – 371 El Camino Del Mar	Vol. 28, 4865
191	Settlement Statement – 370 Los Olivos	Vol. 28, 4866
192	2010 Declaration of Value of 8355 Panorama Dr	Vol. 28, 4867–4868
193	Mortgage – 8355 Panorama Drive	Vol. 28, 4869–4870
194	Compass – Certificate of Custodian of Records (dated 12/21/2016)	Vol. 28, 4871–4871
196	June 6, 2014 Declaration of Sam Morabito – Exhibit 1 to Snowshoe Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss Complaint for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction – filed in Case No. CV13-02663	Vol. 28, 4872–4874
197	June 19, 2014 Declaration of Sam Morabito – Exhibit 1 to Superpumper Motion to Dismiss Complaint for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction – filed in Case No. CV13-02663	Vol. 28, 4875–4877
198	September 22, 2017 Declaration of Sam Morabito – Exhibit 22 to Defendants' SSOF in Support of Opposition to Plaintiff's MSJ – filed in Case No. CV13-02663	Vol. 28, 4878–4879
222	Kimmel – January 21, 2016, Comment on Alves Appraisal	Vol. 28, 4880–4883
223	September 20, 2010 email from Yalamanchili to Morabito	Vol. 28, 4884
224	March 24, 2011 email from Naz Afshar RE: telephone call regarding CWC	Vol. 28, 4885–4886
225	Bank of America Records for Edward Bayuk (dated 09/05/2012)	Vol. 28, 4887–4897

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Clerk's Trial Exhibit List (cont.)		
226	June 11, 2007 Wholesale Marketer Agreement	Vol. 29, 4898–4921
227	May 25, 2006 Wholesale Marketer Facility Development Incentive Program Agreement	Vol. 29, 4922–4928
228	June 2007 Master Lease Agreement – Spirit SPE Portfolio and Superpumper, Inc.	Vol. 29, 4929–4983
229	Superpumper Inc 2008 Financial Statement (dated 12/31/2008)	Vol. 29, 4984–4996
230	November 9, 2009 email from P. Morabito to Bernstein, Yalaman RE: Jan Friederich – entered into Consulting Agreement	Vol. 29, 4997
231	September 30, 2010, Letter from Compass to Superpumper, Morabito, CWC RE: reducing face amount of the revolving note	Vol. 29, 4998–5001
232	October 15, 2010, letter from Quarles & Brady to Vacco RE: Revolving Loan Documents and Term Loan Documents between Superpumper and Compass Bank	Vol. 29, 5002–5006
233	BMO Account Tracker Banking Report October 1 to October 31, 2010	Vol. 29, 5007–5013
235	August 31, 2010 Superpumper Inc., Valuation of 100 percent of the common equity in Superpumper, Inc on a controlling marketable basis	Vol. 29, 5014–5059
236	June 18, 2014 email from S. Morabito to Vanek (WF) RE: Analysis of Superpumper Acquisition in 2010	Vol. 29, 5060–5061
241	Superpumper March 2010 YTD Income Statement	Vol. 29, 5062–5076

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Clerk's Trial Exhibit List (cont.)		
244	Assignment Agreement for \$939,000 Morabito Note	Vol. 29, 5077–5079
247	July 1, 2011 Third Amendment to Forbearance Agreement Superpumper and Compass Bank	Vol. 29, 5080–5088
248	Superpumper Cash Contributions January 2010 thru September 2015 – Bayuk and S. Morabito	Vol. 29, 5089–5096
252	October 15, 2010 Letter from Quarles & Brady to Vacco RE: Revolving Loan documents and Term Loan documents between Superpumper Prop. and Compass Bank	Vol. 29, 5097–5099
254	Bank of America – S. Morabito SP Properties Sale, SP Purchase Balance	Vol. 29, 5100
255	Superpumper Prop. Final Closing Statement for 920 Mountain City Hwy, Elko, NV	Vol. 29, 5101
256	September 30, 2010 Raffles Insurance Limited Member Summary	Vol. 29, 5102
257	Equalization Spreadsheet	Vol. 30, 5103
258	November 9, 2005 Grant, Bargain and Sale Deed; Doc #3306300 for Property Washoe County	Vol. 30, 5104–5105
260	January 7, 2016 Budget Summary – Panorama Drive	Vol. 30, 5106–5107
261	Mary 22, 2006 Compilation of Quotes and Invoices Quote of Valley Drapery	Vol. 30, 5108–5116
262	Photos of 8355 Panorama Home	Vol. 30, 5117–5151
263	Water Rights Deed (Document #4190152) between P. Morabito, E. Bayuk, Grantors, RCA Trust One Grantee (recorded 12/31/2012)	Vol. 30, 5152–5155

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Clerk's Trial Exhibit List (cont.)		
265	October 1, 2010 Bank of America Wire Transfer –Bayuk – Morabito \$60,117	Vol. 30, 5156
266	October 1, 2010 Check #2354 from Bayuk to P. Morabito for \$29,383 for 8355 Panorama funding	Vol. 30, 5157–5158
268	October 1, 2010 Check #2356 from Bayuk to P. Morabito for \$12,763 for 370 Los Olivos Funding	Vol. 30, 5159–5160
269	October 1, 2010 Check #2357 from Bayuk to P. Morabito for \$31,284 for 371 El Camino Del Mar Funding	Vol. 30, 5161–5162
270	Bayuk Payment Ledger Support Documents Checks and Bank Statements	Vol. 31, 5163–5352
271	Bayuk Superpumper Contributions	Vol. 31, 5353–5358
272	May 14, 2012 email string between P. Morabito, Vacco, Bayuk, and S. Bernstein RE: Info for Laguna purchase	Vol. 31, 5359–5363
276	September 21, 2010 Appraisal of 8355 Panorama Drive Reno, NV by Alves Appraisal	Vol. 32, 5364–5400
277	Assessor's Map/Home Comparisons for 8355 Panorama Drive, Reno, NV	Vol. 32, 5401–5437
278	December 3, 2007 Case Docket for CV07-02764	Vol. 32, 5438–5564
280	May 25, 2011 Stipulation Regarding the Imposition of Punitive Damages; Case No. CV07-02764 (filed 05/25/2011)	Vol. 33, 5565–5570
281	Work File for September 24, 2010 Appraisal of 8355 Panorama Drive, Reno, NV	Vol. 33, 5571–5628
283	January 25, 2016 Expert Witness Report Leonard v. Superpumper Snowshoe	Vol. 33, 5629–5652

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Clerk's Trial Exhibit List (cont.)		
284	February 29, 2016 Defendants' Rebuttal Expert Witness Disclosure	Vol. 33, 5653–5666
294	October 5, 2010 Lippes, Mathias Wexler Friedman, LLP, Invoices to P. Morabito	Vol. 33, 5667–5680
295	P. Morabito 2010 Tax Return (dated 10/16/2011)	Vol. 33, 5681–5739
296	December 31, 2010 Superpumper Inc. Note to Financial Statements	Vol. 33, 5740–5743
297	December 31, 2010 Superpumper Consultations	Vol. 33, 5744
300	September 20, 2010 email chain between Yalmanchili and Graber RE: Attorney Client Privileged Communication	Vol. 33, 5745–5748
301	September 15, 2010 email from Vacco to P. Morabito RE: Tomorrow	Vol. 33, 5749–5752
303	Bankruptcy Court District of Nevada Claims Register Case No. 13-51237	Vol. 33, 5753–5755
304	April 14, 2018 email from Allen to Krausz RE: Superpumper	Vol. 33, 5756–5757
305	Subpoena in a Case Under the Bankruptcy Code to Robison, Sharp, Sullivan & Brust issued in Case No. BK-N-13-51237-GWZ	Vol. 33, 5758–5768
306	August 30, 2018 letter to Mark Weisenmiller, Esq., from Frank Gilmore, Esq.,	Vol. 34, 5769
307	Order Granting Motion to Compel Compliance with the Subpoena to Robison, Sharp, Sullivan & Brust filed in Case No. BK-N-13-51237-GWZ	Vol. 34, 5770–5772
308	Response of Robison, Sharp, Sullivan & Brust's to Subpoena filed in Case No. BK-N-13-51237-GWZ	Vol. 34, 5773–5797

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Clerk's Trial Exhibit List (cont.)		
309	Declaration of Frank C. Gilmore in support of Robison, Sharp, Sullivan & Brust's Opposition to Motion for Order Holding Robison in Contempt filed in Case No. BK-N-13-51237-GWZ	Vol. 34, 5798–5801
Minutes of October 29, 2018, Non-Jury Trial, Day 1 (filed 11/08/2018)		Vol. 35, 5802–6041
Transcript of October 29, 2018, Non-Jury Trial, Day 1		Vol. 35, 6042–6045
Minutes of October 30, 2018, Non-Jury Trial, Day 2 (filed 11/08/2018)		Vol. 36, 6046–6283
Transcript of October 30, 2018, Non-Jury Trial, Day 2		Vol. 36, 6284–6286
Minutes of October 31, 2018, Non-Jury Trial, Day 3 (filed 11/08/2018)		Vol. 37, 6287–6548
Transcript of October 31, 2018, Non-Jury Trial, Day 3		Vol. 37, 6549–6552
Minutes of November 1, 2018, Non-Jury Trial, Day 4 (filed 11/08/2018)		Vol. 38, 6553–6814
Transcript of November 1, 2018, Non-Jury Trial, Day 4		Vol. 38, 6815–6817
Minutes of November 2, 2018, Non-Jury Trial, Day 5 (filed 11/08/2018)		Vol. 39, 6818–7007
Transcript of November 2, 2018, Non-Jury Trial, Day 5		Vol. 39, 7008–7011
Minutes of November 5, 2018, Non-Jury Trial, Day 6 (filed 11/08/2018)		Vol. 40, 7012–7167
Transcript of November 5, 2018, Non-Jury Trial, Day 6		Vol. 40, 7168–7169

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Minutes of November 6, 2018, Non-Jury Trial, Day 7 (filed 11/08/2018)		Vol. 41, 7170–7269
Transcript of November 6, 2018, Non-Jury Trial, Day 7		Vol. 41, 7270–7272 Vol. 42, 7273–7474
Minutes of November 7, 2018, Non-Jury Trial, Day 8 (filed 11/08/2018)		Vol. 43, 7475–7476
Transcript of November 7, 2018, Non-Jury Trial, Day 8		Vol. 43, 7477–7615
Minutes of November 26, 2018, Non-Jury Trial, Day 9 (filed 11/26/2018)		Vol. 44, 7616
Transcript of November 26, 2018, Non-Jury Trial – Closing Arguments, Day 9		Vol. 44, 7617–7666 Vol. 45, 7667–7893
Plaintiff’s Motion to Reopen Evidence (filed 01/30/2019)		Vol. 46, 7894–7908
Exhibits to Plaintiff’s Motion to Reopen Evidence		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Declaration of Gabrielle A. Hamm, Esq. in Support of Plaintiff’s Motion to Reopen	Vol. 46, 7909–7913
1-A	September 21, 2017 Declaration of Salvatore Morabito	Vol. 46, 7914–7916
1-B	Defendants’ Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Judgment (Nov. 26, 2018)	Vol. 46, 7917–7957
1-C	Judgment on the First and Second Causes of Action; Case No. 15-05019-GWZ (Bankr. D. Nev.), ECF No. 123 (April 30, 2018)	Vol. 46, 7958–7962

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Plaintiff's Motion to Reopen Evidence (cont.)		
1-D	Amended Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in Support of Judgment Regarding Plaintiffs' First and Second Causes of Action; Case No. 15-05019-GWZ (Bankr. D. Nev.), ECF No. 126 (April 30, 2018)	Vol. 46, 7963–7994
1-E	Motion to Compel Compliance with the Subpoena to Robison Sharp Sullivan Brust; Case No. 15-05019-GWZ (Bankr. D. Nev.), ECF No. 191 (Sept. 10, 2018)	Vol. 46, 7995–8035
1-F	Order Granting Motion to Compel Compliance with the Subpoena to Robison Sharp Sullivan Brust; Case No. 15-05019-GWZ (Bankr. D. Nev.), ECF No. 229 (Jan. 3, 2019)	Vol. 46, 8036–8039
1-G	Response of Robison, Sharp, Sullivan & Brust[] To Subpoena (including RSSB_000001 – RSSB_000031) (Jan. 18, 2019)	Vol. 46, 8040–8067
1-H	Excerpts of Deposition Transcript of Sam Morabito as PMK of Snowshoe Petroleum, Inc. (Oct. 1, 2015)	Vol. 46, 8068–8076
Errata to: Plaintiff's Motion to Reopen Evidence (filed 01/30/2019)		Vol. 47, 8077–8080
Exhibit to Errata to: Plaintiff's Motion to Reopen Evidence		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Plaintiff's Motion to Reopen Evidence	Vol. 47, 8081–8096

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Ex Parte Motion for Order Shortening Time on Plaintiff's Motion to Reopen Evidence and for Expedited Hearing (filed 01/31/2019)		Vol. 47, 8097–8102
Order Shortening Time on Plaintiff's Motion to Reopen Evidence and for Expedited Hearing (filed 02/04/2019)		Vol. 47, 8103–8105
Supplement to Plaintiff's Motion to Reopen Evidence (filed 02/04/2019)		Vol. 47, 8106–8110
Exhibits to Supplement to Plaintiff's Motion to Reopen Evidence		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Supplemental Declaration of Gabrielle A. Hamm, Esq. in Support of Plaintiff's Motion to Reopen Evidence (filed 02/04/2019)	Vol. 47, 8111–8113
1-I	Declaration of Frank C. Gilmore in Support of Robison, Sharp Sullivan & Brust's Opposition to Motion for Order Holding Robison in Contempt; Case No. 15-05019-GWZ (Bankr. D. Nev.), ECF No. 259 (Jan. 30, 2019)	Vol. 47, 8114–8128
Defendants' Response to Motion to Reopen Evidence (02/06/2019)		Vol. 47, 8129–8135
Plaintiff's Reply to Defendants' Response to Motion to Reopen Evidence (filed 02/07/2019)		Vol. 47, 8136–8143
Minutes of February 7, 2019 hearing on Motion to Reopen Evidence (filed 02/28/2019)		Vol. 47, 8144
Rough Draft Transcript of February 8, 2019 hearing on Motion to Reopen Evidence		Vol. 47, 8145–8158

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
[Plaintiff's Proposed] Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Judgment (filed 03/06/2019)		Vol. 47, 8159–8224
[Defendants' Proposed Amended] Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Judgment (filed 03/08/2019)		Vol. 47, 8225–8268
Minutes of February 26, 2019 hearing on Motion to Continue ongoing Non-Jury Trial (Telephonic) (filed 03/11/2019)		Vol. 47, 8269
Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Judgment (filed 03/29/2019)		Vol. 48, 8270–8333
Notice of Entry of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Judgment (filed 03/29/2019)		Vol. 48, 8334–8340
Memorandum of Costs and Disbursements (filed 04/11/2019)		Vol. 48, 8341–8347
Exhibit to Memorandum of Costs and Disbursements		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Ledger of Costs	Vol. 48, 8348–8370
Application for Attorneys' Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRCP 68 (filed 04/12/2019)		Vol. 48, 8371–8384
Exhibits to Application for Attorneys' Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRCP 68		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Declaration of Teresa M. Pilatowicz In Support of Plaintiff's Application for Attorney's Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRCP 68 (filed 04/12/2019)	Vol. 48, 8385–8390
2	Plaintiff's Offer of Judgment to Defendants (dated 05/31/2016)	Vol. 48, 8391–8397

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
3	Defendant's Rejection of Offer of Judgment by Plaintiff (dated 06/15/2016)	Vol. 48, 8398–8399
4	Log of time entries from June 1, 2016 to March 28, 2019	Vol. 48, 8400–8456
5	Plaintiff's Memorandum of Costs and Disbursements (filed 04/11/2019)	Vol. 48, 8457–8487
Motion to Retax Costs (filed 04/15/2019)		Vol. 49, 8488–8495
Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to Retax Costs (filed 04/17/2019)		Vol. 49, 8496–8507
Exhibits to Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to Retax Costs		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Declaration of Teresa M. Pilatowicz In Support of Opposition to Motion to Retax Costs (filed 04/17/2019)	Vol. 49, 8508–8510
2	Summary of Photocopy Charges	Vol. 49, 8511–8523
3	James L. McGovern Curriculum Vitae	Vol. 49, 8524–8530
4	McGovern & Greene LLP Invoices	Vol. 49, 8531–8552
5	Buss-Shelger Associates Invoices	Vol. 49, 8553–8555
Reply in Support of Motion to Retax Costs (filed 04/22/2019)		Vol. 49, 8556–8562
Opposition to Application for Attorneys' Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRCPP 68 (filed 04/25/2019)		Vol. 49, 8563–8578
Exhibit to Opposition to Application for Attorneys' Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRCPP 68		

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Plaintiff's Bill Dispute Ledger	Vol. 49, 8579–8637
	Defendants, Salvatore Morabito, Snowshoe Petroleum, Inc., and Superpumper, Inc.'s Motion for New Trial and/or to Alter or Amend Judgment Pursuant to NRCP 52, 59, and 60 (filed 04/25/2019)	Vol. 49, 8638–8657
	Defendant, Edward Bayuk's Motion for New Trial and/or to Alter or Amend Judgment Pursuant to NRCP 52, 59, and 60 (filed 04/26/2019)	Vol. 50, 8658–8676
	Exhibits to Edward Bayuk's Motion for New Trial and/or to Alter or Amend Judgment Pursuant to NRCP 52, 59, and 60	
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	February 27, 2019 email with attachments	Vol. 50, 8677–8768
2	Declaration of Frank C. Gilmore in Support of Edward Bayuk's Motion for New Trial (filed 04/26/2019)	Vol. 50, 8769–8771
3	February 27, 2019 email from Marcy Trabert	Vol. 50, 8772–8775
4	February 27, 2019 email from Frank Gilmore to eturner@Gtg.legal RE: Friday Trial	Vol. 50, 8776–8777
	Plaintiff's Reply in Support of Application of Attorneys' Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRCP 68 (filed 04/30/2019)	Vol. 50, 8778–8790
	Exhibit to Plaintiff's Reply in Support of Application of Attorneys' Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRCP 68	
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Case No. BK-13-51237-GWZ, ECF Nos. 280, 282, and 321	Vol. 50, 8791–8835

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Motions for New Trial and/or to Alter or Amend Judgment (filed 05/07/2019)		Vol. 51, 8836–8858
Defendants, Salvatore Morabito, Snowshoe Petroleum, Inc., and Superpumper, Inc.'s Reply in Support of Motion for New Trial and/or to Alter or Amend Judgment Pursuant to NRCp 52, 59, and 60 (filed 05/14/2019)		Vol. 51, 8859–8864
Declaration of Edward Bayuk Claiming Exemption from Execution (filed 06/28/2019)		Vol. 51, 8865–8870
Exhibits to Declaration of Edward Bayuk Claiming Exemption from Execution		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Copy of June 22, 2019 Notice of Execution and two Write of Executions	Vol. 51, 8871–8896
2	Declaration of James Arthur Gibbons Regarding his Attestation, Witness and Certification on November 12, 2005 of the Spendthrift Trust Amendment to the Edward William Bayuk Living Trust (dated 06/25/2019)	Vol. 51, 8897–8942
Notice of Claim of Exemption from Execution (filed 06/28/2019)		Vol. 51, 8943–8949
Edward Bayuk's Declaration of Salvatore Morabito Claiming Exemption from Execution (filed 07/02/2019)		Vol. 51, 8950–8954
Exhibits to Declaration of Salvatore Morabito Claiming Exemption from Execution		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Las Vegas June 22, 2019 letter	Vol. 51, 8955–8956
2	Writs of execution and the notice of execution	Vol. 51, 8957–8970

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Minutes of June 24, 2019 telephonic hearing on Decision on Submitted Motions (filed 07/02/2019)		Vol. 51, 8971–8972
Salvatore Morabito’s Notice of Claim of Exemption from Execution (filed 07/02/2019)		Vol. 51, 8973–8976
Edward Bayuk’s Third Party Claim to Property Levied Upon NRS 31.070 (filed 07/03/2019)		Vol. 51, 8977–8982
Order Granting Plaintiff’s Application for an Award of Attorneys’ Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRCP 68 (filed 07/10/2019)		Vol. 51, 8983–8985
Order Granting in part and Denying in part Motion to Retax Costs (filed 07/10/2019)		Vol. 51, 8986–8988
Plaintiff’s Objection to (1) Claim of Exemption from Execution and (2) Third Party Claim to Property Levied Upon, and Request for Hearing Pursuant to NRS 21.112 and 31.070(5) (filed 07/11/2019)		Vol. 52, 8989–9003
Exhibits to Plaintiff’s Objection to (1) Claim of Exemption from Execution and (2) Third Party Claim to Property Levied Upon, and Request for Hearing Pursuant to NRS 21.112 and 31.070(5)		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Declaration of Gabrielle A. Hamm, Esq.	Vol. 52, 9004–9007
2	11/30/2011 Tolling Agreement – Edward Bayuk	Vol. 52, 9008–9023
3	11/30/2011 Tolling Agreement – Edward William Bayuk Living Trust	Vol. 52, 9024–9035
4	Excerpts of 9/28/2015 Deposition of Edward Bayuk	Vol. 52, 9036–9041

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Plaintiff's Objection (cont.)		
5	Edward Bayuk, as Trustee of the Edward William Bayuk Living Trust's Responses to Plaintiff's First Set of Requests for Production, served 9/24/2015	Vol. 52, 9042–9051
6	8/26/2009 Grant Deed (Los Olivos)	Vol. 52, 9052–9056
7	8/17/2018 Grant Deed (El Camino)	Vol. 52, 9057–9062
8	Trial Ex. 4 (Confession of Judgment)	Vol. 52, 9063–9088
9	Trial Ex. 45 (Purchase and Sale Agreement, dated 9/28/2010)	Vol. 52, 9089–9097
10	Trial Ex. 46 (First Amendment to Purchase and Sale Agreement, dated 9/29/2010)	Vol. 52, 9098–9100
11	Trial Ex. 51 (Los Olivos Grant Deed recorded 10/8/2010)	Vol. 52, 9101–9103
12	Trial Ex. 52 (El Camino Grant Deed recorded 10/8/2010)	Vol. 52, 9104–9106
13	Trial Ex. 61 (Membership Interest Transfer Agreement, dated 10/1/2010)	Vol. 52, 9107–9114
14	Trial Ex. 62 (\$1,617,050.00 Promissory Note)	Vol. 52, 9115–9118
15	Trial Ex. 65 (Mary Fleming Grant Deed recorded 11/4/2010)	Vol. 52, 9119–9121
Notice of Entry of Order Denying Defendants' Motions for New Trial and/or to Alter or Amend Judgment (filed 07/16/2019)		Vol. 52, 9122–9124

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibit to Notice of Entry of Order Denying Defendants' Motions for New Trial and/or to Alter or Amend Judgment		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Order Denying Defendants' Motions for New Trial and/or to Alter or Amend Judgment (filed 07/10/2019)	Vol. 52, 9125–9127
Notice of Entry of Order Granting Plaintiff's Application for an Award of Attorneys' Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRCP 68 (filed 07/16/2019)		Vol. 52, 9128–9130
Exhibit to Notice of Entry of Order Granting Plaintiff's Application for an Award of Attorneys' Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRCP 68		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Order Granting Plaintiff's Application for an Award of Attorneys' Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRCP 68 (filed 07/10/2019)	Vol. 52, 9131–9134
Notice of Entry of Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Motion to Retax Costs (filed 07/16/2019)		Vol. 52, 9135–9137
Exhibit to Notice of Entry of Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Motion to Retax Costs		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Motion to Retax Costs (filed 07/10/2019)	Vol. 52, 9138–9141
Plaintiff's Objection to Notice of Claim of Exemption from Execution Filed by Salvatore Morabito and Request for Hearing (filed 07/16/2019)		Vol. 52, 9142–9146
Reply to Objection to Claim of Exemption and Third Party Claim to Property Levied Upon (filed 07/17/2019)		Vol. 52, 9147–9162

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Reply to Objection to Claim of Exemption and Third Party Claim to Property Levied Upon		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	March 3, 2011 Deposition Transcript of P. Morabito	Vol. 52, 9163–9174
2	Mr. Bayuk’s September 23, 2014 responses to Plaintiff’s first set of requests for production	Vol. 52, 9175–9180
3	September 28, 2015 Deposition Transcript of Edward Bayuk	Vol. 52, 9181–9190
Reply to Plaintiff’s Objection to Notice of Claim of Exemption from Execution (filed 07/18/2019)		Vol. 52, 9191–9194
Declaration of Service of Till Tap, Notice of Attachment and Levy Upon Property (filed 07/29/2019)		Vol. 52, 9195
Notice of Submission of Disputed Order Denying Claim of Exemption and Third Party Claim (filed 08/01/2019)		Vol. 52, 9196–9199
Exhibits to Notice of Submission of Disputed Order Denying Claim of Exemption and Third Party Claim		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Plaintiff’s Proposed Order Denying Claim of Exemption and Third-Party Claim	Vol. 52, 9200–9204
2	Bayuk and the Bayuk Trust’s proposed Order Denying Claim of Exemption and Third-Party Claim	Vol. 52, 9205–9210
3	July 30, 2019 email evidencing Bayuk, through counsel Jeffrey Hartman, Esq., requesting until noon on July 31, 2019 to provide comments.	Vol. 52, 9211–9212

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Notice of Submission of Disputed Order (cont.)		
4	July 31, 2019 email from Teresa M. Pilatowicz, Esq. Bayuk failed to provide comments at noon on July 31, 2019, instead waiting until 1:43 p.m. to send a redline version with proposed changes after multiple follow ups from Plaintiff's counsel on July 31, 2019	Vol. 52, 9213–9219
5	A true and correct copy of the original Order and Bayuk Changes	Vol. 52, 9220–9224
6	A true and correct copy of the redline run by Plaintiff accurately reflecting Bayuk's proposed changes	Vol. 52, 9225–9229
7	Email evidencing that after review of the proposed revisions, Plaintiff advised Bayuk, through counsel, that Plaintiff agree to certain proposed revisions, but the majority of the changes were unacceptable as they did not reflect the Court's findings or evidence before the Court.	Vol. 52, 9230–9236
Objection to Plaintiff's Proposed Order Denying Claim of Exemption and Third Party Claim (filed 08/01/2019)		Vol. 53, 9237–9240
Exhibits to Objection to Plaintiff's Proposed Order Denying Claim of Exemption and Third-Party Claim		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Plaintiff's Proposed Order Denying Claim of Exemption and Third-Party Claim	Vol. 53, 9241–9245
2	Defendant's comments on Findings of Fact	Vol. 53, 9246–9247
3	Defendant's Proposed Order Denying Claim of Exemption and Third-Party Claim	Vol. 53, 9248–9252

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Minutes of July 22, 2019 hearing on Objection to Claim for Exemption (filed 08/02/2019)		Vol. 53, 9253
Order Denying Claim of Exemption (filed 08/02/2019)		Vol. 53, 9254–9255
Bayuk’s Case Appeal Statement (filed 08/05/2019)		Vol. 53, 9256–9260
Bayuk’s Notice of Appeal (filed 08/05/2019)		Vol. 53, 9261–9263
Defendants, Superpumper, Inc., Edward Bayuk, Salvatore Morabito; and Snowshoe Petroleum, Inc.’s, Case Appeal Statement (filed 08/05/2019)		Vol. 53, 9264–9269
Defendants, Superpumper, Inc., Edward Bayuk, Salvatore Morabito; and Snowshoe Petroleum, Inc.’s, Notice of Appeal (filed 08/05/2019)		Vol. 53, 9270–9273
Exhibits to Defendants, Superpumper, Inc., Edward Bayuk, Salvatore Morabito; and Snowshoe Petroleum, Inc.’s, Notice of Appeal		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Judgment (filed 03/29/2019)	Vol. 53, 9274–9338
2	Order Denying Defendants’ Motions for New Trial and/or to Alter or Amend Judgment (filed 07/10/2019)	Vol. 53, 9339–9341
3	Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Motion to Retax Costs (filed 07/10/2019)	Vol. 53, 9342–9345
4	Order Granting Plaintiff’s Application for an Award of Attorneys’ Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRCF 68 (filed 07/10/2019)	Vol. 53, 9346–9349

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Plaintiff's Reply to Defendants' Objection to Plaintiff's Proposed Order Denying Claim of Exemption and Third-Party Claim		Vol. 53, 9350–9356
Order Denying Claim of Exemption and Third-Party Claim (08/09/2019)		Vol. 53, 9357–9360
Notice of Entry of Order Denying Claim of Exemption and Third-Party Claim (filed 08/09/2019)		Vol. 53, 9361–9364
Exhibit to Notice of Entry of Order Denying Claim of Exemption and Third-Party Claim		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Order Denying Claim of Exemption and Third-Party Claim (08/09/2019)	Vol. 53, 9365–9369
Notice of Entry of Order Denying Claim of Exemption (filed 08/12/2019)		Vol. 53, 9370–9373
Exhibit to Notice of Entry of Order Denying Claim of Exemption		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Order Denying Claim of Exemption (08/02/2019)	Vol. 53, 9374–9376
Motion to Make Amended or Additional Findings Under NRCP 52(b), or, in the Alternative, Motion for Reconsideration (filed 08/19/2019)		Vol. 54, 9377–9401
Exhibits to Motion to Make Amended or Additional Findings Under NRCP 52(b), or, in the Alternative, Motion for Reconsideration		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Order Denying Claim of Exemption and Third Party Claim (filed 08/09/19)	Vol. 54, 9402–9406

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Motion to Make Amended (cont.)		
2	Spendthrift Trust Amendment to the Edward William Bayuk Living Trust (dated 11/12/05)	Vol. 54, 9407–9447
3	Spendthrift Trust Agreement for the Arcadia Living Trust (dated 10/14/05)	Vol. 54, 9448–9484
4	Fifth Amendment and Restatement of the Trust Agreement for the Arcadia Living Trust (dated 09/30/10)	Vol. 54, 9485–9524
5	P. Morabito's Supplement to NRCP 16.1 Disclosures (dated 03/01/11)	Vol. 54, 9525–9529
6	Transcript of March 3, 2011 Deposition of P. Morabito	Vol. 55, 9530–9765
7	Documents Conveying Real Property	Vol. 56, 9766–9774
8	Transcript of July 22, 2019 Hearing	Vol. 56, 9775–9835
9	Tolling Agreement JH and P. Morabito (partially executed 11/30/11)	Vol. 56, 9836–9840
10	Tolling Agreement JH and Arcadia Living Trust (partially executed 11/30/11)	Vol. 56, 9841–9845
11	Excerpted Pages 8–9 of Superpumper Judgment (filed 03/29/19)	Vol. 56, 9846–9848
12	Petitioners' First Set of Interrogatories to Debtor (dated 08/13/13)	Vol. 56, 9849–9853
13	Tolling Agreement JH and Edward Bayuk (partially executed 11/30/11)	Vol. 56, 9854–9858
14	Tolling Agreement JH and Bayuk Trust (partially executed 11/30/11)	Vol. 56, 9859–9863
15	Declaration of Mark E. Lehman, Esq. (dated 03/21/11)	Vol. 56, 9864–9867

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Motion to Make Amended (cont.)		
16	Excerpted Transcript of October 20, 2015 Deposition of Dennis C. Vacco	Vol. 56, 9868–9871
17	Assignment and Assumption Agreement (dated 07/03/07)	Vol. 56, 9872–9887
18	Order Denying Morabito’s Claim of Exemption (filed 08/02/19)	Vol. 56, 9888–9890
Errata to Motion to Make Amended or Additional Findings Under NRCP 52(b), or, in the Alternative, Motion for Reconsideration (filed 08/20/2019)		Vol. 57, 9891–9893
Plaintiff’s Opposition to Motion to Make Amended or Additional Findings Under NRCP 52(b), or, In the Alternative, Motion for Reconsideration, and Countermotion for Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS 7.085 (filed 08/30/2019)		Vol. 57, 9894–9910
Errata to Plaintiff’s Opposition to Motion to Make Amended or Additional Findings Under NRCP 52(b), or, In the Alternative, Motion for Reconsideration, and Countermotion for Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS 7.085 (filed 08/30/2019)		Vol. 57, 9911–9914
Exhibits to Errata to Plaintiff’s Opposition to Motion to Make Amended or Additional Findings Under NRCP 52(b), or, In the Alternative, Motion for Reconsideration, and Countermotion for Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS 7.085		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Declaration of Gabrielle A. Hamm, Esq.	Vol. 57, 9915–9918
2	Plaintiff’s Amended NRCP 16.1 Disclosures (February 19, 2016)	Vol. 57, 9919–9926

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Exhibits to Errata (cont.)		
3	Plaintiff's Fourth Supplemental NRCP 16.1 Disclosures (November 15, 2016)	Vol. 57, 9927–9930
4	Plaintiff's Fifth Supplemental NRCP 16.1 Disclosures (December 21, 2016)	Vol. 57, 9931–9934
5	Plaintiff's Sixth Supplemental NRCP 16.1 Disclosures (March 20, 2017)	Vol. 57, 9935–9938
Reply in Support of Motion to Make Amended or Additional Findings Under NRCP 52(b), or, In the Alternative, Motion for Reconsideration, and Countermotion for Fees and Costs (filed 09/04/2019)		Vol. 57, 9939–9951
Exhibits to Reply in Support of Motion to Make Amended or Additional Findings Under NRCP 52(b), or, In the Alternative, Motion for Reconsideration, and Countermotion for Fees and Costs		
Exhibit	Document Description	
19	Notice of Submission of Disputed Order Denying Claim of Exemption and Third Party Claim (filed 08/01/19)	Vol. 57, 9952–9993
20	Notice of Submission of Disputed Order Denying Claim of Exemption and Third Party Claim (filed 08/01/19)	Vol. 57, 9994–10010
Order Denying Defendants' Motion to Make Amended or Additional Findings Under NRCP 52(b), or, in the Alternative, Motion for Reconsideration and Denying Plaintiff's Countermotion for Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS 7.085 (filed 11/08/2019)		Vol. 57, 10011–10019
Bayuk's Case Appeal Statement (filed 12/06/2019)		Vol. 57, 10020–10026

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
Bayuk's Notice of Appeal (filed 12/06/2019)		Vol. 57, 10027–10030
Exhibits to Bayuk's Notice of Appeal		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Order Denying [Morabito's] Claim of Exemption (filed 08/02/19)	Vol. 57, 10031–10033
2	Order Denying [Bayuk's] Claim of Exemption and Third Party Claim (filed 08/09/19)	Vol. 57, 10034–10038
3	Order Denying Defendants' Motion to Make Amended or Additional Findings Under NRCP 52(b), or, in the Alternative, Motion for Reconsideration and Denying Plaintiff's Countermotion for Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS 7.085 (filed 11/08/19)	Vol. 57, 10039–10048
Notice of Entry of Order Denying Defendants' Motion to Make Amended or Additional Findings Under NRCP 52(b), or, in the Alternative, Motion for Reconsideration and Denying Plaintiff's Countermotion for Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS 7.085 (filed 12/23/2019)		Vol. 57, 10049–10052
Exhibit to Notice of Entry of Order		
Exhibit	Document Description	
A	Order Denying Defendants' Motion to Make Amended or Additional Findings Under NRCP 52(b), or, in the Alternative, Motion for Reconsideration and Denying Plaintiff's Countermotion for Fees and Costs Pursuant to NRS 7.085 (filed 11/08/19)	Vol. 57, 10053–10062

<u>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</u>		<u>LOCATION</u>
District Court Docket Case No. CV13-02663		Vol. 57, 10063–10111
Notice of Claim of Exemption and Third-Party Claim to Property Levied Upon, Case No. CV13-02663 (filed 08/25/2020)		Vol. 58, 10112–10121
Exhibits to Notice of Claim of Exemption and Third-Party Claim to Property Levied Upon		
Exhibit	Document Description	
1	Writ of Execution, Case No. CV13-02663 (filed 07/21/2020)	Vol. 58, 10123–10130
2	Superior Court of California, Orange County Docket, Case No. 30-2019-01068591-CU-EN-CJC	Vol. 58, 10131–10139
3	Spendthrift Trust Amendment to the Edward William Bayuk Living Trust (dated 11/12/2005)	Vol. 58, 10140–10190

3980
JOHN P. DESMOND
Nevada Bar No. 5618
Email: jdesmond@gordonsilver.com
BRIAN R. IRVINE
Nevada Bar No. 7758
Email: birvine@gordonsilver.com
100 West Liberty Street
Suite 940
Reno, Nevada 89501
Tel: (775) 343-7500
Fax: (775) 786-0131

Attorneys for Plaintiff

**IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF
THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE**

WILLIAM A. LEONARD, Trustee for the
Bankruptcy Estate of Paul Anthony
Morabito,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SUPERPUMPER, INC., an Arizona
corporation; EDWARD BAYUK,
individually and as Trustee of the EDWARD
WILLIAM BAYUK LIVING TRUST;
SALVATORE MORABITO, and individual;
and SNOWSHOE PETROLEUM, INC., a
New York corporation,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: CV13-02663

DEPT. NO.: 1

STIPULATION AND ORDER TO FILE AMENDED COMPLAINT

Plaintiff William A. Leonard, Trustee for the Bankruptcy Estate of Paul Anthony Morabito ("Plaintiff"), by and through his attorneys of record, Gordon Silver, and Defendants Superpumper, Inc.; Edward Bayuk, individually and as Trustee of the Edward William Bayuk Living Trust; Snowshoe Petroleum, Inc.; and Salvatore Morabito (collectively, "Defendants"), by and through their attorneys of record, Robison, Belaustegui, Sharp and Low, hereby jointly agree and stipulate as follows:

1. On December 17, 2013, JH, Inc., Jerry Herbst, and Berry-Hinckley Industries filed a Complaint in this Court against Paul Morabito, individually and as Trustee of the Arcadia

1 Living Trust; Superpumper, Inc.; Edward Bayuk, individually and as Trustee of the Edward
2 William Bayuk Living Trust; Snowshoe Petroleum, Inc.; and Salvatore Morabito. ("Complaint,"
3 on file herein.)

4 2. On July 28, 2014, Defendants Superpumper, Inc. and Snowshoe Petroleum, Inc.
5 filed their Answer to the Complaint.

6 3. On September 29, 2014, Defendants Edward Bayuk, individually and as Trustee
7 of the Edward William Bayuk Living Trust, and Salvatore Morabito filed their Answer to the
8 Complaint.

9 4. Plaintiff now seeks to amend the Complaint.

10 5. Because it has been more than 20 days since Defendants served their Answer to
11 the Complaint, NRCP 15(a) requires either Defendants' written consent to amend their
12 Complaint or leave from the Court.

13 6. Accordingly, Defendants, pursuant to NRCP 15(a), consent to allow Plaintiff to
14 file an Amended Complaint, a copy of which is attached as **Exhibit 1**.

15 ///

16

17 ///

18

19 ///

20

21 ///

22

23 ///

24

25 ///

26

27 ///

28

AFFIRMATION

Pursuant to NRS 239B.030

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

DATED this 13th day of May, 2015.

GORDON SILVER

ROBISON, BELEAUSTEGUI, SHARP AND
LOW

By: 

JOHN P. DESMOND
Nevada Bar No. 5618
Email: jdesmond@gordonsilver.com
BRIAN R. IRVINE
Nevada Bar No. 7758
Email: birvine@gordonsilver.com
100 West Liberty Street
Suite 940
Reno, Nevada 89501
Tel: (775) 343-7500
Fax: (775) 786-0131

Attorneys for Plaintiff

By: 

BARRY L. BRESLOW, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 2023
Email: bbreslow@rbsllaw.com
FRANK C. GILMORE, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 10052
Email: fgilmore@rbsllaw.com
71 Washington Street
Reno, Nevada 89503
Tel: (775) 329-3151
Fax: (775) 329-7169

Attorneys for Defendants

ORDER TO FILE AMENDED COMPLAINT
PURSUANT TO NRCP 15(a)

Pursuant to the foregoing Stipulation, IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 14th day of May, 2015.


DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 I certify that I am an employee of GORDON SILVER, and that on this date, pursuant to
3 NRCP 5(b), I am serving a true and correct copy of the attached **STIPULATION AND**
4 **[PROPOSED] ORDER TO FILE AMENDED COMPLAINT** on the parties as set forth
5 below:

- 6 ☒ Placing an original or true copy thereof in a sealed envelope placed for collection
7 and mailing in the United States Mail, Reno, Nevada, postage prepaid, following
8 ordinary business practices
9 ☐ Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested
10 ☐ Via Facsimile (Fax)
11 ☐ Via E-Mail
12 ☐ Placing an original or true copy thereof in a sealed envelope and causing the same
13 to be personally Hand Delivered
14 ☐ Federal Express (or other overnight delivery)
15 ☐ Via CM/ECF

16 addressed as follows:

17 Barry Breslow
18 Frank Gilmore
19 ROBISON, BELAUSTEGUI, SHARP & LOW
20 71 Washington Street
21 Reno, NV 89503

22 DATED this 14th day of May, 2015.

23 
24 _____
25 An Employee of GORDON SILVER
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT TABLE

Exhibit	Description	Pages¹
1	First Amended Complaint	13

¹ Exhibit page counts are exclusive of exhibit slip sheets.

Exhibit 1

Exhibit 1

1090
GORDON SILVER
JOHN P. DESMOND
Nevada Bar No. 5618
Email: jdesmond@gordonsilver.com
BRIAN R. IRVINE
Nevada Bar No. 7758
Email: birvine@gordonsilver.com
100 West Liberty Street
Suite 940
Reno, Nevada 89501
Tel: (775) 343-7500
Fax: (775) 786-0131

Attorneys for Plaintiff

IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF

THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

WILLIAM A. LEONARD, Trustee for the
Bankruptcy Estate of Paul Anthony
Morabito,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SUPERPUMPER, INC., an Arizona
corporation; EDWARD BAYUK,
individually and as Trustee of the EDWARD
WILLIAM BAYUK LIVING TRUST;
SALVATORE MORABITO, and individual;
and SNOWSHOE PETROLEUM, INC., a
New York corporation,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: CV13-02663

DEPT. NO.: 7

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

[EXEMPT FROM ARBITRATION – DAMAGES IN EXCESS OF \$50,000]

Plaintiff WILLIAM A. LEONARD hereby alleges the following:

I.

THE PARTIES, JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. Plaintiff William A. Leonard is an individual serving as the Chapter 7 Trustee in
the bankruptcy proceeding of Paul Morabito (hereinafter referred to as the “Debtor”), *In re:*

1 *Paul A. Morabito*, Case 13-51237 in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of
2 Nevada.

3 2. Upon information and belief, Defendant Superpumper, Inc. ("Superpumper") is
4 and was at all times relevant hereto an Arizona corporation with its principal place of business
5 in Maricopa County, Arizona. Superpumper was the recipient of certain fraudulent transfers
6 originating in Washoe County, Nevada.

7 3. Upon information and belief, Defendant Edward Bayuk ("Bayuk") is and was at
8 all times relevant hereto a resident of both Washoe County Nevada and Los Angeles County,
9 California and is the domestic partner of the Debtor. Bayuk is also the President of
10 Superpumper.

11 4. Upon information and belief, Bayuk is also the Trustee of the Edward William
12 Bayuk Living Trust. Bayuk, individually, and as Trustee of the Edward William Bayuk Living
13 Trust, was the recipient of certain fraudulent transfers originating in Washoe County, Nevada.

14 5. Upon information and belief, Defendant Salvatore Morabito ("Salvatore
15 Morabito") is and was at all times relevant hereto a resident of Washoe County, Nevada and
16 Maricopa County, Arizona and the Secretary and Vice President of Superpumper. Salvatore
17 Morabito is the brother of the Debtor. Salvatore Morabito was the recipient of certain
18 fraudulent transfers originating in Washoe County, Nevada.

19 6. Upon information and belief, Defendant Snowshoe Petroleum, Inc. ("Snowshoe
20 Petroleum," together with Superpumper, Bayuk, and Salvatore Morabito, collectively referred to
21 as the "Defendants") is a New York corporation. Bayuk is the President of Snowshoe
22 Petroleum. Snowshoe Petroleum and Bayuk, individually, and as Trustee of the Edward
23 William Bayuk Living Trust, were the recipients of certain fraudulent transfers originating in
24 Washoe County, Nevada.

25 7. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter on the basis that the Defendants
26 reside or are located in Washoe County, Nevada; the activities complained of herein occurred in
27 Washoe County, Nevada; the fraudulent transfers outlined in the complaint originated from
28

1 Washoe County, Nevada; and/or Defendants have expressly agreed to submit themselves to the
2 jurisdiction of this Court.

3 8. Venue is proper in Washoe County, Nevada pursuant to NRS § 13.010 because
4 the rights, obligations and activities that give rise to this action occurred in Washoe County,
5 Nevada and Defendants have already agreed that Washoe County, Nevada is an appropriate
6 venue.

7 II.

8 GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

9 9. Plaintiff repeats, realleges, and incorporates the allegations set forth in the
10 proceeding paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

11 10. On or about June 28, 2007, JH and P.A. Morabito & Co., Ltd. ("PAMCO"), the
12 predecessor-in-interest to Consolidated Nevada Corporation ("CNC"), entered into an Amended
13 and Restated Stock Purchase Agreement (the "ARSPA"), whereby JH purchased the stock of
14 Berry-Hinckley Industries ("BHI") from PAMCO. Herbst was the guarantor of the JH
15 obligations under the ARSPA, and the Debtor guaranteed the obligations of PAMCO.

16 THE STATE COURT ACTION

17 11. A dispute developed between JH, Inc., Jerry Herbst, and BHI (collectively, the
18 "Herbst Entities") on the one hand and the Debtor and CNC on the other regarding the sale of
19 the BHI stock to JH.

20 12. On December 3, 2007, the Debtor and CNC filed a lawsuit against the Herbst
21 Entities, captioned Consolidated Nevada Corp., et al. v. JH, et al., (the "State Court"), Case No.
22 CV07-02764 (together with all claims and counterclaims, the "State Court Action").

23 13. The Herbst Entities filed numerous counterclaims in the State Court Action
24 against the Debtor and CNC, including, but not limited to, fraud in the inducement,
25 misrepresentation, and breach of contract relating to the ARSPA.

26 14. On September 13, 2010, the State Court entered an oral judgment against the
27 Debtor and CNC in favor of the Herbst Entities. Specifically, the State Court found that the
28

1 Debtor and CNC fraudulently induced JH and Herbst to enter into the ARSPA and ruled in favor
2 of JH and Herbst against the Debtor on other fraud-based claims.

3 15. On October 12, 2010, the State Court entered its findings of fact and conclusions
4 of law which set forth the legal and factual basis for a forthcoming state court judgment,
5 including fraud in the inducement.

6 16. On August 23, 2011, the State Court entered a judgment awarding the Herbst
7 Entities total damages in the amount of \$149,444,777.80 for actual fraud, representing both
8 compensatory and punitive damages as well as an award of attorneys' fees and costs (the
9 "Nevada Court Judgment").

10 **THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND FORBEARANCE AGREEMENT**

11 17. While the Debtor and CNC's appeal of the State Court Judgment (the "Appeal")
12 was pending before the Nevada Supreme Court, the Debtor, CNC, and the Herbst Entities
13 entered into a Settlement Agreement and Mutual Release dated November 30, 2011 (the
14 "Settlement Agreement"). Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement:

15 (a) The parties agreed to file a *Stipulation to Vacate Appeal and a Stipulation*
16 *to Vacate Judgment and Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law entered by the State*
17 *Court*;

18 (b) The parties agreed to execute a *Confession of Judgment and Stipulation*
19 *to Confess Judgment in the Amount of \$85,000,000.00* (referred to collectively as the
20 "Confessed Judgment"), which, in the event that the Settlement Agreement was
21 breached and not cured, Plaintiffs would be permitted to file *ex parte* and without notice
22 in Department 6 of the Second Judicial District Court in and for the County of Washoe;

23 (c) The Debtor and CNC agreed to comply with the timely payment of
24 numerous financial obligations set forth therein; and

25 (d) The Debtor and CNC agreed to submit themselves to the jurisdiction of
26 the court of Washoe County, Nevada for any dispute relating to the Settlement
27 Agreement.
28

1 18. Consistent with the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the State Court Action
2 was dismissed with prejudice and the Debtor, CNC, and the Herbst Entities executed the
3 Confessed Judgment.

4 19. Unbeknownst to the Herbst Entities, at the time the parties began negotiating and
5 subsequently executed the Settlement Agreement, the Debtor and CNC had no intention of
6 complying with its terms. Instead, the Debtor and CNC induced the Herbst Entities to execute
7 the Settlement Agreement as a delay tactic to avoid execution and collection efforts on the State
8 Court Judgment and in an effort to obtain more time to transfer and dissipate assets in
9 furtherance of their attempts to thwart the Herbst Entities' collection of the State Court
10 Judgment.

11 20. Shortly after execution, the Debtor and CNC defaulted under the terms of the
12 Settlement Agreement by failing to comply with several of their financial obligations, including
13 complying with obligations under the related Moreno settlement agreement (the "Moreno
14 Default"), failing to pay amounts due and owing under the Hinckley Note (the "Hinckley Note
15 Default"), and failing to make the cash payment of Four Million and No/100ths Dollars
16 (\$4,000,000.00) due to Plaintiffs on or before March 1, 2013 (the "Cash Payment Default")
17 (collectively, the "Continuing Defaults").

18 21. After defaulting under the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the Debtor and
19 CNC requested that the Herbst Entities forbear from exercising their rights and remedies set
20 forth in the Settlement Agreement, until December 1, 2013.

21 22. Accordingly, the Debtor, CNC and the Herbst Entities entered into that certain
22 Forbearance Agreement dated March 1, 2013 (the "Forbearance Agreement").

23 23. Pursuant to the Forbearance Agreement, the Debtor and CNC made the following
24 acknowledgments:

25 (i) The Continuing Defaults have occurred and are continuing; (ii)
26 [Paul Morabito and CNC] are unable to cure the Cash Payment Default;
27 (iii) [Paul Morabito and CNC] are unable to cure the Hinckley Note
28 Default; (iv) pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement, as a result
of the occurrence of the Continuing Defaults, [Plaintiffs] currently have
the right to immediately exercise any one or more of the rights and

1 remedies under the Settlement Agreement, at law or in equity, as they, in
2 their sole discretion, deem necessary or desirable; and (v) [Paul Morabito
3 and CNC] do not have any defenses, legal or equitable, to the Continuing
4 Defaults, and/or any other events of Default that may exist under the
Settlement Agreement or the exercise by [Plaintiffs] of anyone or more of
their rights and remedies under the Settlement Agreement.

5 24. In exchange for the Herbst Entities' agreement to grant a forbearance, the Debtor
6 and CNC agreed to (1) by no later than March 15, 2013, provide the Herbst Entities with a fully
7 executed forbearance agreement between the Debtor, CNC, and the holders of the Hinckley
8 Note; (2) to make certain payments of deferred principal on the payment due on March 1, 2013
9 under the Settlement Agreement; and (3) to make certain additional payments to the Herbst
10 Entities commencing with a payment of \$68,437 on or before May 21, 2013.

11 25. In the event of a default under the terms of the Forbearance Agreement or the
12 Settlement Agreement, other than the Continuing Defaults, the Herbst Entities were entitled
13 under the Forbearance Agreement to "immediately, and without expiration of any notice and cure
14 period, exercise and enforce their rights and remedies under the Settlement Agreement or at law."

15 26. Upon information and belief, as with the Settlement Agreement, at the time the
16 parties began negotiating and subsequently executed the Forbearance Agreement, the Debtor and
17 CNC had no intention of complying with its terms. Instead, the Debtor and CNC induced the
18 Herbst Entities to execute the Forbearance Agreement as a delay tactic to avoid execution and
19 collection efforts on the State Court Judgment and in an effort to obtain more time to transfer and
20 dissipate assets in furtherance of their attempts to thwart the Herbst Entities collection of the
21 State Court Judgment.

22 27. The Debtor and CNC failed to comply with the terms of the Forbearance
23 Agreement by, among other things, failing to pay the required April, May, or June payments and
24 failing to obtain or deliver the Hinckley Forbearance Agreement.

25 28. Based on the express terms of the Settlement Agreement, on June 18, 2013, the
26 Herbst Entities filed the Confessed Judgment with the Second Judicial District Court in and for
27 the State of Nevada. Pursuant to the Confessed Judgment, the Debtor and CNC are jointly and
28

1 severally indebted to the Herbst Entities in the amount of \$85,000,000.00, less any credits or
2 offsets for any payments made under the Settlement Agreement.

3 29. Despite the oral findings of fact and conclusions of law, State Court Judgment,
4 Settlement Agreement, Forbearance Agreement, and Confessed Judgment, the Debtor and CNC
5 have failed to make the required payments to the Herbst Entities in satisfaction of the amounts
6 due and owing them.

7 **THE FRAUDULENT TRANSFERS**

8 30. Upon information and belief, Defendants and the Debtor engaged in a series of
9 fraudulent transfers in an effort to prevent the Herbst Entities from collecting on the State Court
10 Judgment and/or the Confessed Judgment and to protect the Debtor from having any of his assets
11 seized. The vast majority of those transfers occurred shortly after the State Court entered its oral
12 findings of fact and conclusions of law. The transfers were intentional and in contravention of
13 the District Court's findings made in the State Court Judgment. The transfers, include, but are
14 not limited to, the following:

15 (a) On or about September 15, 2010, a mere two days after the State Court
16 issued its oral findings of fact and conclusions of law, the Debtor transferred \$6,000,000
17 out of his account with Bank of Montreal in Canada to an entity identified as Sefton
18 Trustees in New Zealand.

19 (b) Upon information and belief, Sefton Trustees is an entity that specializes in
20 offshore trusts.

21 (c) Although the Debtor claimed this \$6,000,000 transfer was made as a
22 settlement relating to his obligation on a guaranty, no documentation supporting said
23 guaranty obligation was ever provided to the Herbst Entities and the Debtor subsequently
24 denied under oath that the transfer was made to satisfy an obligation under a guaranty.

25 (d) Upon information and belief, on September 21, 2010, the Debtor next
26 transferred \$355,000 to Salvatore Morabito, the Debtor's brother, and \$420,250 to Bayuk.

27 (e) Upon information and belief, prior to September 28, 2010, the Debtor
28 resided at 8355 Panorama Drive in Reno, Nevada (the "Reno Property"). The Debtor

1 owned a two-thirds interest in the Property and Bayuk owned the remaining one-third of
2 the Reno Property.

3 (f) Upon information and belief, on October 1, 2010, the Debtor and Bayuk
4 transferred the Reno Property to the Debtor as Trustee of the Arcadia Living Trust for
5 \$981,341. It was later discovered that the appraised value of the Reno Property was
6 \$4,300,000 with a corresponding mortgage of \$1,021,000.

7 (g) Upon information and belief, are Bayuk, who holds a 70% beneficial
8 interest, and Salvatore Morabito, who holds a 30% beneficial interest.

9 (h) Upon information and belief, up until September 28, 2010, the Debtor was
10 the 80% owner of Consolidated Western Corporation ("CWC"). Salvatore Morabito and
11 Bayuk each also held a 10% interest in CWC. At the time, CWC held an interest in
12 Superpumper.

13 (i) Upon information and belief, on September 28, 2010, CWC was merged
14 into Superpumper. At the time, the Debtor's 2009 personal income tax return showed his
15 stock basis in the company was \$5,588,661.

16 (j) On September 30, 2010, despite the Debtor's 2009 \$5,588,661 stock basis,
17 the Debtor sold his interest in Superpumper to Snowshoe Petroleum for approximately
18 \$2,500,000. Snowshoe Petroleum was incorporated on September 29, 2010 for the sole
19 purpose of receiving the transfer from the Debtor.

20 (k) Upon information and belief, prior to October 1, 2010, the Arcadia Living
21 Trust and Bayuk held a joint interest in Baruk Properties. On October 1, 2010, the
22 Debtor transferred the Arcadia Living Trust's 50% interest in Baruk Properties to Bayuk
23 as Trustee of the Edward William Bayuk Living Trust for a promissory note with a
24 principal amount of \$1,617,050, which was then assigned to the principals of Woodland
25 Heights Ltd. for a 20% interest in a joint venture.

26 (l) Upon information and belief, the appraised value of Baruk Properties at the
27 time of the transfer was \$9,266,600 less a mortgage of \$1,440,000, for a net equity value
28

1 of \$7,826,600, making the Debtor's 50% worth \$3,913,000, exceeding the value of the
2 promissory note received in exchange by \$2,295,950.

3 (m) Upon information and belief, in or around September 2010, the Debtor as
4 Trustee of the Arcadia Living Trust, and Bayuk, held joint ownership of a property
5 located at 1254 Mary Flemming Circle in Palm Springs, California (the "Palm Springs
6 Property").

7 (n) Upon information and belief, the Palm Springs Property was subsequently
8 transferred to Bayuk as Trustee of the Edward William Bayuk Living Trust. No
9 documentation has ever been provided demonstrating that this transfer was made for any
10 form of consideration.

11 (o) Upon information and belief, the Debtor and Bayuk also transferred real
12 property consisting of a personal residence located at 371 El Camino Del Mar, Laguna
13 Beach, California (Parcel No. 644-032-01) (the "Laguna Beach Property") to the Debtor
14 as Trustee for the Arcadia Living Trust, and Bayuk as trustee for Edward William Bayuk
15 Living Trust, on or around August 20, 2009. Ownership of the California Property was
16 subsequently transferred in whole to the Edward William Bayuk Living Trust, despite the
17 fact that the Debtor admitted that he did not know if it was for consideration.

18 (p) Lastly, upon information and belief, at some point subsequent to the State
19 Court's oral judgment, the Debtor executed a promissory note in favor of Bayuk in the
20 amount of \$600,000. The Debtor has refused to produce any evidence relating to the
21 underlying obligation to Bayuk or payments made on said obligation and Bayuk claims
22 that the note is in good standing despite the fact that the Debtor purportedly failed to
23 make any payments on the note to Bayuk.

24 31. Upon information and belief, these transfers were done in an effort to avoid the
25 Herbst Entities' efforts to collect on the State Court Judgment and the subsequently executed
26 Confession of Judgment.

27 ///

28 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
84

1 43. Before the transfers were made, the Herbst Entities had obtained an oral judgment
2 against the Debtor on claims for fraud and fraud in the inducement.

3 44. Upon information and belief, the transfers were made to insiders.

4 45. Upon further information and belief, the Debtor retained possession or control of
5 at least some of the property transferred after the transfer and continued to control the actions of
6 Bayuk and Salvatore Morabito and continues to presently control their actions.

7 46. Upon further information and belief, said transfers were made without the Debtor
8 receiving reasonably equivalent value from Defendants, and left the Debtor with debts which he
9 lacked the means to pay, including the State Court Judgment owed to Plaintiffs.

10 47. Upon information and belief, at the time of the transfers to Defendants, the Debtor
11 was engaged or was about to engage in a business or a transaction for which his remaining assets
12 were unreasonably small in relation to his business or transaction.

13 48. Upon information and belief, at the time of the transfers to the remaining
14 Defendants, the Debtor intended to incur, or believed or reasonably should have believed that he
15 would incur debts beyond his ability to pay as they became due.

16 49. Upon further information and belief, at the time of the transfers to Defendants, the
17 Debtor was insolvent or was rendered insolvent by the transfers.

18 50. As a direct, natural, and foreseeable consequence of the Debtor and Defendants'
19 actions, the Bankruptcy Estate has been damaged in an amount to be proven at trial.

20 51. Plaintiff is entitled to the remedies provided in NRS § 112.210, including, but not
21 limited to:

22 (a) Avoidance of the transfer or obligation to the extent necessary to satisfy
23 Plaintiffs' claim.

24 (b) Garnishment against Defendants as transferor and recipients of the
25 fraudulent obligations, in accordance with the procedure prescribed by law in obtaining
26 such remedy.
27
28

1 (c) An attachment or other provisional remedy against the asset transferred or
2 other property of Defendants in accordance with the procedure prescribed by law in
3 obtaining such remedy.

4 (d) Imposition of a constructive trust over the assets fraudulently transferred.

5 (e) Any other relief the circumstances may require.

6 52. It has been necessary for Plaintiff to retain the services of counsel to prosecute
7 this action, and Plaintiff is entitled to recover the attorneys' fees and costs incurred herein.

8 53.

9 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

10 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief as follows:

- 11 1. For an award of compensatory damages against Defendants in an amount to be
12 proven at trial;
- 13 2. For an award of punitive damages against Defendants in an amount to be proven
14 at trial;
- 15 3. For an award to Plaintiff of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs;
- 16 4. For garnishment against Defendants, the recipients of the fraudulent obligation.
- 17 5. For avoidance of the transfer or obligation to the extent necessary to satisfy
18 Plaintiff's claim.
- 19 6. For attachment or other provisional remedy against the asset transferred or other
20 property of Defendants in accordance with the procedure prescribed by law in obtaining such
21 remedy.
- 22 7. For such other and further relief as this Court deems appropriate.

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

AFFIRMATION
Pursuant to NRS 239B.030

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

DATED this 14th day of May, 2015.

GORDON SILVER

By: /s/ John P. Desmond
JOHN P. DESMOND
Nevada Bar No. 5618
Email: jdesmond@gordonsilver.com
BRIAN R. IRVINE
Nevada Bar No. 7758
Email: birvine@gordonsilver.com
100 West Liberty Street
Suite 940
Reno, Nevada 89501
Tel: (775) 343-7500
Fax: (775) 786-0131

Attorneys for Plaintiff

1090
GORDON SILVER
JOHN P. DESMOND
Nevada Bar No. 5618
Email: jdesmond@gordonsilver.com
BRIAN R. IRVINE
Nevada Bar No. 7758
Email: birvine@gordonsilver.com
100 West Liberty Street
Suite 940
Reno, Nevada 89501
Tel: (775) 343-7500
Fax: (775) 786-0131

Attorneys for Plaintiff

IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF
THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

WILLIAM A. LEONARD, Trustee for the
Bankruptcy Estate of Paul Anthony
Morabito,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SUPERPUMPER, INC., an Arizona
corporation; EDWARD BAYUK,
individually and as Trustee of the EDWARD
WILLIAM BAYUK LIVING TRUST;
SALVATORE MORABITO, and individual;
and SNOWSHOE PETROLEUM, INC., a
New York corporation,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: CV13-02663

DEPT. NO.: 7

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

[EXEMPT FROM ARBITRATION – DAMAGES IN EXCESS OF \$50,000]

Plaintiff WILLIAM A. LEONARD hereby alleges the following:

I.

THE PARTIES, JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. Plaintiff William A. Leonard is an individual serving as the Chapter 7 Trustee in
the bankruptcy proceeding of Paul Morabito (hereinafter referred to as the “Debtor”), *In re*:

1 *Paul A. Morabito*, Case 13-51237 in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of
2 Nevada.

3 2. Upon information and belief, Defendant Superpumper, Inc. (“Superpumper”) is
4 and was at all times relevant hereto an Arizona corporation with its principal place of business
5 in Maricopa County, Arizona. Superpumper was the recipient of certain fraudulent transfers
6 originating in Washoe County, Nevada.

7 3. Upon information and belief, Defendant Edward Bayuk (“Bayuk”) is and was at
8 all times relevant hereto a resident of both Washoe County Nevada and Los Angeles County,
9 California and is the domestic partner of the Debtor. Bayuk is also the President of
10 Superpumper.

11 4. Upon information and belief, Bayuk is also the Trustee of the Edward William
12 Bayuk Living Trust. Bayuk, individually, and as Trustee of the Edward William Bayuk Living
13 Trust, was the recipient of certain fraudulent transfers originating in Washoe County, Nevada.

14 5. Upon information and belief, Defendant Salvatore Morabito (“Salvatore
15 Morabito”) is and was at all times relevant hereto a resident of Washoe County, Nevada and
16 Maricopa County, Arizona and the Secretary and Vice President of Superpumper. Salvatore
17 Morabito is the brother of the Debtor. Salvatore Morabito was the recipient of certain
18 fraudulent transfers originating in Washoe County, Nevada.

19 6. Upon information and belief, Defendant Snowshoe Petroleum, Inc. (“Snowshoe
20 Petroleum,” together with Superpumper, Bayuk, and Salvatore Morabito, collectively referred to
21 as the “Defendants”) is a New York corporation. Bayuk is the President of Snowshoe
22 Petroleum. Snowshoe Petroleum and Bayuk, individually, and as Trustee of the Edward
23 William Bayuk Living Trust, were the recipients of certain fraudulent transfers originating in
24 Washoe County, Nevada.

25 7. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter on the basis that the Defendants
26 reside or are located in Washoe County, Nevada; the activities complained of herein occurred in
27 Washoe County, Nevada; the fraudulent transfers outlined in the complaint originated from
28

1 Washoe County, Nevada; and/or Defendants have expressly agreed to submit themselves to the
2 jurisdiction of this Court.

3 8. Venue is proper in Washoe County, Nevada pursuant to NRS § 13.010 because
4 the rights, obligations and activities that give rise to this action occurred in Washoe County,
5 Nevada and Defendants have already agreed that Washoe County, Nevada is an appropriate
6 venue.

7 II.

8 GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

9 9. Plaintiff repeats, realleges, and incorporates the allegations set forth in the
10 proceeding paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

11 10. On or about June 28, 2007, JH and P.A. Morabito & Co., Ltd. ("PAMCO"), the
12 predecessor-in-interest to Consolidated Nevada Corporation ("CNC"), entered into an Amended
13 and Restated Stock Purchase Agreement (the "ARSPA"), whereby JH purchased the stock of
14 Berry-Hinckley Industries ("BHI") from PAMCO. Herbst was the guarantor of the JH
15 obligations under the ARSPA, and the Debtor guaranteed the obligations of PAMCO.

16 THE STATE COURT ACTION

17 11. A dispute developed between JH, Inc., Jerry Herbst, and BHI (collectively, the
18 "Herbst Entities") on the one hand and the Debtor and CNC on the other regarding the sale of
19 the BHI stock to JH.

20 12. On December 3, 2007, the Debtor and CNC filed a lawsuit against the Herbst
21 Entities, captioned Consolidated Nevada Corp., et al. v. JH, et al., (the "State Court"), Case No.
22 CV07-02764 (together with all claims and counterclaims, the "State Court Action").

23 13. The Herbst Entities filed numerous counterclaims in the State Court Action
24 against the Debtor and CNC, including, but not limited to, fraud in the inducement,
25 misrepresentation, and breach of contract relating to the ARSPA.

26 14. On September 13, 2010, the State Court entered an oral judgment against the
27 Debtor and CNC in favor of the Herbst Entities. Specifically, the State Court found that the
28

1 Debtor and CNC fraudulently induced JH and Herbst to enter into the ARSPA and ruled in favor
2 of JH and Herbst against the Debtor on other fraud-based claims.

3 15. On October 12, 2010, the State Court entered its findings of fact and conclusions
4 of law which set forth the legal and factual basis for a forthcoming state court judgment,
5 including fraud in the inducement.

6 16. On August 23, 2011, the State Court entered a judgment awarding the Herbst
7 Entities total damages in the amount of \$149,444,777.80 for actual fraud, representing both
8 compensatory and punitive damages as well as an award of attorneys' fees and costs (the
9 "Nevada Court Judgment").

10 **THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND FORBEARANCE AGREEMENT**

11 17. While the Debtor and CNC's appeal of the State Court Judgment (the "Appeal")
12 was pending before the Nevada Supreme Court, the Debtor, CNC, and the Herbst Entities
13 entered into a Settlement Agreement and Mutual Release dated November 30, 2011 (the
14 "Settlement Agreement"). Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement:

15 (a) The parties agreed to file a *Stipulation to Vacate Appeal and a Stipulation*
16 *to Vacate Judgment and Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law entered by the State*
17 *Court*;

18 (b) The parties agreed to execute a *Confession of Judgment and Stipulation*
19 *to Confess Judgment in the Amount of \$85,000,000.00* (referred to collectively as the
20 "Confessed Judgment"), which, in the event that the Settlement Agreement was
21 breached and not cured, Plaintiffs would be permitted to file *ex parte* and without notice
22 in Department 6 of the Second Judicial District Court in and for the County of Washoe;

23 (c) The Debtor and CNC agreed to comply with the timely payment of
24 numerous financial obligations set forth therein; and

25 (d) The Debtor and CNC agreed to submit themselves to the jurisdiction of
26 the court of Washoe County, Nevada for any dispute relating to the Settlement
27 Agreement.
28

1 18. Consistent with the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the State Court Action
2 was dismissed with prejudice and the Debtor, CNC, and the Herbst Entities executed the
3 Confessed Judgment.

4 19. Unbeknownst to the Herbst Entities, at the time the parties began negotiating and
5 subsequently executed the Settlement Agreement, the Debtor and CNC had no intention of
6 complying with its terms. Instead, the Debtor and CNC induced the Herbst Entities to execute
7 the Settlement Agreement as a delay tactic to avoid execution and collection efforts on the State
8 Court Judgment and in an effort to obtain more time to transfer and dissipate assets in
9 furtherance of their attempts to thwart the Herbst Entities' collection of the State Court
10 Judgment.

11 20. Shortly after execution, the Debtor and CNC defaulted under the terms of the
12 Settlement Agreement by failing to comply with several of their financial obligations, including
13 complying with obligations under the related Moreno settlement agreement (the "Moreno
14 Default"), failing to pay amounts due and owing under the Hinckley Note (the "Hinckley Note
15 Default"), and failing to make the cash payment of Four Million and No/100ths Dollars
16 (\$4,000,000.00) due to Plaintiffs on or before March 1, 2013 (the "Cash Payment Default")
17 (collectively, the "Continuing Defaults").

18 21. After defaulting under the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the Debtor and
19 CNC requested that the Herbst Entities forbear from exercising their rights and remedies set
20 forth in the Settlement Agreement, until December 1, 2013.

21 22. Accordingly, the Debtor, CNC and the Herbst Entities entered into that certain
22 Forbearance Agreement dated March 1, 2013 (the "Forbearance Agreement").

23 23. Pursuant to the Forbearance Agreement, the Debtor and CNC made the following
24 acknowledgments:

- 25 (i) The Continuing Defaults have occurred and are continuing; (ii)
26 [Paul Morabito and CNC] are unable to cure the Cash Payment Default;
27 (iii) [Paul Morabito and CNC] are unable to cure the Hinckley Note
28 Default; (iv) pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement, as a result
of the occurrence of the Continuing Defaults, [Plaintiffs] currently have
the right to immediately exercise any one or more of the rights and

1 remedies under the Settlement Agreement, at law or in equity, as they, in
2 their sole discretion, deem necessary or desirable; and (v) [Paul Morabito
3 and CNC] do not have any defenses, legal or equitable, to the Continuing
4 Defaults, and/or any other events of Default that may exist under the
Settlement Agreement or the exercise by [Plaintiffs] of anyone or more of
their rights and remedies under the Settlement Agreement.

5 24. In exchange for the Herbst Entities' agreement to grant a forbearance, the Debtor
6 and CNC agreed to (1) by no later than March 15, 2013, provide the Herbst Entities with a fully
7 executed forbearance agreement between the Debtor, CNC, and the holders of the Hinckley
8 Note; (2) to make certain payments of deferred principal on the payment due on March 1, 2013
9 under the Settlement Agreement; and (3) to make certain additional payments to the Herbst
10 Entities commencing with a payment of \$68,437 on or before May 21, 2013.

11 25. In the event of a default under the terms of the Forbearance Agreement or the
12 Settlement Agreement, other than the Continuing Defaults, the Herbst Entities were entitled
13 under the Forbearance Agreement to "immediately, and without expiration of any notice and cure
14 period, exercise and enforce their rights and remedies under the Settlement Agreement or at law."

15 26. Upon information and belief, as with the Settlement Agreement, at the time the
16 parties began negotiating and subsequently executed the Forbearance Agreement, the Debtor and
17 CNC had no intention of complying with its terms. Instead, the Debtor and CNC induced the
18 Herbst Entities to execute the Forbearance Agreement as a delay tactic to avoid execution and
19 collection efforts on the State Court Judgment and in an effort to obtain more time to transfer and
20 dissipate assets in furtherance of their attempts to thwart the Herbst Entities collection of the
21 State Court Judgment.

22 27. The Debtor and CNC failed to comply with the terms of the Forbearance
23 Agreement by, among other things, failing to pay the required April, May, or June payments and
24 failing to obtain or deliver the Hinckley Forbearance Agreement.

25 28. Based on the express terms of the Settlement Agreement, on June 18, 2013, the
26 Herbst Entities filed the Confessed Judgment with the Second Judicial District Court in and for
27 the State of Nevada. Pursuant to the Confessed Judgment, the Debtor and CNC are jointly and
28

1 severally indebted to the Herbst Entities in the amount of \$85,000,000.00, less any credits or
2 offsets for any payments made under the Settlement Agreement.

3 29. Despite the oral findings of fact and conclusions of law, State Court Judgment,
4 Settlement Agreement, Forbearance Agreement, and Confessed Judgment, the Debtor and CNC
5 have failed to make the required payments to the Herbst Entities in satisfaction of the amounts
6 due and owing them.

7 **THE FRAUDULENT TRANSFERS**

8 30. Upon information and belief, Defendants and the Debtor engaged in a series of
9 fraudulent transfers in an effort to prevent the Herbst Entities from collecting on the State Court
10 Judgment and/or the Confessed Judgment and to protect the Debtor from having any of his assets
11 seized. The vast majority of those transfers occurred shortly after the State Court entered its oral
12 findings of fact and conclusions of law. The transfers were intentional and in contravention of
13 the District Court's findings made in the State Court Judgment. The transfers, include, but are
14 not limited to, the following:

15 (a) On or about September 15, 2010, a mere two days after the State Court
16 issued its oral findings of fact and conclusions of law, the Debtor transferred \$6,000,000
17 out of his account with Bank of Montreal in Canada to an entity identified as Sefton
18 Trustees in New Zealand.

19 (b) Upon information and belief, Sefton Trustees is an entity that specializes in
20 offshore trusts.

21 (c) Although the Debtor claimed this \$6,000,000 transfer was made as a
22 settlement relating to his obligation on a guaranty, no documentation supporting said
23 guaranty obligation was ever provided to the Herbst Entities and the Debtor subsequently
24 denied under oath that the transfer was made to satisfy an obligation under a guaranty.

25 (d) Upon information and belief, on September 21, 2010, the Debtor next
26 transferred \$355,000 to Salvatore Morabito, the Debtor's brother, and \$420,250 to Bayuk.

27 (e) Upon information and belief, prior to September 28, 2010, the Debtor
28 resided at 8355 Panorama Drive in Reno, Nevada (the "Reno Property"). The Debtor

1 owned a two-thirds interest in the Property and Bayuk owned the remaining one-third of
2 the Reno Property.

3 (f) Upon information and belief, on October 1, 2010, the Debtor and Bayuk
4 transferred the Reno Property to the Debtor as Trustee of the Arcadia Living Trust for
5 \$981,341. It was later discovered that the appraised value of the Reno Property was
6 \$4,300,000 with a corresponding mortgage of \$1,021,000.

7 (g) Upon information and belief, are Bayuk, who holds a 70% beneficial
8 interest, and Salvatore Morabito, who holds a 30% beneficial interest.

9 (h) Upon information and belief, up until September 28, 2010, the Debtor was
10 the 80% owner of Consolidated Western Corporation (“CWC”). Salvatore Morabito and
11 Bayuk each also held a 10% interest in CWC. At the time, CWC held an interest in
12 Superpumper.

13 (i) Upon information and belief, on September 28, 2010, CWC was merged
14 into Superpumper. At the time, the Debtor’s 2009 personal income tax return showed his
15 stock basis in the company was \$5,588,661.

16 (j) On September 30, 2010, despite the Debtor’s 2009 \$5,588,661 stock basis,
17 the Debtor sold his interest in Superpumper to Snowshoe Petroleum for approximately
18 \$2,500,000. Snowshoe Petroleum was incorporated on September 29, 2010 for the sole
19 purpose of receiving the transfer from the Debtor.

20 (k) Upon information and belief, prior to October 1, 2010, the Arcadia Living
21 Trust and Bayuk held a joint interest in Baruk Properties. On October 1, 2010, the
22 Debtor transferred the Arcadia Living Trust’s 50% interest in Baruk Properties to Bayuk
23 as Trustee of the Edward William Bayuk Living Trust for a promissory note with a
24 principal amount of \$1,617,050, which was then assigned to the principals of Woodland
25 Heights Ltd. for a 20% interest in a joint venture.

26 (l) Upon information and belief, the appraised value of Baruk Properties at the
27 time of the transfer was \$9,266,600 less a mortgage of \$1,440,000, for a net equity value
28

1 of \$7,826,600, making the Debtor's 50% worth \$3,913,000, exceeding the value of the
2 promissory note received in exchange by \$2,295,950.

3 (m) Upon information and belief, in or around September 2010, the Debtor as
4 Trustee of the Arcadia Living Trust, and Bayuk, held joint ownership of a property
5 located at 1254 Mary Flemming Circle in Palm Springs, California (the "Palm Springs
6 Property").

7 (n) Upon information and belief, the Palm Springs Property was subsequently
8 transferred to Bayuk as Trustee of the Edward William Bayuk Living Trust. No
9 documentation has ever been provided demonstrating that this transfer was made for any
10 form of consideration.

11 (o) Upon information and belief, the Debtor and Bayuk also transferred real
12 property consisting of a personal residence located at 371 El Camino Del Mar, Laguna
13 Beach, California (Parcel No. 644-032-01) (the "Laguna Beach Property") to the Debtor
14 as Trustee for the Arcadia Living Trust, and Bayuk as trustee for Edward William Bayuk
15 Living Trust, on or around August 20, 2009. Ownership of the California Property was
16 subsequently transferred in whole to the Edward William Bayuk Living Trust, despite the
17 fact that the Debtor admitted that he did not know if it was for consideration.

18 (p) Lastly, upon information and belief, at some point subsequent to the State
19 Court's oral judgment, the Debtor executed a promissory note in favor of Bayuk in the
20 amount of \$600,000. The Debtor has refused to produce any evidence relating to the
21 underlying obligation to Bayuk or payments made on said obligation and Bayuk claims
22 that the note is in good standing despite the fact that the Debtor purportedly failed to
23 make any payments on the note to Bayuk.

24 31. Upon information and belief, these transfers were done in an effort to avoid the
25 Herbst Entities' efforts to collect on the State Court Judgment and the subsequently executed
26 Confession of Judgment.

27 ///

28 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDINGS

32. On June 20, 2013, the Herbst Entities filed an involuntary petition for relief under Chapter 7 of the Bankruptcy Code, thereby commencing the Chapter 7 involuntary proceeding against the Debtor and CNC.

33. On December 17, 2013, the Bankruptcy Court entered an Order in which it suspended the proceedings and abstained from hearing the case.

34. On July 10, 2014, the Bankruptcy Court lifted the suspension, vacating its prior suspension Order.

35. The Herbst Entities subsequently filed a motion for summary judgment.

36. The Bankruptcy Court granted the Herbst Entities’ motion for summary judgment, and also entered an Order for Relief against Morabito.

37. On December 18, 2014, an interim trustee was appointed.

38. In January 2015, Plaintiff was elected to serve as the Chapter 7 Trustee in the bankruptcy proceedings.

III.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

[FRAUDULENT TRANSFERS NRS § 112.140 – ALL DEFENDANTS]

39. Plaintiff repeats, realleges and incorporates each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

40. At all times relevant herein, the Herbst Entities have been a creditor of the Debtor, and Paul Morabito is a debtor within the definitions set forth in NRS § 112.150.

41. Upon information and belief, between August 29, 2009 and October 1, 2010, the Debtor engaged in a transfer or series of transfers whereby several of his assets were transferred to Defendants or on behalf of Defendants.

42. Upon information and belief, the transfers by the Debtor to the Defendants were made with the actual intent to hinder, delay, or defraud the Herbst Entities as a creditor of the Debtor , pursuant to NRS § 112.180.

1 43. Before the transfers were made, the Herbst Entities had obtained an oral judgment
2 against the Debtor on claims for fraud and fraud in the inducement.

3 44. Upon information and belief, the transfers were made to insiders.

4 45. Upon further information and belief, the Debtor retained possession or control of
5 at least some of the property transferred after the transfer and continued to control the actions of
6 Bayuk and Salvatore Morabito and continues to presently control their actions.

7 46. Upon further information and belief, said transfers were made without the Debtor
8 receiving reasonably equivalent value from Defendants, and left the Debtor with debts which he
9 lacked the means to pay, including the State Court Judgment owed to Plaintiffs.

10 47. Upon information and belief, at the time of the transfers to Defendants, the Debtor
11 was engaged or was about to engage in a business or a transaction for which his remaining assets
12 were unreasonably small in relation to his business or transaction.

13 48. Upon information and belief, at the time of the transfers to the remaining
14 Defendants, the Debtor intended to incur, or believed or reasonably should have believed that he
15 would incur debts beyond his ability to pay as they became due.

16 49. Upon further information and belief, at the time of the transfers to Defendants, the
17 Debtor was insolvent or was rendered insolvent by the transfers.

18 50. As a direct, natural, and foreseeable consequence of the Debtor and Defendants'
19 actions, the Bankruptcy Estate has been damaged in an amount to be proven at trial.

20 51. Plaintiff is entitled to the remedies provided in NRS § 112.210, including, but not
21 limited to:

22 (a) Avoidance of the transfer or obligation to the extent necessary to satisfy
23 Plaintiffs' claim.

24 (b) Garnishment against Defendants as transferor and recipients of the
25 fraudulent obligations, in accordance with the procedure prescribed by law in obtaining
26 such remedy.

1 (c) An attachment or other provisional remedy against the asset transferred or
2 other property of Defendants in accordance with the procedure prescribed by law in
3 obtaining such remedy.

4 (d) Imposition of a constructive trust over the assets fraudulently transferred.

5 (e) Any other relief the circumstances may require.

6 52. It has been necessary for Plaintiff to retain the services of counsel to prosecute
7 this action, and Plaintiff is entitled to recover the attorneys' fees and costs incurred herein.

8 53.

9 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

10 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief as follows:

11 1. For an award of compensatory damages against Defendants in an amount to be
12 proven at trial;

13 2. For an award of punitive damages against Defendants in an amount to be proven
14 at trial;

15 3. For an award to Plaintiff of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs;

16 4. For garnishment against Defendants, the recipients of the fraudulent obligation.

17 5. For avoidance of the transfer or obligation to the extent necessary to satisfy
18 Plaintiff's claim.

19 6. For attachment or other provisional remedy against the asset transferred or other
20 property of Defendants in accordance with the procedure prescribed by law in obtaining such
21 remedy.

22 7. For such other and further relief as this Court deems appropriate.

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

AFFIRMATION
Pursuant to NRS 239B.030

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

DATED this 15th day of May, 2015.

GORDON SILVER

By: /s/ John P. Desmond
JOHN P. DESMOND
Nevada Bar No. 5618
Email: jdesmond@gordonsilver.com
BRIAN R. IRVINE
Nevada Bar No. 7758
Email: birvine@gordonsilver.com
100 West Liberty Street
Suite 940
Reno, Nevada 89501
Tel: (775) 343-7500
Fax: (775) 786-0131

Attorneys for Plaintiff

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 I certify that I am an employee of GORDON SILVER, and that on this date, pursuant to
3 NRCP 5(b), I am serving a true and correct copy of the attached **FIRST AMENDED**
4 **COMPLAINT** on the parties as set forth below:

- 5 _____ Placing an original or true copy thereof in a sealed envelope placed for collection
6 and mailing in the United States Mail, Reno, Nevada, postage prepaid, following
7 ordinary business practices
8 _____ Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested
9 _____ Via Facsimile (Fax)
10 _____ Via E-Mail
11 _____ Placing an original or true copy thereof in a sealed envelope and causing the same
12 to be personally Hand Delivered
13 _____ Federal Express (or other overnight delivery)
14 X Via CM/ECF

15 addressed as follows:

16 Barry Breslow
17 Frank Gilmore
18 ROBISON, BELAUSTEGUI, SHARP & LOW
19 71 Washington Street
20 Reno, NV 89503

21 DATED this 15th day of May, 2015.

22 /s/ Mina Reel
23 An Employee of GORDON SILVER
24
25
26
27
28

1 **3980**
JOHN P. DESMOND
2 Nevada Bar No. 5618
Email: jdesmond@gordonsilver.com
3 BRIAN R. IRVINE
Nevada Bar No. 7758
4 Email: birvine@gordonsilver.com
100 West Liberty Street
5 Suite 940
Reno, Nevada 89501
6 Tel: (775) 343-7500
Fax: (775) 786-0131

7 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

8
9 **IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF
THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE**

10 JH, INC., a Nevada corporation; JERRY
11 HERBST, an individual; and BERRY-
HINCKLEY INDUSTRIES, a Nevada
12 corporation,

13 Plaintiffs,

14 vs.

15 PAUL MORABITO, individually and as
Trustee of the ARCADIA LIVING TRUST;
16 SUPERPUMPER, INC., an Arizona
corporation; EDWARD BAYUK,
17 individually and as Trustee of the EDWARD
WILLIAM BAYUK LIVING TRUST;
18 SALVATORE MORABITO, and individual;
and SNOWSHOE PETROLEUM, INC., a
19 New York corporation,

20 Defendants.

CASE NO.: CV13-02663

DEPT. NO.: 1

21
22 **STIPULATION AND ORDER TO SUBSTITUTE A PARTY**
23 **PURSUANT TO NRCP 17(a)**

24 Plaintiffs JH, Inc., Jerry Herbst, and Berry-Hinckley Industries (collectively, the "Herbst
25 Entities"), by and through their attorneys of record, Gordon Silver, and Defendants Paul
26 Morabito, individually and as Trustee of the Arcadia Living Trust; Superpumper, Inc.; Edward
27 Bayuk, individually and as Trustee of the Edward William Bayuk Living Trust; Snowshoe
28 Petroleum, Inc.; and Salvatore Morabito (collectively, "Defendants"), by and through their

1 attorneys of record, Robison, Belaustegui, Sharp and Low, hereby jointly agree and stipulate as
2 follows:

- 3 1. To remove the Herbst Entities as plaintiffs to this action;
4 2. To substitute William A. Leonard, Jr., the Trustee for the Bankruptcy Estate of Paul A.
5 Morabito, as the plaintiff to this action under NRCP 17(a); and
6 3. To remove Paul Morabito as a Defendant to this action, both individually and as
7 Trustee of the Arcadia Living Trust.


8 **AFFIRMATION**

9 **Pursuant to NRS 239B.030**

10 The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document does not contain the
11 social security number of any person.


12 DATED this 13th day of May, 2015.

14 GORDON SILVER

15
16 
17 By: _____
18 JOHN P. DESMOND
19 Nevada Bar No. 5618
20 Email: jdesmond@gordonsilver.com
21 BRIAN R. IRVINE
22 Nevada Bar No. 7758
23 Email: birvine@gordonsilver.com
24 100 West Liberty Street
25 Suite 940
26 Reno, Nevada 89501
27 Tel: (775) 343-7500
28 Fax: (775) 786-0131

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

ROBISON, BELEAUSTEGUI, SHARP AND
LOW

15
16 
17 By: _____
18 BARRY L. BRESLOW, ESQ.
19 Nevada Bar No. 3023
20 Email: bbreslow@rbsllaw.com
21 FRANK C. GILMORE, ESQ.
22 Nevada Bar No. 10052
23 Email: fgilmore@rbsllaw.com
24 71 Washington Street
25 Reno, Nevada 89503
26 Tel: (775) 329-3151
27 Fax: (775) 329-7169

Attorneys for Defendants

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ORDER TO SUBSTITUTE A PARTY PURSUANT TO NRCP 17(a)

Pursuant to the foregoing Stipulation, IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 14th day of May, 2015.


DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I am an employee of GORDON SILVER, and that on this date, pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I am serving a true and correct copy of the attached **STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO SUBSTITUTE A PARTY PURSUANT TO NRCP 17(a)** on the parties as set forth below:

- ☒ Placing an original or true copy thereof in a sealed envelope placed for collection and mailing in the United States Mail, Reno, Nevada, postage prepaid, following ordinary business practices
- ☐ Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested
- ☐ Via Facsimile (Fax)
- ☐ Via E-Mail
- ☐ Placing an original or true copy thereof in a sealed envelope and causing the same to be personally Hand Delivered
- ☐ Federal Express (or other overnight delivery)
- ☐ Via CM/ECF

addressed as follows:

Barry Breslow
Frank Gilmore
ROBISON, BELAUSTEGUI, SHARP & LOW
71 Washington Street
Reno, NV 89503

DATED this 14th day of May, 2015.


An Employee of GORDON SILVER

1 **4075**
2 GORDON SILVER
3 JOHN P. DESMOND
4 Nevada Bar No. 5618
5 Email: jdesmond@gordonsilver.com
6 BRIAN R. IRVINE
7 Nevada Bar No. 7758
8 Email: birvine@gordonsilver.com
9 100 West Liberty Street
10 Suite 940
11 Reno, Nevada 89501
12 Tel: (775) 343-7500
13 Fax: (775) 786-0131

14 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

15 **IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF**
16 **THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE**

17 WILLIAM A. LEONARD, Trustee for the
18 Bankruptcy Estate of Paul Anthony
19 Morabito,

20 Plaintiff,

21 vs.

22 SUPERPUMPER, INC., an Arizona
23 corporation; EDWARD BAYUK,
24 individually and as Trustee of the EDWARD
25 WILLIAM BAYUK LIVING TRUST;
26 SALVATORE MORABITO, and individual;
27 and SNOWSHOE PETROLEUM, INC., a
28 New York corporation,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: CV13-02663

DEPT. NO.: 7

SUBSTITUTION OF COUNSEL


John P. Desmond, Esq. and Brian R. Irvine, Esq. and the firm GORDON SILVER,
attorneys for Plaintiff, WILLIAM A. LEONARD, Trustee for the Bankruptcy Estate of Paul

///

1 Anthony Morabito, do hereby consent, pursuant to WDCR 23(2)(a), to the substitution of Gerald
2 M. Gordon, Esq., Teresa M. Pilatowicz, Esq., and Mark M. Weisenmiller, Esq. and the law firm
3 of GARMAN TURNER GORDON in the above-entitled matter in their place and stead.

4 DATED this 21st day of May, 2015.


5 GORDON SILVER
6 100 West Liberty Street, Suite 940
7 Reno, NV 89501

8 
9 BY: _____
10 Brian R. Irvine, Esq. (NSB #7758)
11 John P. Desmond, Esq. (NSB #5618)

12 Gerald M. Gordon, Esq., Teresa M. Pilatowicz, Esq., and Mark M. Weisenmiller, Esq.
13 and the law firm of GARMAN TURNER GORDON, do hereby agree, pursuant to WDCR
14 23(2)(a), to be substituted in the place of John P. Desmond, Esq. and Brian R. Irvine, Esq., as the
15 attorneys for Plaintiff, WILLIAM A. LEONARD, Trustee for the Bankruptcy Estate of Paul
16 Anthony Morabito, in the above-entitled matter.

17 DATED this 21 day of May, 2015.

18 GARMAN TURNER GORDON
19 650 White Drive, Ste. 100
20 Las Vegas, NV 89119

21
22 BY: 
23 Gerald M. Gordon, Esq. (NSB #229)
24 Mark M. Weisenmiller, Esq. (NSB #12128)
25 Teresa M. Pilatowicz, Esq. (ASB #9605)

26 ///

27
28 ///

1 Plaintiff, WILLIAM A. LEONARD, Trustee for the Bankruptcy Estate of Paul Anthony
2 Morabito, in the above entitled case consent, pursuant to WDCR 23(2)(a), to the substitution of
3 Gerald M. Gordon, Esq., Teresa M. Pilatowicz, Esq., and Mark M. Weisenmiller, Esq. and the
4 law firm of GARMAN TURNER GORDON, as their attorney of record.

5 DATED this 21 day of May, 2015.

6 WILLIAM A. LEONARD

7
8
9 BY: WAL

10
11 **AFFIRMATION**
12 **Pursuant to NRS 239B.030**

13 The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document does not contain the
14 social security number of any person.

15 DATED this 26th day of May, 2015.

16 GORDON SILVER

17
18 By: /s/ John P. Desmond
19 JOHN P. DESMOND
20 Nevada Bar No. 5618
21 Email: jdesmond@gordonsilver.com
22 BRIAN R. IRVINE
23 Nevada Bar No. 7758
24 Email: birvine@gordonsilver.com
25 100 West Liberty Street
26 Suite 940
27 Reno, Nevada 89501
28 Tel: (775) 343-7500
Fax: (775) 786-0131

Attorneys for Plaintiff

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I am an employee of GORDON SILVER, and that on this date, pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I am serving a true and correct copy of the attached **SUBSTITUTION OF COUNSEL** on the parties as set forth below:

- ☐ Placing an original or true copy thereof in a sealed envelope placed for collection and mailing in the United States Mail, Reno, Nevada, postage prepaid, following ordinary business practices
- ☐ Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested
- ☐ Via Facsimile (Fax)
- ☐ Via E-Mail
- ☐ Placing an original or true copy thereof in a sealed envelope and causing the same to be personally Hand Delivered
- ☐ Federal Express (or other overnight delivery)
- ☒ Via CM/ECF

addressed as follows:

Barry Breslow
Frank Gilmore
ROBISON, BELAUSTEGUI, SHARP & LOW
71 Washington Street
Reno, NV 89503

DATED this 26th day of May, 2015.


An Employee of GORDON SILVER

1140
BARRY L. BRESLOW, ESQ. – NSB #3023
bbreslow@rbsllaw.com
FRANK C. GILMORE, ESQ. - NSB #10052
fgilmore@rbsllaw.com
Robison, Belaustegui, Sharp & Low
A Professional Corporation
71 Washington Street
Reno, Nevada 89503
Telephone: (775) 329-3151
Facsimile: (775) 329-7169

Attorneys for Defendants

IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT FOR THE STATE OF NEVADA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

WILLIAM A. LEONARD, Trustee for the
Bankruptcy Estate of Paul Anthony Morabito

CASE NO.: CV13-02663

DEPT. NO.: B1

Plaintiffs,

vs.

SUPERPUMPER, INC., an Arizona corporation;
EDWARD BAYUK, individually and as Trustee
of the EDWARD WILLIAM BAYUK LIVING
TRUST; SALVATORE MORABITO, an
individual; and SNOWSHOE PETROLEUM,
INC., a New York corporation,

Defendants.

DEFENDANTS' ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

Defendants, and each of them ("Defendants"), by and through counsel, Robison, Belaustegui, Sharp & Low, hereby respond to the First Amended Complaint ("Complaint") filed in this matter as follows:

1. These answering Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 1 of the Complaint.

2. These answering Defendants admit that Superpumper is an Arizona corporation with its principal place of business in Maricopa County, Arizona, but deny the remainder of the allegations contained in paragraph 2 of the Complaint.

1 3. These answering Defendants admit that Bayuk is President of Superpumper but
2 deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 3 of the Complaint.

3 4. These answering Defendants admit that Bayuk is the trustee of his living trust, but
4 deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 4 of the Complaint.

5 5. These answering Defendants admit that Morabito is Vice-President of Superpumper
6 but deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 5 of the Complaint.

7 6. These answering Defendants admit that Snowshoe Petroleum is a New York
8 Corporation, but deny the remainder of the allegations contained in paragraph 6 of the Complaint.

9 7. These answering Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 7 of the
10 Complaint.

11 8. These answering Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 8 of the
12 Complaint.

13 9. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 9 of the Complaint, these
14 answering Defendants incorporate their responses to the proceeding allegations contained in the
15 Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

16 10. These answering Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 10 of the
17 Complaint.

18 11. These answering Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 11 of the
19 Complaint.

20 12. These answering Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 12 of the
21 Complaint.

22 13. These answering Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 13 of the
23 Complaint.

24 14. The Judgment referred to in paragraph 14 of the Complaint speaks for itself, but has
25 since been voided nunc pro tunc.

26 15. The Judgment referred to in paragraph 15 of the Complaint speaks for itself, but has
27 since been voided nunc pro tunc.

28 16. The Judgment referred to in paragraph 16 of the Complaint speaks for itself, but has

1 since been voided nunc pro tunc.

2 17. These answering Defendants admit that the document speaks for itself.

3 18. These answering Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 18 of the
4 Complaint.

5 19. These answering Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 19 of the
6 Complaint.

7 20. These answering Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 20 of the
8 Complaint.

9 21. These answering Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 21 of the
10 Complaint.

11 22. These answering Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 22 of the
12 Complaint.

13 23. The document referred to in paragraph 23 of the Complaint speaks for itself.

14 24. The document referred to in paragraph 24 of the Complaint speaks for itself.

15 25. The document referred to in paragraph 25 of the Complaint speaks for itself.

16 26. These answering Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 26 of the
17 Complaint.

18 27. These answering Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 27 of the
19 Complaint.

20 28. These answering Defendants admit that Plaintiffs improperly filed the Confession
21 and deny the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 28 of the Complaint.

22 29. These answering Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 29 of the
23 Complaint.

24 30. These answering Defendants deny allegations contained in paragraph 30 of the
25 Complaint.

26 31. These answering Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 31 of the
27 Complaint.

28 32. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 32 of the Complaint, these

1 answering Defendants incorporates their responses to the proceeding allegations contained in the
2 Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

3 33. These answering Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 33 of the
4 Complaint.

5 34. These answering Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 34 of the
6 Complaint.

7 35. These answering Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 35 of the
8 Complaint.

9 36. These answering Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 36 of the
10 Complaint.

11 37. These answering Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 37 of the
12 Complaint.

13 38. These answering Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 38 of the
14 Complaint.

15 39. In response to the allegations contained in paragraph 39 of the Complaint, these
16 answering Defendants incorporates their responses to the proceeding allegations contained in the
17 Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

18 40. These answering Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 40 of the
19 Complaint.

20 41. These answering Defendants admit the allegations contained in paragraph 41 of the
21 Complaint.

22 42. These answering Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 42 of the
23 Complaint.

24 43. These answering Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 43 of the
25 Complaint.

26 44. These answering Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 44 of the
27 Complaint.

28 45. These answering Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 45 of the

1 Complaint.

2 46. These answering Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 46 of the
3 Complaint.

4 47. These answering Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 47 of the
5 Complaint.

6 48. These answering Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 48 of the
7 Complaint.

8 49. These answering Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 49 of the
9 Complaint.

10 50. These answering Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 50 of the
11 Complaint.

12 51. These answering Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 51 of the
13 Complaint.

14 52. These answering Defendants deny the allegations contained in paragraph 52 of the
15 Complaint.

16 **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

17 1. Plaintiffs have waived their claims.

18 2. Plaintiffs are estopped from proceeding with their claims.

19 3. Plaintiffs proceeded in bad faith and in violation of their duty to provide Defendants
20 with the benefit of the bargain.

21 4. Plaintiffs have breached their contractual promises.

22 5. To the extent Plaintiffs are attempting to enforce unwritten provisions, the statute of
23 frauds prohibits them from doing so.

24 6. Plaintiffs have been unjustly enriched by virtue of their false assertions and by and
25 through instituting this legal proceeding.

26 7. The Plaintiffs' Complaint is an abuse of process and is being maliciously prosecuted.

27 8. The Plaintiffs, by and through their representatives and partners, were actively
28 negligent.

1 9. The Plaintiffs, by and through their representatives and partners, are comparatively
2 negligent to the extent that Plaintiffs' negligence exceeds the negligence, if any, of these answering
3 Defendants.

4 10. The Plaintiffs have failed and refused to mitigate the damages, if any, they have
5 sustained.

6 11. Laches bars Plaintiffs' claims.

7 12. The Plaintiffs, by and through their manager, representatives and partners, expressly
8 consented to and authorized the conduct of the Defendants now complained of and Plaintiffs are
9 therefore estopped from recovering on their claim.

10 13. The cause of Plaintiffs' damages, if any, is a result of their own inept conduct and in the
11 alternative, is caused by third parties unrelated to the Defendants named herein.

12 14. Plaintiffs' negligent conduct proximately caused whatever damages they have
13 sustained.

14 15. These answering Defendants is entitled to setoff.

15 16. All alleged improper acts allegedly committed by these answering Defendants was
16 accepted, approved and ratified by the Plaintiffs.

17 17. Plaintiffs' Complaint fails to state claims upon which relief can be granted.

18 18. Plaintiffs' claims are barred by the election of remedies.

19 19. Discovery has not yet commenced and these answering Defendants reserve the right to
20 amend this Answer to include additional affirmative defenses as the discovery process proceeds.

21 20. Plaintiff's claims are barred by the applicable statute of limitations.

22 WHEREFORE, Defendants requests judgment in their favor against the Plaintiffs and further
23 requests that said judgment include an award of attorney's fees and Court costs against the Plaintiffs.

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

AFFIRMATION
Pursuant to NRS 239B.030

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

DATED this 1st day of June, 2015.

ROBISON, BELAUSTEGUI, SHARP & LOW
A Professional Corporation
71 Washington Street
Reno, Nevada 89503

/s/ FRANK C. GILMORE
BARRY L. BRESLOW, ESQ.
FRANK C. GILMORE, ESQ.
Attorneys for Defendants

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of Robison, Belaustegui, Sharp & Low, and that on this date I caused to be served a true copy of the **ANSWER TO AMENDED COMPLAINT** all parties to this action by the method(s) indicated below:

X

by placing an original or true copy thereof in a sealed envelope, with sufficient postage affixed thereto, in the United States mail at Reno, Nevada, addressed to:

Gerald Gordon, Esq.
Mark M. Weisenmiller, Esq.
Teresa M. Pilatowicz, Esq.
GARMAN TURNER GORDON
650 White Drive, Suite 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
Attorneys for Plaintiff

X

by using the Court's CM/ECF Electronic Notification System addressed to:

Gerald Gordon, Esq.
Email: ggordon@Gtg.legal
Mark M. Weisenmiller, Esq.
Email: mweisenmiller@Gtg.legal
Teresa M. Pilatowicz, Esq.
Email: tpilatowicz@Gtg.legal

—

by personal delivery/hand delivery addressed to:

—

by facsimile (fax) addressed to:

—

by Federal Express/UPS or other overnight delivery addressed to:

DATED: This 2 day of June, 2015.



1 **3980**

2 GARMAN TURNER GORDON LLP
3 GERALD M. GORDON, ESQ.
4 Nevada Bar No. 229
5 E-mail: ggordon@gtg.legal
6 ERIKA PIKE TURNER, ESQ.
7 Nevada Bar No. 6454
8 E-mail: eturner@gtg.legal
9 TERESA M. PILATOWICZ, ESQ.
10 Nevada Bar No. 9605
11 E-mail: tpilatowicz@gtg.legal
12 650 White Drive, Ste. 100
13 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
14 Telephone 725-777-3000
15

16 *Proposed Attorneys to Trustee*

17 **IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF**
18 **THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE**

19 WILLIAM A. LEONARD, Trustee for the
20 Bankruptcy Estate of Paul Anthony
21 Morabito,

22 Plaintiff,

23 vs.

24 SUPERPUMPER, INC., an Arizona
25 corporation; EDWARD BAYUK,
26 individually and as Trustee of the EDWARD
27 WILLIAM BAYUK LIVING TRUST;
28 SALVATORE MORABITO, and individual;
and SNOWSHOE PETROLEUM, INC., a
New York corporation,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: CV13-02663

DEPT. NO.: 1

29 **AMENDED STIPULATION AND ORDER TO SUBSTITUTE A PARTY PURSUANT TO**
30 **NRCP 17(a)**

31 Plaintiff William A. Leonard, Jr. ("Leonard"), trustee for the Bankruptcy Estate of Paul
32 Anthony Morabito, by and through his counsel of record, Garman Turner Gordon, LLP, and
33 Defendants Superpumper, Inc.; Edward Bayuk, individually and as Trustee of the Edward

1 William Bayuk Living Trust; Snowshoe Petroleum, Inc.; and Salvatore Morabito (collectively,
2 "Defendants") by and through their attorneys of record, Robison, Belaustegui, Sharp & Low,
3 hereby jointly agree and stipulation as follows:¹

4 1. To remove JH, Inc., Jerry Herbst, and Berry-Hinkley Industries as plaintiff to this
5 action;

6 2. To substitute Leonard, the trustee for the Bankruptcy Estate of Paul A. Morabito,
7 as the plaintiff in this action under NRCP 17(a);

8 3. To remove Paul Morabito as a defendant to this action, both individually and as a
9 Trustee of the Arcadia Living Trust;

10 4. To remove the Arcadia Living Trust as a defendant to this action.

11 **AFFIRMATION**
12 **Pursuant to NRS 239B.030**


13 The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document does not contain the
14 social security number of any person.

15 DATED this 1 day of June, 2015.

16 GARMAN TURNER GORDON LLP

ROBISON BELAUSTEGUI SHARP & LOW

17
18 /s/ Teresa M. Pilatowicz
19 GERALD E. GORDON, ESQ.
20 ERIKA PIKE TURNER, ESQ.
21 TERESA M. PILATOWICZ, ESQ.
22 650 White Drive, Ste. 100
23 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
24 Telephone 725-777-3000


BARRY L. BRESLOW, ESQ.
FRANK C. GILMORE, ESQ.
71 Washington Street
Reno, Nevada 89503
Telephone 775-329-3151

25 *Proposed Attorneys for Trustee*

Attorneys for Defendants

26 ...

27 ¹ Plaintiffs JH, Inc., Jerry Herbst, and Berry-Hinckley Industries and Defendants, including Paul
28 Morabito, individually and as trustee of the Arcadia Living Trust, previously submitted a
stipulation to substitute Leonard, which was approved. The purpose of this Amended Stipulation
is to clarify that all Leonard is substituting if for all three previous plaintiffs, and that the Arcadia
Living Trust is being removed as a defendant

1 **4030**

GARMAN TURNER GORDON LLP

2 GERALD M. GORDON, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 229

3 E-mail: ggordon@gtg.legal

4 ERIKA PIKE TURNER, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 6454

5 E-mail: eturner@gtg.legal

TERESA M. PILATOWICZ, ESQ.

6 Nevada Bar No. 9605

E-mail: tpilatowicz@gtg.legal

7 650 White Drive, Ste. 100

8 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119

Telephone 725-777-3000

9 *Proposed Attorneys to Trustee*

10 **IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF**

11 **THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE**

12 WILLIAM A. LEONARD, Trustee for the
13 Bankruptcy Estate of Paul Anthony
14 Morabito,

15 Plaintiff,

16 vs.

17 SUPERPUMPER, INC., an Arizona
corporation; EDWARD BAYUK,
18 individually and as Trustee of the EDWARD
WILLIAM BAYUK LIVING TRUST;
19 SALVATORE MORABITO, and individual;
and SNOWSHOE PETROLEUM, INC., a
20 New York corporation,

21 Defendants.

CASE NO.: CV13-02663

DEPT. NO.: 1

22
23 **ORDER APPROVING AMENDED STIPULATION TO SUBSTITUTE A PARTY**
24 **PURSUANT TO NRCP 17(a)**

25 Pursuant to the foregoing Stipulation, IT IS SO ORDERED.

26 Dated this 15th day of June, 2015.

27 
28 DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of the Second Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, County of Washoe; that on this 16th day of June, 2015, I deposited in the County mailing system for postage and mailing with the United States Postal Service in Reno, Nevada, a true copy of the attached document addressed the individuals listed herein and/or electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of the Court by using the ECF system which will send a notice of electronic filing to the following: :

VIA ECF

Barry Breslow, Esq.

Frank Gilmore, Esq.


VIA MAIL

Gerald Gordan, Esq.

Teresa Pilotowicz, Esq.

650 White Drive, Ste. 100

Las Vegas, NV 89119



JUDICIAL ASSISTANT

2405
BARRY L. BRESLOW, ESQ. – NSB #3023

bbreslow@rbsllaw.com

FRANK C. GILMORE, ESQ. - NSB #10052

fgilmore@rbsllaw.com

Robison, Belaustegui, Sharp & Low

A Professional Corporation

71 Washington Street

Reno, Nevada 89503

Telephone: (775) 329-3151

Facsimile: (775) 329-7169

Attorneys for Defendants Snowshoe Petroleum,
Inc., Superpumper, Inc., Edward Bayuk, individually
and as Trustee of the Edward William Bayuk Living
Trust, and Salvatore Morabito.

IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT FOR THE STATE OF NEVADA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE

WILLIAM A. LEONARD, Trustee for the
Bankruptcy Estate of Paul Anthony Morabito

CASE NO.: CV13-02663

DEPT. NO.: B1

Plaintiffs,

vs.

SUPERPUMPER, INC., an Arizona corporation;
EDWARD BAYUK, individually and as Trustee
of the EDWARD WILLIAM BAYUK LIVING
TRUST; SALVATORE MORABITO, an
individual; and SNOWSHOE PETROLEUM,
INC., a New York corporation,

Defendants.


**MOTION TO PARTIALLY QUASH, OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, FOR A
PROTECTIVE ORDER PRECLUDING TRUSTEE FROM SEEKING DISCOVERY
PROTECTED BY THE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE**

Defendants SUPERPUMPER, INC., EDWARD BAYUK, individually and as Trustee of
the EDWARD WILLIAM BAYUK LIVING TRUST, SALVATORE MORABITO, and
SNOWSHOE PETROLEUM (collectively, “Defendants”) hereby move this Court to partially
quash, or, in the alternative, enter a protective order regarding the subpoena issued to non-party
DENNIS VACCO (“Vacco”), by plaintiff WILLIAM A. LEONARD, Trustee for the Bankruptcy

1 Estate of Paul Anthony Morabito ("Trustee"). This motion is made pursuant to NRCP 45, NRCP
2 27, and NRCP 37, and is based upon the attached memorandum of points and authorities, exhibits
3 and affidavits, and the pleadings and papers on file herein.

4 DATED this 10th day of March, 2016.

5 ROBISON, BELAUSTEGUI, SHARP & LOW
6 A Professional Corporation
7 71 Washington Street
8 Reno, Nevada 89503

9 
10 BARRY L. BRESLOW, ESQ.
11 FRANK C. DILMORE, ESQ.
12 Attorneys for Defendants Snowshoe Petroleum,
13 Inc., Superpumper, Inc., Edward Bayuk, individually
14 and as Trustee of the Edward William Bayuk Living
15 Trust, and Salvatore Morabito.

14 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

15 I. INTRODUCTION

16 Defendants seek an order from this Court partially quashing the subpoena issued to non-
17 party Dennis Vacco to the extent that subpoena seeks information protected by the Defendants'
18 attorney-client privilege. Alternatively, Defendants request that this Court enter a protective order
19 precluding the Trustee from seeking discovery of this information.¹ This relief is warranted
20 because the information that the Trustee intends to seek at Mr. Vacco's deposition, set to be
21 conducted on March 18, 2016, is protected by the attorney-client privilege. There has been no
22 waiver of that privilege, and the bankruptcy court's waiver of non-party Paul Morabito's attorney-
23 client privilege with Mr. Vacco did not and cannot waive Defendant's attorney-client privileges.
24 Because the right and existence of a privilege is a question of state law, this issue is properly
25 before this Court and is not within the jurisdiction of the bankruptcy court to rule upon. However,

26
27 ¹ Defendants properly seek this alternative relief from this Court in this motion. *See* WDCR 10(9)
28 (permitting motions to be filed in the same document if the motions are "pleaded in the
alternative").

1 should the Trustee seek to compel disclosure of this information from Mr. Vacco, the Trustee will
2 need to file his motions in New York, where Mr. Vacco is located, pursuant to NRCP 37.

3 **II. RELEVANT FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND.**

4 As this Court is aware, this dispute arises from the Trustee's contention that certain
5 conveyances made by non-party Paul Morabito to Defendants were intended to hide assets from
6 the creditors of Mr. Morabito's bankruptcy estate. Mr. Morabito's bankruptcy proceeding is
7 currently pending before Judge Zive. Part of that proceeding involves a dispute regarding the
8 discoverability of Mr. Morabito's communications with his New York attorney, Dennis Vacco.

9 Mr. Vacco also, at various times, represented Defendants. On March 9, 2016, counsel
10 received a letter from Mr. Vacco's law firm in which counsel was informed that the Trustee had
11 issued a subpoena to Mr. Vacco that touched upon information protected by the attorney-client
12 privilege. *See Exhibit 1* (March 9, 2016 Letter from Lippes); *see also Exhibit 2* (Affidavit of
13 Frank C. Gilmore, Esq.) at ¶ 4.

14 The subpoena to Mr. Vacco was issued by this Court and was served pursuant to a
15 commission from the New York court of relevant jurisdiction on September 2015. The subpoena,
16 as issued by this Court, does not, on its face, seek the disclosure of information protected by the
17 attorney-client privilege. *See Exhibit 3* (Subpoena). It was not until Mr. Vacco's law firm
18 revealed that the information that had been included clearly attorney-client and work product
19 privileged material. Exh. 2 at ¶ 5.

20 Pursuant to WDCR 12(6),² Defendants immediately contacted the Trustee to discuss this
21 issue. In that communication, Defendants advised the Trustee that they were unaware of the scope
22 the Trustee was seeking with regard to the documents and communications between Vacco and
23 Defendants. *See Exhibit 4* (Email chain); *see also* Exh. 2 at ¶ 6. As the Trustee made clear in its
24 response, he intends to seek any communication between Vacco, Mr. Morabito, and Defendants.

25 The Trustee bases his position on an order issued by Judge Zive in which Judge Zive
26 waived the attorney-client privilege between Vacco and Mr. Morabito. *See id.* That order did not

27 ² "All discovery motions shall include the certificate of moving counsel certifying that after
28 consultation with opposing counsel, they have been unable to resolve the matter." WDCR 12(6).

1 waive the attorney-client privilege between Defendants and Vacco. Judge Zive has no jurisdiction
2 to waive that privilege. This Court is the only court that can make that determination.

3 Accordingly, Defendants bring this current motion to quash, or, alternatively, for a protective order
4 protecting their privileged information.

5 **III. ARGUMENT**

6 **A. STANDARD OF REVIEW**

7 On a timely motion, “the court by which a subpoena was issued shall quash or modify the
8 subpoena if it . . . requires disclosure of privileged or other protected matter and no exception or
9 waiver applies.” NRCP 45(c)(3)(A)(iii). In addition, and alternatively, this Court has discretion to
10 enter a protective order “which justice requires to protect a person from annoyance,
11 embarrassment, oppression or undue burden or expense.” NRCP 26(c). This includes an order
12 mandating “that the discovery not be had,” or “that the discovery may be had only on specified
13 terms and conditions.” NRCP 26(c)(1)-(2).

14 **B. THE TRUSTEE IS NOT ENTITLED TO DISCOVER INFORMATION 15 PROTECTED BY THE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE.**

16 The attorney-client privilege “protects communications between clients or client
17 representatives and lawyers when made in furtherance of legal services.” *Coyote Springs Inv.,*
18 *LLC v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 131 Nev. ___, ___, 347 P.3d 267, 270 (2015). The client and/or
19 their attorney may refuse to disclose these communications. *Sloan v. State Bar of Nev.*, 102 Nev.
20 436, 441, 726 P.2d 330, 333 (1986). “The attorney-client privilege rests on the theory that
21 encouraging clients to make full disclosure to their attorneys enables the latter to act more
22 effectively, justly, and expeditiously, ***a benefit outweighing the risks posed to truth-finding.***”
23 *Haynes v. State*, 103 Nev. 309, 317, 739 P.2d 497, 502 (1987) (emphasis added).

24 It is well established that “[a] party is not entitled to discovery of information protected by
25 the attorney-client privilege.” *Navajo Nation v. Confederated Tribes & Bands of the Yakama*
26 *Indian Nation*, 331 F.3d 1041, 1046 (9th Cir. 2003). The attorney-client privilege is “the most
27 sacred of all legally recognized privileges, and its preservation is essential to the just and orderly
28 operation of our legal system.” *United States v. Bauer*, 132 F.3d 504, 510 (9th Cir. 1997). Thus,

1 “where the attorney-client privilege is concerned, *hard cases should be resolved in favor of the*
2 *privilege, not in favor of disclosure.*” *United States v. Mett*, 178 F.3d 1058, 1065 (9th Cir. 1999)
3 (emphasis added).

4 Here, the Trustee seeks information from Vacco that is unquestionably protected by the
5 attorney-client privilege. The Trustee is not entitled to discovery of this information. *Navajo*
6 *Nation*, 331 F.3d at 1046.

7 The Trustee cannot argue that the privilege as to Defendant’s communications with Vacco
8 has been waived because there has been no order entered establishing that Defendants’
9 communications with Vacco have been waived. The only order entered pertains to Mr. Morabito
10 and that order does not waive the protection of communications between Vacco and Defendants.
11 Accordingly, the subpoena must be quashed or modified to preclude discovery of this information.

12 **C. THIS COURT, AND NOT THE BANKRUPTCY COURT, IS THE PROPER**
13 **TRIBUNAL TO DECIDE THIS ISSUE.**

14 Where a state court action and a pending bankruptcy action involve the same parties, the
15 state court possesses jurisdiction over discovery disputes. *See, e.g., Lodi Mem’l Hosp. Ass’n, Inc.*
16 *v. Blue Cross of Am.*, No. CIV. 12-1071 WBS GGH, at *13 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 22, 2012) (federal
17 court refused to impose a fine relating to the filing of a frivolous notice of removal in order to
18 “refrain from exceeding its jurisdiction and inserting itself into disputes that occurred in state
19 court”); *GP Indus., LLC v. Bachman*, Nos. 8:06CV50, 8:06CV51, 2007 WL 4245786, at *2 n.3
20 (D. Neb. Nov. 29, 2007) (stating that where a party is accused “of failing to provide discovery in a
21 related matter now pending in state court, this court does not have the inclination – or jurisdiction
22 – to resolve any discovery disputes that arise in the state court proceeding.”).

23 Moreover, whether the attorney-client privilege applies is a substantive state law issue, and
24 Judge Zive conceded this point during his hearing in which he waived the privilege as to Morabito,
25 but did not waive the privilege as to Defendants. Accordingly, this Court is the proper tribunal to
26 modify the subpoena to prevent the Trustee from seeking communications and information
27 protected by the attorney-client privilege.

28 ///


1 **D. ANY MOTION TO COMPEL MUST BE BROUGHT IN NEW YORK.**

2 Because discovery to set to occur in New York, any motion to compel must be filed in New
3 York. "An application for an order to a deponent who is not a party shall be made to the court in
4 the district where the deposition is being, or is to be, taken." NRCP 37(a)(1). Accordingly,
5 because this is not the district where discovery will be taken, any motions to compel Vacco's
6 compliance must be brought in New York.

7 **IV. CONCLUSION**


8 For the foregoing reasons, Defendants respectfully request that this Court enter an order
9 modifying or quashing the subpoena, or in the alternative, enter a protective order, precluding the
10 Trustee from seeking discovery of communications and information protected by the attorney-
11 client privilege from Vacco. Defendants do not wish to obstruct the Trustee's right to discover
12 non-privileged information; Defendants merely wish to protect their privileged communications.
13 Accordingly, Defendants respectfully request that this Court grant their motion.

14 **AFFIRMATION**
15 **Pursuant to NRS 239B.030**

16 The undersigned does hereby affirm that this document does not contain the social security
17 number of any person. 

18 DATED this 10th day of March, 2016.

19 ROBISON, BELAUSTEGUI, SHARP & LOW
20 A Professional Corporation
21 71 Washington Street
22 Reno, Nevada 89503

23 
24 BARRY L. BRESLOW, ESQ.
25 FRANK C. GILMORE, ESQ.
26 Attorneys for Defendants Snowshoe Petroleum,
27 Inc., Superpumper, Inc., Edward Bayuk, individually
28 and as Trustee of the Edward William Bayuk Living
 Trust, and Salvatore Morabito.

J:\WPData\BLB\14359.001 Snowshoe adv. Herbst\P-Mtn Quash or Modify Vacco Subpoena 3-10-16.doc

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of Robison, Belaustegui, Sharp & Low, and that on this date I caused to be served a true copy of the MOTION TO PARTIALLY QUASH, OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER PRECLUDING TRUSTEE FROM SEEKING DISCOVERY PROTECTED BY THE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE all parties to this action by the method(s) indicated below:

by placing an original or true copy thereof in a sealed envelope, with sufficient postage affixed thereto, in the United States mail at Reno, Nevada, addressed to:

Gerald Gordon, Esq.
Mark M. Weisenmiller, Esq.
Teresa M. Pilatowicz, Esq.
GARMAN TURNER GORDON
650 White Drive, Suite 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
Attorneys for Plaintiff

by using the Court's CM/ECF Electronic Notification System addressed to:

Gerald Gordon, Esq.
Email: ggordon@Gtg.legal
Mark M. Weisenmiller, Esq.
Email: mweisenmiller@Gtg.legal
Teresa M. Pilatowicz, Esq.
Email: tpilatowicz@Gtg.legal

by personal delivery/hand delivery addressed to:

by email addressed to:

Gerald Gordon, Esq.
Email: ggordon@Gtg.legal
Mark M. Weisenmiller, Esq.
Email: mweisenmiller@Gtg.legal
Teresa M. Pilatowicz, Esq.
Email: tpilatowicz@Gtg.legal

by facsimile (fax) addressed to:

by Federal Express/UPS or other overnight delivery addressed to:

DATED: This 10th day of March, 2016.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

LIST OF EXHIBITS

<u>EXHIBIT NO.</u>	<u>DOCUMENT</u>	<u>NO. OF PAGES</u>
1	March 9, 2016 Letter from Lippe	2
2	Affidavit of Frank C. Gilmore, Esq.	2
3	Subpoena	14
4	Email chain	2

EXHIBIT 1

EXHIBIT 1



Lippes Mathias Wexler Friedman LLP

Attorneys at Law

Kevin Burke

Partner

kburke@lippes.com

March 9, 2016

Via Electronic Mail and First Class Mail

tlukas@hollandhart.com

Timothy A. Lukas

Holland & Hart LLP

5441 Kietzke Lane, Second Floor

Reno, Nevada 89511

fgilmore@rbsllaw.com

Frank C. Gilmore, Esq.

Robison, Belaustegui, Sharp and Low, P.C.

71 Washington Street

Reno, Nevada 89503

Re: Morabito - Subpoena

Dear Counselors:

I write to advise you of a subpoena that may impact the rights of your client(s). A copy of the subpoena is attached.

I have been advised that there are at least two pending motions concerning the subpoena. Although I am not personally familiar with the full scope of the factual and legal arguments at issue in these motions, I understand that the subjects of the motions touch upon attorney-client privilege and/or crim-fraud exception issues raised by the subpoena.


Please be advised that Mr. Vacco, the subject of the subpoena (and a related deposition notice), has been asked to appear and give testimony about records potentially relating to your client on Friday, March 18, 2016, at 50 Fountain Plaza, Suite 1700, Buffalo, New York 14202. If you intend to

March 9, 2016
Page Two

challenge any part of the subpoena, please do so with a court of competent jurisdiction (New York State Supreme Court, County of Erie) prior to March 18, 2016. Kindly notify me if you do, in fact, intend to seek an order in Erie County as soon as possible.

Very truly yours,

LIPPES MATHIAS WEXLER FRIEDMAN LLP

By: 
Kevin Burke

BKB/jad

Enclosure

cc: Garman Turner Gordon LLP

EXHIBIT 2

EXHIBIT 2

1 **AFFIDAVIT OF FRANK C. GILMORE, ESQ., IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO MODIFY**
2 **SUBPOENA, OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER**
3 **PRECLUDING TRUSTEE FROM SEEKING DISCOVERY PROTECTED BY THE**
4 **ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE**

5 STATE OF NEVADA)
6)ss.
7 COUNTY OF WASHOE)

8 I, FRANK C. GILMORE, being duly sworn, depose and state under penalty of perjury the
9 following:

10 1. I am an attorney licensed in Nevada and am counsel representing Defendants in
11 this matter. I am a shareholder with the law firm of Robison, Belaustegui, Sharp & Low.

12 2. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this affidavit, and if I am called
13 as a witness, I would and could testify competently as to each fact set forth herein.

14 3. I submit this affidavit in support of Defendants' Motion to Modify Subpoena, or,
15 in the Alternative, For a Protective Order Precluding Trustee From Seeking Discovery Protected
16 By the Attorney-Client Privilege ("Motion"), to which this affidavit is attached as Exhibit 2.

17 4. Attached as Exhibit 1 to the Motion is a true and correct copy of the March 9,
18 2016 letter that I received from Dennis Vacco's law firm.

19 5. From that letter, I first learned the scope of the documents the Trustee intends to
20 seek, which are discovery of communications protected by the attorney-client privilege.

21 6. Attached as Exhibit 4 to the Motion is a true and correct copy of the email chain
22 between me and counsel for Trustee, summarizing the meet and confer that we telephonically
23 conducted on this issue.

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///


///

///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

Dated this 10th March, 2016.


FRANK C. GILMORE, ESQ.

STATE OF NEVADA)
):ss.
COUNTY OF WASHOE)

Subscribed and sworn to before me
On this 10th day of March, 2016 by
Frank C. Gilmore, Esq.


NOTARY PUBLIC



J:\WPData\BLB\14359.001 Snowshoe adv. Herbst\P-Aff FCG ISO Mtn PO 3-10-16.doc

EXHIBIT 3

EXHIBIT 3

1 **2610**
2 GARMAN TURNER GORDON LLP
3 GERALD M. GORDON, ESQ.
4 Nevada Bar No. 229
5 E-mail: ggordon@gtg.legal
6 TERESA M. PILATOWICZ, ESQ.
7 Nevada Bar No. 9605
8 E-mail: tpilatowicz@gtg.legal
9 650 White Drive, Ste. 100
10 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
11 Telephone 725-777-3000

12 *Attorneys for William A. Leonard*

13 **IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF**
14 **THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE**

15 WILLIAM A. LEONARD, Trustee for the
16 Bankruptcy Estate of Paul Anthony
17 Morabito,

18 Plaintiff,

19 vs.

20 SUPERPUMPER, INC., an Arizona
21 corporation; EDWARD BAYUK,
22 individually and as Trustee of the EDWARD
23 WILLIAM BAYUK LIVING TRUST;
24 SALVATORE MORABITO, and individual;
25 and SNOWSHOE PETROLEUM, INC., a
26 New York corporation,

27 Defendants.

CASE NO.: CV13-02663

DEPT. NO.: 1

**NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENA
TO DENNIS VACCO**

28 Plaintiff, WILLIAM A LEONARD, Trustee for the Bankruptcy Estate of Paul Anthony
Morabito, by and through his counsel, GERALD M. GORDON and TERESA M. PILATOWIZ,
of the law firm of Garman Turner Gordon, hereby provide notice to Defendants of the issuance
of a Subpoena to testify at a deposition and produced documents upon Dennis Vacco. A copy of
the subpoena is attached hereto as Exhibit "1."

///

///

AFFIRMATION
Pursuant to NRS 239B.030

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

Dated this 29th day of January 2015.

GARMAN TURNER GORDON LLP

/s/ Teresa M. Pilatowicz
GERALD M. GORDON, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 229
TERESA M. PILATOWICZ, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 9605
650 White Drive, Suite 100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
Tel: (735) 777-3000
Attorneys for William A. Leonard

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 The undersigned, an employee of Garman Turner Gordon, hereby certifies that on the
3 29th day of September, 2015, she served a copy of the NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF
4 SUBPOENA TO DENNIS VACCO, to all interested parties via e-mail and U.S Mail system
5 addressed to:

6
7 Barry Breslow
8 Frank Gilmore
9 ROBISON, BELAUSTEGUI, SHARP & LOW
10 71 Washington Street
11 Reno, NV 89503

12 
13 An employee of Garman Turner Gordon
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT 1

EXHIBIT 1

1 3980
2 GARMAN TURNER GORDON LLP
3 GERALD M. GORDON, ESQ.
4 Nevada Bar No. 229
5 E-mail: ggordon@gtg.legal
6 TERESA M. PILATOWICZ, ESQ.
7 Nevada Bar No. 9605
8 E-mail: tpilatowicz@gtg.legal
9 650 White Drive, Ste. 100
10 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
11 Telephone 725-777-3000

12 *Attorneys for William A. Leonard*

13 **IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF**
14 **THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE**

15 WILLIAM A. LEONARD, Trustee for the
16 Bankruptcy Estate of Paul Anthony
17 Morabito,

18 Plaintiff,

19 vs.

20 SUPERPUMPER, INC., an Arizona
21 corporation; EDWARD BAYUK,
22 individually and as Trustee of the EDWARD
23 WILLIAM BAYUK LIVING TRUST;
24 SALVATORE MORABITO, and individual;
25 and SNOWSHOE PETROLEUM, INC., a
26 New York corporation,

27 Defendants.

CASE NO.: CV13-02663

DEPT. NO.: 1

SUBPOENA - CIVIL

☒ Regular ☒ Duces Tecum

28 **THE STATE OF NEVADA SENDS GREETINGS TO:**

Dennis Vacco
Lippes Mathias Wexler Friedman LLP
665 Main Street, Suite 300
Buffalo, New York 14203

YOU ARE HEREBY COMMANDED that all and singular, business and excuses set
aside, you (1) shall produce the documents requested below for inspection and copying¹ on

¹ Alternatively, the documents may be delivered electronically to tpilatowicz@gtg.legal prior to October 15, 2015.
If documents are provided electronically, no appearance to produce and permit inspection is necessary on October

1 October 15, 2015 at 10:00 a.m. and (2) shall appear and attend to present testimony on the 20th
2 day of October, 2015 at 10:00 a.m.. The address where you are required to appear is Key Center,
3 50 Fountain Plaza, Suite 1400, Buffalo, New York 14202. Your attendance is required to give
4 testimony and/or produce and permit inspection and copying of designated books, documents or
5 tangible things in your possession, custody or control, or to permit inspection of premises. If you
6 fail to attend, you may be deemed guilty of contempt of Court and liable to pay all losses and
7 damages caused by your failure to appear. Please see Exhibit "A" attached hereto for
8 information regarding the rights of the person subject to this Subpoena.

9 Dated this 24th day of September, 2015.

10 GARMAN TURNER GORDON LLP

11
12 /s/ Teresa M. Pilatowicz
13 GERALD E. GORDON, ESQ.
14 TERESA M. PILATOWICZ, ESQ.
15 650 White Drive, Ste. 100
16 Las Vegas, Nevada 89119
17 Telephone 725-777-3000

18 *Attorneys for William A. Leonard*

19 ITEMS TO BE PRODUCED

20 DEFINITIONS

- 21 1. "Action" means the above-captioned case pending in the Second Judicial District Court,
22 Washoe County, Nevada, at Case No. A CV13-02663.
- 23 2. "Communication" means any contact, oral or written, formal or informal, at any time or
24 any place under any circumstance whatsoever whereby any information of any nature
25 was transmitted or transferred, including but not limited to personal conversation,
26 conferences, telephone conversations, memoranda, letters, correspondence, electronic
27 correspondence, texts, reports, and publications.
- 28 3. "Document" shall be deemed to mean any printed, typewritten, handwritten, electronic,

15, 2015. (Continued)

1 or otherwise recorded matter of whatever character, whether original, master or copy
2 (whether still active, archived or transparent) and any copies or reproductions that are not
3 identical to the original, that is or has been in the possession, control or custody of you,
4 your attorney and/or all other person acting in your behalf or of which any of the
5 aforementioned persons have knowledge, other person acting in your behalf or of which
6 any of the aforementioned persons have knowledge, including, but not limited to, letters,
7 e-mail (internal and external), communications, correspondence, memoranda,
8 confirmations, facsimile transmittal sheets, transmittal forms, telegrams, notes,
9 summaries, minutes, contracts, subcontracts, purchase orders, leases, amendments,
10 change orders, proposals, requests for proposal, bids, marketing documents, reports,
11 studies, drawings, charts, diagrams, sketches, estimates, specifications, addenda,
12 schedules, directives, records of telephone conversations, staffing projections, records of
13 meetings and conferences, including lists of persons attending meetings or conferences,
14 summaries and records of personal conversations or interviews, exhibits, transcripts,
15 books, manuals, publications, diaries, logs, daily reports, status reports, minutes of
16 meetings, records, journals, entries in journals, charts, financial records and/or summaries
17 of financial records, work papers, bills, ledgers, financial statements, audit reports,
18 financial data, status sheets, contract status reports, tax returns, certificate of insurance,
19 agreements of suretyship and/or indemnification, insurance policies, calendars,
20 summaries of investigations and/or surveys, statistical compilations, audio or visual
21 recordings, photographs, cpm schedules, spreadsheets, computer or magnetic records,
22 computer memory (including that of any "transparent" information, information deleted
23 from the personal computer or file but not from the system), hard drives, floppy discs,
24 optical discs, CD-ROM discs, Bernoulli discs and their equivalents, magnetic tape,
25 disaster recovery back-up, compact disks, computer generated reports or summaries,
26 drafts of original or preliminary notes on and marginal comments appearing on any
27 documents, other reports and records, any other paper or physical thing containing
28 writing, photographic, imaged, or electronically recorded data, every copy of such
writing or records where the original is not in the possession, custody or control of the
aforementioned persons, and every copy of every such writing or record where such copy
contains any commentary or notation whatsoever that does not appear on the original.

19 4. "Morabito" means Paul Morabito.

20 5. "Plaintiff" or "Leonard" refers to Plaintiff William A. Leonard, Trustee.

21 6. "Relate" or "Relating to" or "Relative to" means constituting, comprising, containing,
22 setting forth, showing, disclosing, describing, explaining, summarizing, concerning, or
23 referring to directly or indirectly.

24 7. "YOU" OR "YOUR" means Dennis Vacco and Lippes Mathias Wexler Friedman LLP
25 and their agents, employees, heirs, assignees or representatives.

26 INSTRUCTIONS

27 1. These requests shall be deemed continuing and as additional information concerning the
28 answers is secured, such additional information shall be supplied to Plaintiff.

2. You shall produce all Documents in the manner in which they are maintained in the usual

1 course of business and/or shall organize and label Documents to correspond with the
2 categories of these requests. A request shall be deemed to include a request for any and
3 all file folders within which the document was contained, transmittal sheets, cover letters,
4 exhibits, enclosures, or attachments to the Document in addition to the Document itself.

5 3. In producing Documents and other materials, You are requested to furnish all Documents
6 or things in Your possession, custody, or control, regardless of whether such Documents
7 or materials are possessed by You directly or Your directors, officers, agents, employees,
8 representatives, subsidiaries, managing agents, affiliates, investigators, or by Your
9 attorneys or their agents, employees, representatives, or investigators.

10 4. If any Document is held under claim of privilege, please identify the Document for which
11 there is a claim of privilege and a full description thereof, including without limitation:

- 12 1. The date it bears;
- 13 2. The name of each person who prepared it or who participated in any way
14 in its preparation;
- 15 3. The name of each person who signed it;
- 16 4. The name of each person to whom it, or a copy of it was addressed;
- 17 5. The name of each person who presently has custody of it or a copy of it;
- 18 6. The subject matter and its substance; and
- 19 7. What factual basis there is for the claim of privilege.

20 5. If any Document requested to be produced was but is no longer in Your possession or
21 control, or is no longer in existence, state whether it is (1) missing or lost, (2) destroyed,
22 (3) transferred voluntarily or involuntarily to others and if so to whom, or (4) otherwise
23 disposed of; and in each instance explain the circumstances surrounding an authorization
24 of such disposition thereof and state the approximate date thereof.

25 6. In the event that Documents called for by any particular request have been lost or
26 destroyed, please state: (i) the date on which the Document(s) were lost or destroyed; (ii)
27 the manner in which the Document(s) were lost or destroyed; (iii) the identity of the
28 Document(s); (iv) the information contained within such Document(s) and the nature of
the Document(s); and (v) the identity of any person(s) who has knowledge of the
contents of the Document(s) or has received a copy of such Document(s).

7. Documents attached to each other should not be separated.

8. Documents not otherwise responsive to these requests shall be produced if such
Documents mention, discuss, refer to, or explain the Documents that are called for in a
request.

9. The term "and" as well as "or" shall be construed either disjunctively or conjunctively, as
necessary, to bring within the scope of these requests any information which might
otherwise be construed to be outside their scope.

10. Whenever appropriate, the singular form of a word shall be interpreted as plural and the
masculine gender shall be deemed to include feminine.

- 1 11. The fact that a Document has been produced by You or any other defendant in any other
2 litigation does not relieve You of Your obligation to produce your copy of the same
3 Document, even if the two Documents are identical

4 **DISCOVERY REQUESTS**

5 1. Any and all Documents constituting, relating to, or referring to your engagement
6 as counsel for Morabito between January 1, 2007 and December 31, 2014.

7 2. Any and all statements from January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2010
8 detailing the descriptions of and amount billed for services provided by you to Paul A. Morabito
9 or any third party on his behalf.

10 3. Any and all documents sufficient to identify any and all payments made from
11 January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2010 to you by Paul Morabito or a third party on his
12 behalf.

13 4. Any and all documents sufficient to identify any and all payments made by You
14 to any third party on Morabito's behalf from January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2010.

15 5. Any and all Documents constituting, relating to, or referring to services
16 performed by you with respect to the transfer of property located at 8355 Panorama Drive, Reno,
17 Nevada to the Arcadia Living Trust on or about October 1, 2010. This includes, but is not limited
18 to, opinion letters, written agreements relating to the transfer, including drafts, and valuations of
19 the real and personal property located at 8355 Panorama Drive, Reno, Nevada whether ordered
20 by You, obtained by You, or otherwise in Your file.

21 6. Any and all Documents constituting, relating to, or referring to services
22 performed by you with respect to the transfer of property located at 371 El Camino Del Mar,
23 Laguna Beach, California to the Edward William Bayuk Living Trust (the "Bayuk Living Trust")
24 on or about October 1, 2010. This includes, but is not limited to, opinion letters, written
25 agreements relating to the transfer, including drafts, and valuations of the real and personal
26 property located at 371 El Camino Del Mar, Laguna Beach, California whether ordered by You,
27 obtained by You, or otherwise in Your file.

28 7. Any and all Documents constituting, relating to, or referring to services

1 performed by you with respect to the transfer of property located at 370 Los Olivos, Laguna
2 Beach, California to the Bayuk Living Trust on or about October 1, 2010. This includes, but is
3 not limited to, opinion letters, written agreements relating to the transfer, including drafts, and
4 valuations of the real and personal property located at 370 Los Olivos, Laguna Beach, California
5 whether ordered by You, obtained by You, or otherwise in Your file.

6 8. Any and all Documents constituting, relating to, or referring to services
7 performed by you with respect to the transfer of the Arcadia Living Trust's ownership interest in
8 Baruk Properties, LLC on or about October 1, 2010. This includes, but is not limited to, opinion
9 letters, written agreements relating to the transfer, including drafts, and valuations of the assets
10 owned by Baruk Properties, LLC whether ordered by You, obtained by You, or otherwise in
11 Your file. Such assets include, but are not limited to, the real and personal property located at
12 1254 Mary Flemming Circle, Palm Springs, California; 1461 Glenneyre St., Laguna Beach,
13 California; 520 Glenneyre St., Laguna Beach, California; and 49 Clayton Place, Sparks, Nevada.

14 9. Any and all Documents constituting, relating to, or referring to services
15 performed by you relating to the sale of Paul A. Morabito's 80% interest in Superpumper, Inc. to
16 Snowshoe Petroleum on or about September 30, 2010. This includes, but is not limited to,
17 opinion letters, written agreements relating to the transfer, including drafts, and valuations of
18 Morabito's interest in Superpumper, Inc. whether ordered by You, obtained by You, or otherwise
19 in Your file.

20 10. Any and all Documents constituting, relating to, or referring to Communications
21 between you and any employee of Matrix Capital Markets Group, Inc. regarding any valuations
22 requested by You of Superpumper, Inc.

23 11. Any and all promissory notes drafted by You between January 1, 2010 and
24 December 31, 2010 at the request of Morabito, or at the request of any third party on Morabito's
25 behalf.

26 12. Any and all Documents related to or referring to promissory notes drafted by You
27 between January 1, 2010 and December 31, 2010 at the request of Morabito, or at the request of
28 any third party on Morabito's behalf including, but not limited to, any ledgers regarding

1 payments on such promissory notes.

2 13. Any and all Communications between You and any third party regarding
3 promissory notes drafted by You between January 1, 2010 and December 31, 2012 at the request
4 of Morabito, or at the request of any third party on Morabito's behalf.

5 14. Any and all Documents sufficient to identify any and all payments Received in
6 any of Your accounts from Sefton Trustees on Morabito's behalf between September 15, 2010
7 and the date of Your response to these requests.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

STATE OF NEVADA)
) ss:
COUNTY OF CLARK)

_____, being duly sworn says: That at all times
herein affiant was over 18 years of age, not a party to nor interested in the proceeding in which
this affidavit is made. That affiant received the Subpoena on the __ day of _____, 2015,
and served the same on the _____ day of _____, 2015 by delivering a copy to
the witness at: _____

I declare under penalty of perjury under the law of the State of Nevada that the foregoing
is true and correct.

EXECUTED this ____ day of _____, 2015.

Signature of person making service

EXHIBIT "A"

NEVADA RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

Rule 45:

(c) **Protection of Persons Subject to Subpoenas.**

(1) A party or an attorney responsible for the issuance and service of a subpoena shall take reasonable steps to avoid imposing undue burden or expense on a person subject to that subpoena. The court on behalf of which the subpoena was issued shall enforce this duty and impose upon the party or attorney in breach of this duty an appropriate sanction, which may include, but is not limited to, lost earnings and a reasonable attorney's fee.

(2)(A) A person commanded to produce and permit inspection and copying of designated books, papers, documents or tangible things, or inspection of premises need not appear in person at the place of production or inspection unless commanded to appear for deposition, hearing or trial.

(B) Subject to paragraph (d)(2) of this rule, a person commanded to produce and permit inspection and copying may, within 14 days after service of the subpoena or before the time specified for compliance if such time is less than 14 days after service, serve upon the party or attorney designated in the subpoena written objection to inspection or copying of any or all of the designated materials or of the premises. If objection is made, the party serving the subpoena shall not be entitled to inspect and copy the materials or inspect the premises except pursuant to an order of the court by which the subpoena was issued. If objection has been made, the party serving the subpoena may, upon notice to the person commanded to produce, move at any time for an order to compel the production. Such an order to compel production shall protect any person who is not a party or an officer of a party from significant expense resulting from the inspection and copying commanded.

(3)(A) On timely motion, the court by which a subpoena was issued shall quash or modify the subpoena if it

- (i) fails to allow reasonable time for compliance;
- (ii) requires a person who is not a party or an officer of a party to travel to a place more than 100 miles from the place where that person resides, is employed or regularly transacts business in person, except that, subject to the provisions of clause (c)(3)(B)(iii) of this rule, such a person may in order to attend trial be commanded to travel from any such place within the state in which the trial is held, or
- (iii) requires disclosure of privileged or other protected material and no exception or waiver applies, or
- (iv) subjects a person to undue burden.

(B) If a subpoena

- (i) requires disclosure of a trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information, or
- (ii) requires disclosure of an unretained expert's opinion or information not describing specific events or occurrences in dispute and resulting from the expert's study made not at the request of any party,

the court may, to protect a person subject to or affected by the subpoena, quash or modify the subpoena, or, if the party in whose behalf the subpoena is issued shows a substantial need for the testimony or material that cannot be otherwise met without undue hardship and assures that the person to whom the subpoena is addressed will be reasonably compensated, the court may order appearance or production only upon specified conditions.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

(d) Duties in Responding to Subpoena.

- (1) A person responding to a subpoena to produce documents shall produce them as they are kept in the usual course of business or shall organize and label them to correspond with the categories in the demand.
- (2) When information subject to a subpoena is withheld on a claim that it is privileged or subject to protection as trial preparation materials, the claim shall be made expressly and shall be supported by a description of the nature of the documents, communications, or things not produced that is sufficient to enable the demanding party to contest the claim.

EXHIBIT 4

EXHIBIT 4

Frank Gilmore

From: Teresa Pilatowicz <tpilatowicz@Gtg.legal>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 10:56 AM
To: Frank Gilmore
Cc: Mary Carroll Davis; Vicki DiMaio; Gerald Gordon
Subject: RE: Superpumper

Please see my responses below

Teresa M. Pilatowicz
Attorney

Phone: 725 777 3000
Direct: 702 478 0559
Fax: 725 777 3112

GARMAN | TURNER | GORDON
2415 E. CAMELBACK RD., SUITE 700
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85016

Visit us online at www.gtg.legal

From: Frank Gilmore [mailto:FGilmore@rbsllaw.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 11:16 AM
To: Teresa Pilatowicz <tpilatowicz@Gtg.legal>
Cc: Mary Carroll Davis <MDavis@rbsllaw.com>
Subject: Superpumper

Teresa,

Confirming our call just now:

1. It was my understanding that Judge Zive had requested that we confer prior to the filing of a brief on the issue of the Vacco deposition. I saw the brief and was a little surprised it was filed prior to us discussing the issues; nevertheless, we have now had the chance to discuss them.

I reviewed the Order Granting Motion to Compel Responses to Deposition Questions (the "Order") again and disagree there was any requirement to confer prior to the filing of the brief. As such, we filed the brief ten days prior to the deposition, as required by the Order.

2. Debtor will not be asserting a privilege on the existing Vacco subpoena. I have tried to make that as clear as possible.
3. I was not aware that the trustee was seeking documents and communications which do not involve the debtor. I understand the trustee seeks documents and communications related to the transfers, irrespective of Morabito's involvement therein. In other words, I understand that the Trustee is taking the position that Judge Zive's waiver of debtor's privilege with Vacco entirely eviscerated ALL the Superpumper Defendants' privileges with Vacco, as to all files, papers, and communications.

For purposes of Vacco's deposition and the subpoena relating thereto, we will not seek documents to which Morabito is not a party. We reserve all rights to do so in the future.

4. As to the issue of privilege, I believe there is a fundamental legal difference between communications with Vacco and Edward or Sam alone, and communications with Vacco, Edward, Sam and Morabito together. You have told me that the trustee seeks both types of communications, provided that they relate to the transactions at issue in the Superpumper case. Even if a joint interest privilege has been waived as to communications with Morabito (which I do not concede), I do not agree that the Trustee can then waive the privilege as to communications with non-debtor entities or persons when the debtor was not involved in the communication, irrespective of the topic areas. Because we now have a dispute about this where I was not aware that one existed previously, I will instruct Vacco, on behalf of the Superpumper defendants, to not produce any documents until a court of competent jurisdiction can make a ruling on the privilege issue. Moreover, now that we understand the scope of the Trustee's intent, the documents must be made available to the privilege holders to determine if/how a privilege applies prior to any effort to disclose them to the trustee.

The first issue is resolved by the Trustee's agreement to seek only seek production of communications to which Debtor is a party. The Trustee reserves his rights to seek such documents in the future. With respect to the documents to which Debtor is a party, the Bankruptcy Court has ordered that the privilege has been waived as to the Debtor. As is clear from the Nevada Bankruptcy Court Case of In re Hotels Nevada, Inc., 458 B.R. 560, this includes all communications with Debtor, whether or not they include other parties. Therefore these documents must be produced. This is not a new dispute of which you just became aware. This has been an ongoing dispute with respect to other documents sought in the bankruptcy cases. Furthermore, the subpoena was first served in September 2015. It generally sought all documents regarding the transfers that are the subject of the state court case. The Order Granting Motion to Compel Responses to Deposition Questions was entered on February 3. Notwithstanding that the subpoena was issued six months ago and the order regarding the subpoena was issued over a month ago, we have never been provided any sort of privilege log from any party asserting any privileges. As you know, the party asserting the privilege has the burden of proving its application. No effort has been made to do so in this case.

5. We do not agree that the Bankruptcy court has jurisdiction to (a) waive any joint interest privilege for any non-debtor entities or persons, and (2) compel Vacco to produce documents. We believe the proper venue is the state court in the venue where the documents are being sought: Eire County, New York.

As was determined by the Bankruptcy Court at the initial hearing on this matter, the Bankruptcy Court properly has jurisdiction over issues regarding the Debtor's privilege. The Bankruptcy Court has ordered that there is no privilege as to the Debtor's communications as a result of the crime fraud exception and, to the extent there is a privilege the Trustee has waived it. As a result, Vacco has been instructed to by Trustee and the Court to turn over the Debtor's communications. Any refusal to provide documents to which the Trustee holds the privilege is a matter for the Bankruptcy Court.

Please advise if you think I have not adequately stated our respective positions on the telephone.

FRANK C. GILMORE, ESQ.
ROBISON, BELAUSTEGUI, SHARP AND LOW, P.C.
71 WASHINGTON STREET
RENO, NV 89503
PH: (775) 329-3151
FAX: (775) 329-7169
fgilmore@rbsllaw.com

DATE, JUDGE
OFFICERS OF
COURT PRESENT

APPEARANCES-HEARING

CONTINUED TO

02/24/16

HONORABLE

JANET J. BERRY

DEPT. NO. 1

M. Schuck

(Clerk)

E. Ferretto

(Reporter)

Deputy Manor

(Bailiff)

PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE

Plaintiff, William Leonard, Jr., present and represented by Gabrielle Hamm, Esq. and Teresa Pilatowicz, Esq.

Defendant, Superpumer, without a representative present and represented by Barry Breslow, Esq. and Frank Gilmore, Esq.

Defendant Edward Bayuk, not present and Barry Breslow, Esq. and Frank Gilmore, Esq.

Defendant, Edward William Bayuk Living Trust, without a representative present and represented by Barry Breslow, Esq. and Frank Gilmore, Esq.

Defendant, Snowshoe Petroleum, Inc., without a representative present and represented by Barry Breslow, Esq. and Frank Gilmore, Esq.

Defendant, Salvatore Morabito, not present and represented by Barry Breslow, Esq. and Frank Gilmore, Esq.

John Murtha, Esq. was present behind the bar.

JH, Inc., Jerry Herbst, Berry-Hinckley Industries, Paul Morabito and Arcadia Living Trust were substituted as per stipulation and order filed on May 15, 2015.

Court convened at 1:45 p.m.

Counsel Pilatowicz indicated the parties were working through discovery, referenced the March 31, 2016 deadline for depositions, noted depositions were scheduled. She noted the parties had discussed trial length and further noted defense counsel had a different view on the trial length. She suggested new dates be discussed. She addressed issues with depositions for Mr.

Bernstein and witness deposition that was completed five years ago. Plaintiffs believe a new deposition was necessary as to Daryl Noble. She referenced disclosure of tax and noted there were approximately eight to nine depositions.

Counsel Gilmore noted there were approximately ten depositions and believed Mr. Bernstein's deposition would be at least one day.

Counsel Pilatowicz discussed testimony via depositions and referenced the pretrial order deadlines.

Court addressed and explained the submission process to be followed by counsel. She noted any discovery dispute would be handled by the discovery commissioner. She noted trial statements were to include causes of action, articulation the witnesses, case authority and the elements.

Court referenced the pending trial setting.

6/06/16 at
9:30 a.m. for
Bench Trial
(3 weeks)

She directed Counsel to meet and confer and designate on how they wanted to interpose objections accompanied with legal basis as to the video depositions. She addressed trial logistics.

Counsel Gilmore addressed case history as to Mr. Stanton Bernstein and questioned as to why he was the last witness to be deposed, he further addressed discovery issues pending with Commissioner Ayres.

Court noted she would take issue with Counsel regarding Mr. Bernstein.

Counsel Gilmore indicated they would have approximately 15 live witnesses and 4 depositions would be read from the stand. He was concerned there would be more witnesses than time.

Court indicated trial could commence on June 6, 2016.

Counsel Breslow requested trial commence on June 8, 2016 due to a prior engagement.

COURT ORDERED: Trial reset to June 06, 2016 at 9:30 a.m. and noted Counsel Breslow could be excused for the first two days as Counsel Gilmore could handle the pretrial motions and any other pending issues that would be taken up during the first two days of trial. Court indicated she would conduct a criminal calendar only on Tuesday of said week, so the rest of the week would be dedicated to the trial.

Counsel Gilmore addressed appraisals and valuations.

Court questioned if briefing would be necessary; Counsel

Pilatowicz explained Plaintiff's position and addressed privacy.

Counsel Hamm addressed the issue with the files following the many different attorneys that were previously on the matter.

Counsel Pilatowicz continued to explain her position.

Counsel noted Mr. Bernstein was a critical witness, she directed Counsel to contact his attorney, indicated the Court wanted to review his deposition and directed all Counsel to meet and confer prior to leaving the courtroom with their calendars. She suggested Counsel offer to move up the deposition and not back. Further suggested Counsel cross check their files and indicated if matters needed attention Counsel could do a setting form.

Court and Counsel discussed a settlement conference.

COURT ORDERED: Final pre-trial conference set for week of April 11, 2016. Counsel to set with Court's Judicial Assistant. Further Counsel to discuss setting a settlement conference in April or first part of May.

Matter concluded at 3:05 p.m.

4185
SUNSHINE LITIGATION
151 Country Estates Circle
Reno, Nevada 89512

THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE
BEFORE THE HONORABLE JANET J. BERRY, DISTRICT JUDGE

-o0o-

JH, INC.; et al.,	:	
	:	
Plaintiffs,	:	
	:	
vs	:	Case No. CV13-02663
	:	
PAUL MORABITO; et al.,	:	Dept. No. 1
	:	
Defendants.	:	
	:	

=====

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 24TH, 2016

Reno, Nevada

Reported By: ERIN T. FERRETTO, RPR, CCR #281

*** SUNSHINE LITIGATION ***

A P P E A R A N C E S

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:

TERESA PILATOWICZ, ESQ.
GABRIELLE HAMM, ESQ.
Garman Turner Gordon
2415 E. Camelback Road
Suite 700
Phoenix, Arizona 85016

FOR THE DEFENDANTS:

FRANK GILMORE, ESQ.
BARRY L. BRESLOW, ESQ.
Robison, Belaustegui, Sharp
& Low
71 Washington Street
Reno, Nevada 89503

ALSO PRESENT:

JOHN MURTHA, ESQ.

1 -o0o-

2 RENO, NEVADA, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 24TH, 2016, 1:50 P.M.

3 -o0o-

4
5
6 THE COURT: Please be seated. Thank you for your
7 patience on the docket.

8 This is JH, Inc., et al., versus Paul Morabito,
9 CV13-02663. We are scheduled for a 10-day, non-jury
10 trial commencing June 13th, three months from trial.

11 Counsel, can you tell me where we are?

12 MS. PILATOWICZ: Good morning, your Honor,
13 Teresa -- or good afternoon, Teresa Pilatowicz and
14 Gabrielle Hamm on behalf the plaintiff. Also present in
15 the courtroom is William Leonard, who is the Chapter 7
16 trustee and the plaintiff, and his bankruptcy counsel
17 John Murtha.

18 THE COURT: Okay.

19 MR. GILMORE: Good afternoon, your Honor. Frank
20 Gilmore and my partner Barry Breslow for the defendant.

21 MS. PILATOWICZ: Your Honor, the parties have been
22 working through discovery. We have a discovery cutoff
23 date of December -- I'm sorry -- March 31st. We've got
24 approximately 10 to 15 depositions scheduled in March.

____** SUNSHINE LITIGATION **____

1 We anticipate being able to complete discovery by the end
2 of March with some limited exceptions that we would like
3 to address today to see if we can resolve them.

4 I think that we had some discussions before the --
5 before the conference about whether two weeks was still a
6 realistic trial date. I believe the question first for
7 your Honor is whether the courtroom is closed on Friday
8 afternoons?

9 THE COURT: No. We can now -- we have -- that was
10 two chief judges ago. So now this Chief Judge says we
11 can continue trial through Friday afternoon.

12 MS. PILATOWICZ: Okay. Then we are looking at a
13 full 10 days. I'm optimistic we can do it in 10 days. I
14 believe the defendants have a different position and I'll
15 let them give you their position.

16 If we have to go beyond that 10 days, it would be
17 our preference to perhaps set a new trial date so that
18 we're not breaking it up to two weeks and then something
19 later because, in the plaintiff's view, the series of
20 transactions make a whole lot more sense when they're all
21 put together and any loss in time might lead to some
22 confusion.

23 Do you want me to discuss the discovery issues
24 that we anticipate coming up at the close of discovery?

1 THE COURT: Sure.

2 MS. PILATOWICZ: The first issue we have is one
3 deponent, his name is Stanton Bernstein, he is a CPA who
4 is located out in California. He was timely noticed for
5 a deposition in mid-March. His counsel has reached out
6 to me, because he is a CPA, a solo CPA in tax season, it
7 is difficult for him to come in. He requested that his
8 deposition be conducted after April 15th.

9 Mr. Gilmore and I have spoke about some potential
10 resolutions to get that done. I believe at this point
11 the defendants aren't willing to agree to our proposal,
12 which was that we hold the deposition at the end of April
13 with a limited additional 30 days for discovery in case
14 any other issues come out in that deposition so that
15 discovery would still be completely closed by the end of
16 May, gives a little time before trial. But I don't
17 anticipate any new issues are going to come up from that
18 deposition, though there's always a possibility.

19 We are prepared to go back to Stanton Bernstein's
20 counsel and let him know if we can't reach an agreement
21 and we have to get it done by March 31st that we'll
22 require him to sit for the deposition. We are trying to
23 accommodate the witness given his job as a CPA. So
24 that's the first issue with depositions.

—** SUNSHINE LITIGATION **—

1 There's another issue pending of a witness that
2 was deposed five years ago in a -- in the case that led
3 to the judgment after which these transfers occurred.
4 The defendants have requested that we do not depose the
5 same person the same time because they believe that the
6 issues are the same. It's our position that the counsel
7 are different, the parties are different, we're
8 representing the trustee. We have requested a copy of
9 the transcript for that deposition. We're looking it
10 over and have agreed to let counsel know by next week
11 whether we intend to proceed with a new deposition or if
12 we'll use the transcript. That's the second deposition
13 issue.

14 THE COURT: What is the name of that witness?

15 MS. PILATOWICZ: Darryl Noble; he is an appraiser.

16 THE COURT: He's an appraiser?

17 MS. PILATOWICZ: He is an appraiser, but not a
18 retained appraiser for this case. He did an appraisal
19 back in 2010.

20 THE COURT: Okay.

21 MS. PILATOWICZ: There's an issue with disclosure
22 of tax returns that I believe we have reached an
23 agreement on. There was a request from the plaintiff
24 that tax returns be produced. There was an objection

1 from defendants that the request was too broad. We've
2 agreed to limit it. I believe we're still in discussions
3 but I believe that we can reach an agreement on that so
4 that shouldn't be an issue but it may be something that
5 comes up before the court. And I believe that is the
6 extent of the deposition issues.

7 There is written discovery outstanding. There's,
8 like I said, still depositions scheduled.

9 THE COURT: So how many depositions do you have
10 for the month -- from now to the end of March?

11 MS. PILATOWICZ: We have, I believe, it's eight or
12 nine.

13 THE COURT: Is that what you understand,
14 Mr. Gilmore?

15 MR. GILMORE: I suppose it could be as few as
16 eight, it could be as many as ten.

17 THE COURT: So we have eight to ten depositions
18 left to be completed, and that would include Stanton
19 Bernstein, the solo CPA?

20 MS. PILATOWICZ: Correct.

21 THE COURT: What is Mr. Bernstein's global
22 involvement in all of this?

23 MS. PILATOWICZ: Mr. Bernstein had prepared the
24 tax returns for the individual defendants at the time

1 that the transfers occurred and the certain audits and
2 tax returns for Superpumper, the value of which is an
3 issue in this case, the value of Superpumper.

4 THE COURT: So he is an important witness in the
5 case?

6 MR. GILMORE: Critical. One of the top three
7 probably.

8 THE COURT: Okay. How long do you think his
9 deposition is going to take?

10 MS. PILATOWICZ: I believe it could be completed
11 in six hours, likely less but six hours given the
12 outside.

13 MR. GILMORE: Well, herein lies the difficulty.
14 Nobody really knows what he's going to say. So I'll
15 address this more sort of when it's my turn, but I expect
16 it would be a day or less based on what I expect of his
17 knowledge base and his involvement in the preparation of
18 the tax returns.

19 THE COURT: Okay. So anything else for the
20 plaintiffs?

21 MS. PILATOWICZ: I believe those are the discovery
22 issues. We do have some issues that we'd like to preview
23 for trial as far as how stuff will be presented.

24 There's going to be some testimony by deposition

1 and we'd like to know how the court is going to handle
2 that so we can start setting dates and preparing for how
3 we're going to address that.

4 The other issue we had was the pre-trial order has
5 deadlines for motions in limine to be submitted and
6 dispositive motions. Those deadlines are based on the
7 dates that they're submitted. I just wanted some
8 clarification on exactly what we're meaning by *submitted*.
9 Is it after hearing? Is it after the motion is filed?
10 Is it after motion and opposition? Just so we're sure on
11 the deadlines, if we could set the deadlines so we know
12 the dates we're working with.

13 THE COURT: Okay. Well, we haven't had a trial
14 together before. Do you mainly practice in Vegas or
15 here?

16 MS. PILATOWICZ: I mainly practice in Vegas.

17 THE COURT: Okay. So -- and I ask that only
18 because our system is a bit different. There will be --
19 any time we have motion practice, there will be a motion,
20 an opposition, a reply, and then whoever is the proponent
21 of the motion, you'll file your reply and when you do
22 that you'll file the submission. If you fail to file the
23 submission, I won't know you have a motion. It will
24 never come to court. We do not do law and motion

1 calendar like they do in Vegas --

2 MS. PILATOWICZ: Understood.

3 THE COURT: -- everything is submitted but
4 oftentimes attorneys will forget to submit.

5 Additionally, any of these discovery disputes that
6 can't be resolved between counsel will go immediately to
7 the discovery commissioner. I won't see them. I can
8 certainly tell you what I think should happen with these
9 things and what I think Commissioner Ayres will recommend
10 and what I would be inclined to believe would be the
11 appropriate outcome of them.

12 And then generally what we do is I don't address
13 any of your motions in limine. This is a non-jury trial
14 so I don't anticipate having a lot of those. The most
15 important thing that I look for in a non-jury trial is
16 your trial statement. So the recipe that is before the
17 court is your complaint and all of the information you
18 have in your files.

19 So if you have five causes of action, then my
20 expectation is your trial statement will go over each one
21 of those causes of action, will articulate the witnesses
22 who will support your claims, and will provide me all of
23 the relevant case authority, and all the elements of each
24 of your claims. And if you are going to drop some claims

---** SUNSHINE LITIGATION **---

1 or not pursue those claims, opposing counsel should meet
2 and confer because in a non-jury trial I have to consider
3 each and every claim before the court. And oftentimes in
4 non-jury trials counsel forgets that and so they just
5 sort of start throwing stuff out there and, to me, I have
6 to apply the law to the facts as you present them, and I
7 have to know what facts you think support your claims by
8 a preponderance of the evidence. So the trial statement
9 can be -- is critical to a trial judge in a non-jury
10 trial.

11 Motions in limine, you know, not so much. And
12 what I generally do is because you have a June trial
13 date, we will have a final pre-trial conference, we will
14 have -- I imagine this is going to be exhibit
15 intensive --

16 MS. PILATOWICZ: Yes.

17 THE COURT: -- would you say?

18 MS. PILATOWICZ: Yes.

19 THE COURT: So we will have exhibit marking, and
20 if you have -- are you going to have video depositions?

21 MS. PILATOWICZ: We anticipate we will.

22 THE COURT: Okay. So then what we generally do is
23 the Friday before trial you can get in here and you can
24 get everything set up. You have these nice screens that

1 have been provided -- Maria, ABA? Or, no. Nevada Trial
2 Lawyers?

3 THE CLERK: It was the Nevada Bar.

4 THE COURT: Nevada Bar. They were so kind. So we
5 now have -- although, I don't know why they put it so
6 high, it should come down a bit. Anyway, you can get
7 everything set up, and but you're responsible for all the
8 IT stuff.

9 Additionally, we've been asked to remind counsel
10 that at the conclusion of trial, when everybody is
11 exhausted and everybody wants to go home and you have all
12 to junk here, you've got demonstrative exhibits, you have
13 10 million books of stuff, the fire marshal is telling us
14 that we have to clean out the evidence room so we will --
15 the court clerks will be encouraging you to take whatever
16 needs to be taken. Okay? So does that assist a little
17 bit?

18 MS. PILATOWICZ: That does assist with the
19 deadline for submission.

20 MS. HAMM: Do you mind if I --

21 THE COURT: Go ahead, if you have a question.

22 THE CLERK: Your Honor, also the --

23 MS. PILATOWICZ: I believe that's all we have at
24 this time, your Honor.

---** SUNSHINE LITIGATION **---

1 THE COURT: Question?

2 MS. HAMM: Not yet.

3 THE COURT: Not yet, okay.

4 MS. PILATOWICZ: I'm not sure if we want to go
5 through sort of the discovery issues and then deal with
6 the trial issues, specifically the designation of
7 deposition transcripts. That was the inquiry, is whether
8 we're going to set deadlines for them to be exchanged,
9 for objections to be made to the deposition transcripts,
10 if they're going to be published in court, if they're
11 just going to be submitted to your Honor. I wasn't sure
12 if we wanted to get into the trial issue of that just
13 yet.

14 THE COURT: Well, I'm not going to do that.
15 You'll have to meet and confer and you'll have to
16 designate every portion of the transcript that you want a
17 ruling on. And, again, in a non-jury trial it's not that
18 big of a deal, but for your appellant record certainly it
19 is. So what I've done in the past is -- it's a
20 tremendous amount of time that counsel needs to do
21 if you're sitting depos just objecting, you know, hither
22 and yon, then be ready to spend hours and hours and
23 hours. This has happened in previous cases where every
24 single section of the deposition is notated and you

—** SUNSHINE LITIGATION **—

1 interpose your objection -- and don't give me objections
2 like, *Objection, doesn't sound good*. I mean, give me a
3 legal basis for each objection, *Objection*, you know,
4 *asked and answered* -- I mean, let's have some relevance
5 there.

6 So the good news is you don't have a jury;
7 right -- we're non-jury?

8 MS. PILATOWICZ: Right.

9 THE COURT: When we've had to do this with jury
10 trials, then you have to go through and redact the entire
11 video. Now, if you want to do that and you want to do
12 that pre-trial, I've done that before where I've spent,
13 you know, six or seven hours with counsel and we go
14 through the entire video and make all the rulings, and
15 then I order all the redactions. It is a substantial
16 amount of work but, again, it's your appellant record so
17 you'll have to make that judgment call.

18 MS. PILATOWICZ: Then we will meet and confer on
19 that issue.

20 THE COURT: See how you want to handle it. Okay.
21 Mr. Gilmore? Mr. Breslow?

22 MR. GILMORE: Thank you, your Honor.

23 I think before I get into the four issues that
24 Ms. Pilatowicz mentioned, I think some context is

1 important.

2 The court will recall that about May of 2015 there
3 was a substitution of counsel that was necessitated by
4 virtue of the fact that the trustee took over this case,
5 but that's relevant with respect to the discovery
6 disputes because it sort of belies or refutes, if you
7 will, some of the contentions that the plaintiff might be
8 making with respect to what they actually need for
9 discovery, and let me explain to the court what I mean by
10 that.

11 So, first of all, Stan Bernstein has been on the
12 radar of the trustee since essentially the Involuntary
13 Petitions were filed on Booth Street back in June of
14 2013.

15 THE COURT: When you say "Stan Berstein," I
16 thought his name was Denton but it's --

17 MR. GILMORE: It's Stanton.

18 THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry. Stanton.

19 MR. GILMORE: But we just call him Stan or
20 Bernstein.

21 THE COURT: Okay.

22 MR. GILMORE: So he has been on the radar of the
23 trustee and the Herbst -- remember, before it was the
24 trustee it was the Herbst plaintiffs -- Stanton Bernstein

1 has been on their radar for five years, ever since the
2 transactions that occurred that have been alleged in the
3 complaint.

4 So the idea that -- one of the most important
5 witnesses that the trustee has been trying to track down
6 and depose for five years, he's now receiving a
7 deposition subpoena the last month of discovery when they
8 know he's a CPA, because we dealt with this issue last
9 year. When they tried to get records from Mr. Bernstein
10 during tax time, he came back and said, "Guys, I can't do
11 this," and that was with the trustee, not in this case
12 necessarily.

13 I don't know yet what the Stanton Bernstein
14 deposition dispute is going to ultimately become because
15 nobody in this courtroom has any control over him. He is
16 represented by a counsel in Los Angeles, he was deposed
17 by the trustee last month on some unrelated issues. But
18 the problem I have with this, with the Stan Bernstein
19 issue, is present counsel took over from essentially the
20 same firm, the Gordon & Silver firm which imploded last
21 summer. They took over for that firm in May of 2015 and
22 in the motion that they filed in the bankruptcy court, in
23 order to get appointed as counsel for the trustee, they
24 basically said, *New firm is the perfect firm to take over*

1 *the state court case because -- I'm trying to remember*
2 *the word -- we are deeply familiar with all of the issues*
3 *that are being raised in that case, which would include*
4 Stanton Bernstein, your Honor, it would include Darryl
5 Noble -- and I'll explain that in a minute -- and it
6 would include all of the related issues.

7 So I do want to suggest today as a little bit of a
8 preface that I think it is somewhat disingenuous for the
9 plaintiff to come in here and say, "Well, we really only
10 took over in May, and we didn't really know what Stan was
11 going to do or what he was going to say or what his
12 involvement is." He was disclosed as an initial witness
13 in the very first production that was ever done. He's
14 been on the radar.

15 So to the extent that the court would say, "Well,
16 I'm going to open -- keep discovery open for the purpose
17 of Stan Bernstein in order to get this accomplished," the
18 defendants' position would be there's been plenty of time
19 to put that on the radar. The one thing we didn't hear
20 from plaintiff's counsel is the reason for the delay.
21 Why is he now the last witness to be disposed?

22 And, quite frankly, your Honor, depending on what
23 he says could require, from the defendants' standpoint, a
24 tremendous amount of follow-up because we're talking

1 primarily in this case about appraised value of assets,
2 real estate, interest in various limited liability
3 companies, et cetera, and Stan Bernstein essentially
4 prepared the tax returns for most of those entities and
5 people at some point in time, not the entire time. But
6 he is going to, in his deposition, most likely refer to
7 people who provided him information who are not disclosed
8 as witnesses in this case, probably because today nobody
9 believes they're necessary. But there was a accounting
10 firm in Buffalo that was doing work with the Buffalo law
11 firm that provided a lot of information, I suspect, to
12 Mr. Bernstein in order to have him do his job and I
13 expect he's going to mention those folks in his
14 deposition.

15 And if his deposition is the last week of April
16 and our pre-trial disclosures are due a week later, how
17 are we then going to be able to say, "Time out. We have
18 to go out to Buffalo and examine what the accountants in
19 Buffalo know," or "We have to re-depose the accountants
20 in Los Angeles that are not Stan Bernstein," one of the
21 people that is going to be deposed next month in March.
22 That's the issue I have with the Stan Bernstein thing.
23 He's been on the radar forever, he should have been
24 deposed prior to now, and it's not really an emergency

1 that anybody is making except for plaintiffs.

2 So to the extent the court wants to discuss to
3 that further or the court just wants to preface this to
4 what might be coming down, that is the defendants'
5 position.

6 I understand that the court has indicated that
7 might be an issue for Judge Ayres and that was going to
8 be one of my questions. If we get an issue for Stan
9 Bernstein deposition and the close of discovery that's
10 also going to be related probably to maintenance of the
11 trial date, I was going to ask the court if that's
12 something the court would want to hear directly from us
13 perhaps on shortened notice or if we would be taking that
14 downstairs to Judge Ayres.

15 THE COURT: I'll take up that issue today with
16 counsel and we can decide how we want to proceed.

17 MR. GILMORE: Okay. Then if the court doesn't
18 mind, I'll table that issue for now and I'll address the
19 other three and then we can get back to Mr. Berstein.

20 Darryl Noble was an appraiser in Reno from the
21 Alves & Noble firm who appraised a property that was
22 owned by the defendants. He performed the appraisal, I
23 believe, in February of 2011, and he did so as part of
24 the execution proceedings that predated the bankruptcy.

1 If the court recalls, there was a judgment from
2 Judge Adams that was rendered in 2010, and for some
3 period of time the Herbst plaintiffs attempted to execute
4 on that judgment by examining these very transactions
5 that are alleged in the complaint that brings us here
6 today.

7 In other words, the Gordon & Silver firm pursued
8 my clients and Mr. Morabito back in 2011 to discover the
9 information related to these transactions. Specifically,
10 I'm talking about a house over on Windy Hill on Panorama
11 Drive.

12 THE COURT: These were judgment debtor exams?

13 MR. GILMORE: Correct. These were judgment debtor
14 exams that were taken in effort -- in aid of execution of
15 the judgment that predated the bankruptcy by a
16 year-and-a-half. So it was Mr. Irvine who was Herbst's
17 counsel who took the deposition in 2011 and the sole
18 source of inquiry was Mr. Noble's valuation of the
19 Panorama property. The valuation of the Panorama
20 property is a key, if not the paramount issue in this
21 case that the court is going to hear in June.

22 When we saw the deposition subpoena of Mr. Noble,
23 we said to plaintiffs counsel, "Why are we deposing
24 Mr. Noble again? Your partner" -- I should say --

1 "ex-partner deposed Mr. Noble back in 2011 when most
2 undoubtedly his memory was more fresh then than it is
3 now, over the exact same issue, over the exact the same
4 appraisal that is at issue in this case, over the exact
5 same house we were fighting about before the bankruptcy
6 took over this case and led us here today, why are we
7 going to waste our time taking those kind of redundant
8 depositions when it's already been done?"

9 There is, indeed, privity at every level.
10 Mr. Breslow was at the deposition five years ago and
11 Teresa's ex-partner -- I say "ex" because the firm
12 split -- Brian Irvine was the one taking the deposition.
13 So our position would be on that there's no reason to
14 take a redundant deposition that is going to add to the
15 ten we're already going to take next month, in addition
16 to the fact that the record on that issue is clear, his
17 appraisal has been produced, plaintiff's counsel should
18 have the deposition transcript. They do now.

19 So with respect to Darryl Noble, we would suggest
20 that the court simply require that the parties rely on
21 his previous testimony by -- which was taken by
22 Mr. Pilatowicz's former partner.

23 MR. BRESLOW: Your Honor, one point of
24 clarification, if I may. I believe at that time Mr.

1 Irvine was with Jones Vargas. I believe he had been then
2 transitioned over to Gordon & Silver. But the rest of
3 what Mr. Gilmore said is our position, the same interests
4 were being represented, the same issues were examined,
5 and so to depose at this time would be redundant.

6 MR. GILMORE: Indeed. Right, Mr. Breslow is
7 correct, and I did know that. So if I said that he
8 wasn't at Jones Vargas at the time, I misspoke.

9 But here's the most important point. Brian Irvine
10 and John Desmond filed the complaint in this case after
11 they had taken Darryl Noble's deposition in the debtor's
12 exam. The original complaint, even the amended complaint
13 that named the trustee as the plaintiff, was filed by
14 Brian Desmond and John Irvine -- John Desmond and Brian
15 Irvine, sorry.

16 MR. BRESLOW: Try again.

17 MR. GILMORE: Did I get it right the second time?

18 MR. BRESLOW: Close enough.

19 MR. GILMORE: I don't want to belabor that, but
20 that is the issue.

21 Ms. Pilatowicz mentioned the tax returns.
22 Essentially what happened is she subpoenaed Stanton
23 Bernstein for complete copies of the tax returns for the
24 individual defendants for a time period that is relevant

1 to this case, and I said to her, essentially, well, we're
2 not going to fish up the entire tax return for these
3 individuals but it looks like we've reached resolution
4 whereby the exchange that is at issue here, to the extent
5 it is located on the defendant's tax schedules, we will
6 produce that information. So I don't think that that's
7 an issue. The only reason it hasn't been resolved yet is
8 because it probably only came up last week or so.

9 As the trial date and the length of trial, the
10 duration of trial, I am optimistic. I want to be
11 optimistic but I've also tried enough cases that have a
12 lot less complexity than this and a lot fewer witnesses
13 and experts that have taken us a lot longer than two
14 weeks. We will have no less than, just on the
15 plaintiff's side, 15 witnesses --

16 MR. BRESLOW: Defendants.

17 MR. GILMORE: I'm sorry, did I say "plaintiff's"
18 again? I apologize, your Honor.

19 Just on my side of the table, we will have at
20 least 15 witnesses, probably 11 of which will be live and
21 four of which might be deposition transcripts, which we
22 would probably read from the stand just in order to
23 maintain the cleanest record.

24 So that doesn't even include the plaintiff's

1 expert witnesses, of which I think at least there are
2 three. If there's no other additional witnesses
3 identified in the next month, we're talking a minimum of
4 18 witnesses in 10 court days on very complex issues,
5 including the gentleman from New York who will be coming
6 here likely to be on the stand at least a day or two, if
7 not more.

8 THE COURT: Who is the gentleman from New York?

9 MR. GILMORE: Oh. The lawyers from New York who
10 facilitated the transfers.

11 THE COURT: Okay.

12 MR. GILMORE: His name is Mr. Vacco, an attorney
13 from Buffalo, New York. He and one of his partners will
14 be here to testify live as to who was driving the ship,
15 so to speak, with respect to these transfers. And his
16 deposition, we were there in Buffalo taking depositions
17 for two days on those gentlemen, so I expect we're going
18 to have at least two days of trial testimony just from
19 those two gentlemen. So that leaves us eight days, your
20 Honor.

21 THE COURT: They're fine, deputy.

22 Go ahead and take a seat. You're here trying to
23 get your hours for your government class; is that right?

24 How did I know?

1 MR. GILMORE: Couldn't have picked a more exciting
2 day.

3 THE COURT: This is a real barn burner, kids.
4 Look out. It's murder, mayhem, all sorts of stuff.

5 MR. GILMORE: So simply the point I was making is
6 even if we assume that Mr. Vacco and his partner are
7 going to be on the stand for two days, then we're talking
8 about 17, 16 witnesses in eight court days so --

9 THE COURT: Okay.

10 MR. GILMORE: -- I want to be optimistic but I
11 don't know if that's pragmatic.

12 THE COURT: But you're not.

13 MR. GILMORE: So what we discussed before the
14 meeting -- the hearing today was if we were forced with
15 the realization in the next month or two that we have
16 more witnesses than we have time, what would we do?
17 Would we divide the trial up into sort of Package A and
18 Package B? Which I think would probably not be the ideal
19 way but we would agree to do that if it meant that we
20 could maintain some of the trial dates.

21 Alternatively, as plaintiff's counsel said, they
22 would really not want to do that because their entire
23 case is built on the continuity of these entire
24 transactions, and I understand that. So I think it might

-----** SUNSHINE LITIGATION **-----

1 be wise for us to put in the back of our minds or at
2 least in the horizon, your Honor, the possibility that
3 we're going to need three weeks sometime after June, or
4 in June if we can get it.

5 THE COURT: Well, we could back this trial date up
6 to June 6th, I suppose.

7 MR. GILMORE: And take then the three weeks back
8 to back to back?

9 THE COURT: Well, the Nevada State Bar, I think,
10 starts on the 24th, and I am scheduled to be attending
11 that with a committee, so we would have -- we could work
12 on the weekend, I suppose, but we'd have -- do I have any
13 murder trials?

14 THE CLERK: I'm looking now, your Honor.

15 THE COURT: June 6th?

16 THE CLERK: No. Only two civil matters.

17 THE COURT: So we could back you up and start
18 June 6th instead of June 13th, and then we could -- I
19 mean, generally we can -- most of the judges in our
20 district will cross cover on our non- -- I mean,
21 sometimes I'll have to do a couple of criminal hearings
22 that I just have to do if it's a murder case or a life
23 case, but we can get in a pretty lengthy trial day.

24 MR. GILMORE: Okay.

---** SUNSHINE LITIGATION **---

1 THE COURT: Like 9:00 to 5:00 and keep our
2 recesses relatively short. So we could start on the 6th
3 and just moving, and I could probably give you until the
4 22nd or 23rd. I don't know quite the dates that I have
5 to go. I mean, we may be able to go to the 24th. I
6 can't -- I think -- I think I have to leave on the 24th
7 or 25th. I'm not sure.

8 MR. GILMORE: Okay. The position I'm trying to
9 relay is we want to be as flexible as possible. I
10 just -- I didn't want anybody to not have the ability to
11 hear me say that this is not a ten-day bench trial. So I
12 don't know --

13 THE COURT: Just for future reference, counsel.
14 When you fill out your setting form -- this is truly the
15 problem with complex civil litigation. I mean, you guys
16 don't even know what's coming in March. If you're doing
17 ten depositions in March and people start puking other stuff
18 out that they didn't think -- I mean, we don't know what
19 we don't know. So you could have witnesses who start
20 saying, "Well, yeah, we did this," "We did that?" And
21 you're, "What? I have to have this and I got to have
22 that." And I don't know why we're all -- procrastination
23 has no destination. We end up getting all this stuff at
24 the end, and then you all come in and say, "Oh, no, this

-----** SUNSHINE LITIGATION **-----

1 isn't going to work."

2 And it's only in civil practice. And I've only
3 had one trial go over in 23 years and it was a civil
4 case, and I will warn you all, if you have a jury trial
5 here, I make you all turn around -- I think you've had
6 one in here -- and you tell the jury, "I'm going to ask
7 this much of your time," and you get no more. And I will
8 put you on a clock. So this is not just some endless
9 food chain that we go into.

10 But in fairness to you, you guys still have a huge
11 chunk of discovery to finish and maybe those depositions
12 are what you fully anticipate and maybe they're not. I
13 don't know. I mean, it's your movie. This is what I
14 have so far -- and this isn't even your whole thing
15 because we don't get files anymore. It drives me crazy.

16 MR. GILMORE: Most of the file is at Booth Street,
17 your Honor, because the dispute we had on NRCP Rule 37
18 for Mr. Vacco in Buffalo was actually heard by Judge Zive
19 across the street -- on Booth Street.

20 THE COURT: I understand. I understand.

21 MR. GILMORE: So really what's happened is as the
22 plaintiff has further developed their case it has
23 mushroomed. This person identifies a witness and now we
24 have to go track him down. This person identifies a

1 witness, that's natural. It's unfortunate but it's
2 natural.

3 Your Honor, my proposal would be, I don't know
4 that we have to make a decision today on the record as to
5 the trial date issue. I simply --

6 THE COURT: We do.

7 MR. GILMORE: Oh, do we?

8 THE COURT: Because I have over a thousand cases.
9 I have people everyday saying -- so -- and she sits over
10 here with this tortured look. So what we're going to do
11 today is reset the trial to start on the 6th and then
12 once you complete your depositions, we can go back to the 13th,
13 but I will give you that extra week. That's all I can
14 give you unless you wanted to move to the month of
15 December.

16 MR. BRESLOW: May I be heard, your Honor?

17 THE COURT: Yes.

18 MR. BRESLOW: Although Mr. Gilmore is likely to be
19 lead trial counsel, it's assumed that I will have a
20 speaking role as well. Your Governor decided to appoint
21 me to a commission, a state commission that oversees all
22 homeowner associations in the state.

23 THE COURT: Oh. Poor you.

24 MR. BRESLOW: I thought he was my friend, right?

---** SUNSHINE LITIGATION **---

1 But I know he has a lot going on today also if anyone
2 turns on CNN.

3 But, anyway, my point, your Honor, is this. Our
4 quarterly meetings in Las Vegas are pretty stacked with
5 stuff and I'm -- last year I was the chair, this year I'm
6 the vice chair. We've set our meetings to be that week,
7 June 6, 7, 8, and so certainly I could miss a meeting
8 because people miss meetings for other things but would
9 it -- would the court be inclined perhaps, and would
10 counsel agree, if we could start the trial, say, the 8th
11 and give ourselves three extra days of court trial -- or
12 the 9th, give ourselves two extra days? I believe 10 --
13 excuse me, your Honor, I believe 12 court days this case
14 gets tried, 13 certainly, 10 very close, 15 is probably
15 too much, and that would -- I could --

16 THE COURT: I wouldn't want to start on a
17 Thursday. I could start you on Wednesday, the 8th.

18 MR. BRESLOW: That would work much better, your
19 Honor, with my calendar, if that would please the court.

20 MS. HAMM: Your Honor, may we turn our phones on
21 to check our calendars?

22 THE COURT: Oh, sure, go right ahead. Go right
23 ahead.

24 So the only reason -- I mean, you guys might get

1 through your ten depositions or your eight depositions and you might
2 say, "Look, we just don't need that much time. We can
3 winnow this down. We can" -- you know, that's fine. But
4 if I don't give it to you now, I'm not going to have it.

5 And so what we will do is we'll go ahead and set
6 it for Monday, and what we might do -- we're going to
7 pre-trial this again. Then I'll see where we are with
8 any kind of pre-trial motions, any housekeeping stuff we
9 may have to do.

10 And then maybe, even if you're in your meeting,
11 depending on -- if he's going to have an opening
12 statement, sometimes I have to do a bunch of pre-trial
13 orders, usually for jury trials, but we'll have that time
14 set aside and what I'll do is I'll take my criminal
15 calendar for Thursday of that week, we'll just -- and
16 what we'll do is maybe do a huge calendar on Tuesday.

17 THE CLERK: That's better. Tuesdays are better
18 than Thursdays.

19 MR. BRESLOW: Thank you, your Honor.

20 MR. GILMORE: It also just occurred to me that
21 something that we've been discussing for a month or so
22 with respect to the necessity of putting on the stand all
23 of these property appraisers, so we have a whole host of
24 real properties that were appraised back in 2010 and now

1 the plaintiff has sort of retroactively appraised them.
2 And our original appraisers will be here, who is Darryl
3 Noble and some others, and the plaintiff has disclosed
4 his experts which will be battling essentially our 2010
5 appraisals, if I can put it that way. So, yeah, that
6 is --

7 THE COURT: So I'll have a 2010 appraisal and then
8 I'm having an appraisal from current date?

9 MR. GILMORE: Well, it's retroactive to that date
10 of valuation but it would have been prepared in the last
11 couple of months. That is going to be three to four days
12 trial and it occurred to me as we were -- that's just the
13 nature of the claims and the nature of the transactions
14 is essentially the plaintiff is trying to prove that the
15 transactions that were made in 2010 were done for less
16 than equivalent value.

17 THE COURT: Okay.

18 MR. GILMORE: That's the simplest way I can put
19 it. And so in order for them to do that, they're going
20 back to our appraisal and saying, "Well, you didn't do
21 this, you didn't did this," or whatever, and that is
22 what's to be ultimately established at trial.

23 So it occurred to me that we've been discussing
24 the possibility of trying not to have to use all of the

1 appraisers in trial for those properties where the
2 valuations between our 2010 appraisal and their present
3 day appraisal retroactive to the same date of valuation
4 are within the same ballpark. The problem is we just
5 haven't been able to figure out a way that works for us
6 to avoid having to put all the appraisers on the stand
7 and also sort of maintain the integrity of what the
8 plaintiffs believe are the heart of their claims.

9 So I think perhaps either today or some other
10 date, with the court's assistance, I think we can
11 probably figure out a way to cut out two or three of
12 these appraisers, and let me give you one example. So
13 there are -- there's a property in Palm Springs and -- a
14 residential property in Palm Springs that was transferred
15 as part of these allegations, and then there was a number
16 of properties in Laguna Beach. Well, the Palm Springs
17 property, the plaintiff's appraisal came in at the exact
18 dollar value as our 2010 appraisal.

19 So I called Ms. Pilatowicz and I said, "It looks
20 like we don't have a dispute as to the valuation on Palm
21 Springs, we're not going to call that expert to the
22 stand, let's just stipulate that your guy came back with
23 this valuation and our guy came back with this valuation
24 and it just happened to be identical." Which is good for

—** SUNSHINE LITIGATION **—

1 Palm Springs because there was zero *delta*.

2 But then we when looked at one of the properties
3 in Laguna Beach, a \$2.1 or \$2.2 million property, the
4 plaintiff's appraiser came in \$50,000 different from
5 ours. And so I'll just be very frank with the court, I
6 called Teresa and I said, "On this one property in Laguna
7 Beach, we're \$50,000 apart on a \$2 million property, it
8 seems to me we shouldn't even have to depose these guys."
9 We shouldn't have to depose them and spend the money to
10 go -- he was in Redondo Beach, California, to depose him,
11 and then bring him here to testify, and then have the
12 plaintiff's expert has to cross-examine him, that could
13 take a day, or half a day if it got more intense than it
14 needed to be.

15 So I don't think we figured out the solution to
16 that yet but I think the time is right to try that. And
17 I don't know if the court thinks that briefing would be
18 the best way to do it or if the court wants some sort of
19 further background information from plaintiff's counsel
20 on that so that we could narrow it down today, but I
21 think that if we were to resolve that cuts a day out of
22 the trial, and then we're a lot we're closer to the 10
23 days than we were hoping for.

24 MS. PILATOWICZ: Let me just clarify our position

1 on that. When Mr. Gilmore called and said, "I think we
2 can maybe work something out and not do this deposition
3 on Friday," and this was on a Wednesday, we agreed and
4 said, "Let's sit down and work it out." We just haven't
5 received any proposals. We're certainly not trying to
6 waste time or waste expenses in this case, so we are --
7 we continue to work on that. There just hasn't been any
8 proposals back and forth. I think in the next week or so
9 we can talk about that, and if we can't come to an
10 agreement, either come to the court or maybe the
11 discovery commissioner. I think it's probably a court
12 issue.

13 I want to address a couple of other things that
14 were raised as to the Stanton Bernstein and Darryl Noble.
15 There was a lot of discussion about privity, and the
16 only -- the discussion came from the law firms, and
17 there's been three now. There was Jones Vargas, which
18 was very distinct from Gordon Silver, and very distinct
19 from Garman Turner Gordon. There was Gordon Silver that
20 had some members of -- some members went over to Garman
21 Turner Gordon. The members that didn't go over were
22 Brian Irvine and John Desmond. They're now at Dickinson
23 Wright.

24 The same attorneys who were working on this case

1 on behalf of different parties back five years ago are
2 not the same attorneys that are trying it now. And, more
3 importantly, it's not the same party. We've got a
4 trustee in place and the trustee has the duty to all the
5 creditors in the bankruptcy, not just the Herbst and the
6 plaintiffs, he has a duty to all of them. He has a
7 duty -- he has an obligation and a right to put on his
8 case, that means deposing witnesses, taking the discovery
9 that is necessary. Just because people who -- from my
10 old firm were involved in another firm that went into my
11 old firm took the deposition doesn't mean that I don't
12 get to take them again.

13 So we've agreed to look at the issue, as I
14 indicated. We just haven't had an opportunity to because
15 one of the other problems is this being it's third firm
16 now, is we don't have a physical file. We've asked for
17 it, we've tried to get it, it hasn't been given to us.
18 It's not lack for of trying.

19 MS. HAMM: And if I can add to that, too.
20 Obviously that is a failure of counsel at some point
21 along the way to not have the originals but --

22 THE COURT: Failure of what counsel?

23 MS. HAMM: I don't want to cast aspersions on
24 anybody but either certain files did not make it from

1 Jones Vargas over to Gordon & Silver, or they did not
2 make it from Gordon & Silver over to Garman Turner
3 Gordon. Obviously that's not something that should
4 happen. The original deposition transcripts should be
5 there, they are not.

6 But at the same time, and with respect to
7 Mr. Noble, this is actually, I think, a fairly minor
8 issue. It's not a lengthy deposition but we don't think
9 that our client should be penalized for an error of
10 either ours or former counsel in the case.

11 THE COURT: No, I agree with counsel. I don't
12 have a problem with that.

13 Any other issues?

14 MS. PILATOWICZ: The other issue was with the
15 deposition of Stanton Bernstein. Again, there's been
16 sort of a imputed knowledge on me that was from attorneys
17 three firms ago. Yes, we knew Stanton Bernstein was a
18 witness. We had the right to gather information about
19 what he might know, as do the other parties. We deposed
20 Salvatore Morabito out in Buffalo in October. We asked
21 him questions that we thought we could get the
22 information from him. He indicated that Stanton
23 Bernstein had that information, so we went ahead and
24 started to notice up Stanton Bernstein. He's in

1 California.

2 We started the process back in January.
3 California has a lengthy state court subpoena process
4 where notice to consumers have to be given and the
5 subpoena issued. We are not here today a month before
6 discovery closes saying we need more time to schedule his
7 deposition. We timely noticed it.

8 We're trying to make sure that we're not going to
9 get into another fight out in California over whether
10 he's going to sit. But then, you know, on the outcome of
11 that, we might be back before you asking for an extension
12 of a discovery deadline. We're just trying to deal with
13 it proactively and reach a resolution.

14 THE COURT: This is what I would suggest as to
15 Mr. Bernstein. Because he is a critical witness -- I
16 mean, do you agree with that?

17 MS. PILATOWICZ: I do agree with that, your Honor.

18 THE COURT: Okay. Why don't we do this. Why
19 don't -- why don't you contact his counsel. I'd like to
20 see the deposition -- I don't know why -- you've got it
21 scheduled now for mid-March?

22 MS. PILATOWICZ: It's scheduled for, I believe,
23 March 15th -- March 16th or 15th.

24 THE COURT: Why don't you meet and confer while

1 you're here with your calendars and move -- see if you
2 can move him up. Contact his attorney and say, "We'll
3 come on a weekend," "We'll come start it in the evening
4 and then finish in the morning," I mean, I don't care if
5 he's a solo CPA, he must have something shaking and
6 baking if he was doing all this stuff. Maybe not. But
7 you could offer to move the deposition up rather than
8 move it back, because we have a trial date.

9 And if they won't do that and if there are
10 problems, then we will reconvene on the telephone
11 conference and determine what we have to do. But I am
12 somewhat concerned that by attempting to accommodate this
13 person, you're going to accommodate yourselves out of a
14 trial date because it just happens, particularly with
15 critical witnesses, they will blurt out something or say
16 something that may or may not necessitate further
17 discovery, and then you're spending your time and your
18 money filing motions to shorten time, motions to compel,
19 motions to extend discovery deadlines. It's all just a
20 bunch of drama.

21 So tell the attorney what our problems are and,
22 you know, if they'll stipulate -- and get everything in
23 writing from them -- if they'll stipulate to move it up,
24 move it up. And if Mr. Breslow has to go or Mr. Gilmore,

1 you guys -- you know, if you're beefing about it, then
2 you get somebody there. You've got somebody in your firm
3 to go.

4 As to Noble, I agree with counsel, it may or may
5 not be redundant but it's her movie. It's their movie
6 and they have the burden as plaintiffs. So if in their
7 judgment as counselors at law on behalf of their client
8 they feel they have to re-depose Darryl Noble, then so be
9 it. If you guys want to beef about it, file your
10 motions, go to the discovery commissioner. But if he was
11 deposed five years ago, I suspect the discovery
12 commissioner would deny your objection to that
13 deposition. It's irrelevant that maybe these folks were
14 once associated. You know, it is what it is.

15 But you can't tell the plaintiff, "No, you don't
16 need this," and "You don't need that," because then
17 you're the guy standing in the well of my courtroom
18 saying, "Well, they didn't produce this," "They didn't do
19 that," "They didn't ask those questions," "They have the
20 burden of proof," "They haven't met their burden, too
21 bad, so sad, go away, I'm done."

22 If it's a beef, file motions, but I'm not going to
23 preclude or find that the plaintiff's desire to depose
24 witnesses who they believe necessary to meet their burden

____** SUNSHINE LITIGATION **_____

1 of proof are necessary and the defense is saying, "Well,
2 gee, I think they're redundant because three firms ago,
3 two firms ago they had all these."

4 With that said, I think plaintiff's counsel,
5 obviously their clients are here, they're not going to
6 spend money needlessly, I think you have a duty to meet
7 and confer, go over these issues. What I'm going to
8 suggest, based upon Ms. Hamm's comments, which I find
9 very interesting, as I understand, you're saying that
10 with the -- like in a criminal case, when one criminal
11 defense lawyer is removed from a case, then that criminal
12 defense lawyer has an obligation to take the entire
13 physical file or everything they've done and hand it to
14 the next lawyer. When I was in private practice that was
15 kind of the plan.

16 Is that still the plan, Mr. Breslow?

17 MR. BRESLOW: It is.

18 THE COURT: Okay. So I don't know, Mr. Gilmore is
19 saying no.

20 MR. GILMORE: Well, there are some qualifications
21 to that. So, for example, if prior counsel is still owed
22 money --

23 THE COURT: Oh, I know.

24 MR. GILMORE: -- then prior counsel has the

---** SUNSHINE LITIGATION **---

1 ability to hold the file.

2 THE COURT: So is that what's happening?

3 MS. PILATOWICZ: That's not the issue here. The
4 issue is, in part, that it was paperless, or at some
5 point transitioning maybe at Jones Vargas or Gordon
6 Silver to a paperless firm. Everyone thinks the file has
7 been transferred from the old Gordon & Silver but there
8 are things that don't appear to be in there; such as
9 the -- the Noble deposition.

10 I'm not suggesting that we haven't gotten the file
11 and reviewed the file, we haven't reviewed everything we
12 have, we have, but there are some certain things that,
13 you know, we've attempted to locate that aren't there.

14 THE COURT: This is what I was going to suggest.
15 What we do in criminal cases is we do a file review. And
16 I think, again, we're all here, you're welcome to use the
17 courtroom, I'll leave, you can yell at each other, you
18 can talk to each other, you can have some nice government
19 coffee --

20 Do we have any food? We might have some prisoner
21 food.

22 THE CLERK: I think there's candy in there, your
23 Honor.

24 THE COURT: Candy. But maybe sit down and

—** SUNSHINE LITIGATION **—

1 basically do a cross file check either with Mr. Gilmore,
2 Mr. Breslow, what do you have that we don't have.
3 Because I see their point. It's like, look, you have all
4 this stuff. And then it's all over in the bankruptcy
5 court and you may need to deploy a minion over there to
6 do a cross file check but --

7 MS. HAMM: We are the bankruptcy court minion as
8 well.

9 THE COURT: I understand, so minion away. But if
10 we don't have all the depos, if we don't -- you know,
11 we -- obviously there's going to be stuff like that that
12 may be missing so --

13 MR. GILMORE: Could I briefly speak to that?

14 THE COURT: Go ahead.

15 MR. GILMORE: Thank you, your Honor. I appreciate
16 the latitude.

17 You have the Herbst original judgment creditors
18 and we just call them the Herbst parties. The Herbst
19 parties have been represented by Gerry Gordon, in some
20 form or another, basically since the time of the judgment
21 and here's the important part. In June of 2015, Gerry
22 Gordon filed a motion in the bankruptcy court asking to
23 be employed as special counsel for this case. He files a
24 declaration -- I think there are at least two

1 declarations, and he says -- this is so important because
2 I think it really gives the true color to what is really
3 going on here -- Gerry Gordon and his firm had
4 represented Herbst basically from the beginning. And he
5 confirms it with the bankruptcy court when he asks the
6 court to allow his firm to represent the petitioning
7 creditors, the Herbst, to represent the trustee in one of
8 the adversarial actions, which is this one, and then to
9 represent -- I'm sorry -- represent the petitioning
10 creditors, to represent the trustee in this case --
11 okay -- he says:

12 On May 15, 2015, I, together with eight
13 other shareholders and numerous
14 associates of Gordon Silver, left the
15 employ of Gordon Silver to join Garman
16 Turner Gordon effective immediately.
17 Gordon Silver currently represents the
18 plaintiffs in the state court action, who
19 are also the petitioning creditors in
20 this bankruptcy. The petitioning
21 creditors have elected to retain the
22 services of Garman Turner in this
23 bankruptcy case in place of Gordon
24 Silver. As such, the representation of

-----** SUNSHINE LITIGATION **-----

1 the petitioning creditors in this
2 bankruptcy and such representation in the
3 state court action upon approval of the
4 application will continue concurrently.

5 As a result, Garman Turner Gordon's
6 attorneys are deeply familiar with the
7 state court action.

8 And they're asking to be appointed as litigation
9 counsel here in place of John Desmond and Brian Irvine
10 because of the declarations that Gordon filed in the
11 bankruptcy court explaining that it is a perfectly
12 seamless transition.

13 THE COURT: Well, he didn't say that. Let's be
14 fair, Mr. Gilmore. He didn't say, "This is a perfectly
15 seamless transition." Obviously Judge Zive would have
16 thought about this and said, "Well, heck, how can this be
17 seamless when John Desmond and Brian Irvine are my guys
18 on this. Where did they go?"

19 What happened? Did Judge Zive ask that question?

20 MR. GILMORE: No, because it was unopposed.

21 THE COURT: Why was it unopposed?

22 MR. GILMORE: Because there was no creditor to
23 oppose it. This is a one-creditor dispute.

24 MS. PILATOWICZ: Well, your Honor --

1 THE COURT: Why didn't John Desmond jump in there
2 and say, "I'm a seamless man"?

3 MR. GILMORE: Because Herbst had told John
4 Desmond -- this is a true story. We were in a bankruptcy
5 hearing -- this is a true story, Judge -- and Judge Zive
6 was there, there were all three of them sitting at the
7 table -- Gordon, Desmond and Irvine -- was Desmond there?
8 They're all sitting at the table and the judge said -- in
9 the middle of a sentence, he said, "Oh, I probably
10 shouldn't mention this from the bench but I read the
11 newspaper about Gordon Silver breaking up. Which one of
12 you guys is going to take the file?"

13 MS. PILATOWICZ: Your Honor, we've identified one
14 issue thus far and that is the Noble deposition. I'm not
15 sure we need to go into all of this.

16 THE COURT: No --

17 MS. PILATOWICZ: We've gotten knowledge, we've
18 gotten what we can. My point was we haven't located that
19 deposition. I told them I would review it. I asked them
20 to send it. As soon as they send it, we said we would
21 review it, but doesn't limit our ability to take his
22 deposition again.

23 THE COURT: I understand, but he's reading from
24 this affidavit. I'm just curious, what did Judge Zive

1 do? Because Ms. Hamm says with all these law firms
2 blowing up or going under or changing hands, the file is
3 gone.

4 MS. HAMM: No, your Honor. I'm sorry to
5 interrupt. No, there's no paper file. But like
6 Teresa -- Ms. Pilatowicz said, things were primarily
7 electronic so we do have a ton of discovery that was
8 previously done in both the -- this action and then in
9 the action that led up to this action that was completely
10 Jones Vargas in the first place. We have significant
11 amounts of documents, they're all electronic, but there's
12 no paper file. So if there was a certified deposition
13 transcript, it would have been in that paper file and we
14 don't have that. That's what I'm staying.

15 Now, as far as what Judge Zive said, with all due
16 respect to Mr. Gilmore, I think that he sometimes
17 misconstrues what Judge Zive says in the bankruptcy case.
18 I wasn't at this particular meeting --

19 MR. GILMORE: I was.

20 MS. HAMM: -- but we've had fights about orders
21 and such where people interpret what other people meant,
22 and the judge says, "No, that is not at all what I meant.
23 I'll write it down for you all." So I think this is sort
24 of a sideshow but --

1 THE COURT: I started it. You kind of started it,
2 Ms. Hamm.

3 MS. HAMM: That's absolutely true.

4 THE COURT: There's no file but -- and he didn't
5 say "a seamless transition." What happened was
6 Mr. Gordon got the business; right?

7 MR. GILMORE: And I'm not trying to change the
8 court's mind. I only wanted to tell the story because it
9 is an interesting story, and let me finish it very
10 briefly.

11 THE COURT: Go ahead.

12 MR. GILMORE: He said, "Which one of you guys at
13 the table" -- he actually said, "I don't know that I
14 should ask this on the record but I'm going to anyway."
15 He said, "Which one of you at the table is going to take
16 this file?"

17 And Gordon, who was standing kind of -- I was
18 sitting right here and Gordon was standing right there,
19 on Booth Street -- and Gordon looked at Irvine and he
20 sort of looked up and said -- he was totally caught
21 flatfooted, no doubt -- and he said, "Your Honor, it's
22 Wednesday, we don't know the answer to that, but we'll
23 know by Friday."

24 And then probably within two weeks or so, we all

-----** SUNSHINE LITIGATION **-----

1 went down in Gerry Gordon's new office doing a deposition
2 in the bankruptcy case, because Gordon's office had taken
3 it.

4 The point I'm trying to make by all of that is
5 that this not one law firm from Lewis & Roca to Holland &
6 Hart to whoever, no. It's all been Herbst and the file
7 has just gone around like this by the different
8 amalgamations. But the people who deposed Darryl Noble,
9 who subpoenaed Darryl Noble were trying to get the exact
10 same relief that the plaintiffs are trying to get here.
11 No doubt about it.

12 THE COURT: Well, we have new counsel and they --
13 again, because they bear the burden of proof --

14 Young students, this is a civil action, and in a
15 civil action the burden of proof is by a preponderance of
16 the evidence. And the plaintiffs, who always sit over
17 here, they go first in everything, and they have to prove
18 their case. And, as such, they're entitled to do their
19 discovery.

20 As impassioned and as eloquent as your argument
21 is, Mr. Gilmore --

22 MR. GILMORE: Thank you. I'll take that.

23 THE COURT: Yes, it was very, very fine -- but
24 with all of these things, it's just like when I get three

1 different criminal defense counsel and I look at it and I
2 think, *What the heck did you guys do here?* And it's a
3 train wreck by the third counsel. It's not a good
4 situation because there's a disconnect, a disconnect, a
5 disconnect.

6 And if the tables were turned, Mr. Gilmore, and
7 they were saying, "Look, Mr. Gilmore, doesn't need to
8 depose these folks, we talked to them five years ago,"
9 and you had the burden of proof, you'd be squealing like
10 a stuck pig. I know that. So -- so --

11 MR. GILMORE: I would be saying it's not just
12 preponderance of the evidence in all these claims, some
13 of these are clear and convincing. Maybe I just proved
14 the court's point there.

15 THE COURT: There you go.

16 MR. GILMORE: Let them have the deposition because
17 it's actually clear and convincing.

18 THE COURT: All right. So what we're going to do
19 is we're going to reset trial to -- I'll hold that
20 Monday, because if this thing blows up -- because I'm
21 probably am going to terminate your trial, and I will do
22 it -- I will advise you before trial begins as to how
23 much time you're going to get and you will get no more
24 than the time I give you, so I'm adding time to you but

1 what I'm going to do is I'm going to give you a new
2 setting form while you're all here, go ahead and set it
3 for Monday, June 6th.

4 And then, Maria, in parentheses on the setting
5 form, June 6th and 7th will be pre-trial preparation with
6 the trial to commence June 8th.

7 THE CLERK: I'm going to have Ms. Clements come in
8 here, your Honor, and take that from them.

9 THE COURT: And then what we're going to do is
10 trial will not go beyond June 23rd, and -- but this is
11 what I'm going to need from you after your discovery
12 close. If everything is blowing up, if Mr. Bernstein is
13 like, "Oh, my gosh you're kidding me? These are
14 bombshells of information, I've got to fly to Tahiti and
15 depose these ten people who invested in the Tahitian
16 house," then you might come back to me and say, "Okay,
17 Judge, we've got to start Monday morning at 9 o'clock.
18 We've got to rock'n'roll." And if that's the case, I'll
19 call Governor Sandoval and say, "Your man Breslow cannot
20 be there, as much as you need him there," and by then, he
21 may be sitting on the U.S. Supreme Court with -- you
22 know, they have these tragic chambers there, little card
23 tables that they sit at like gnomes, I don't see the
24 governor enjoying that life but --

-----** SUNSHINE LITIGATION **-----

1 MR. BRESLOW: We shall see.

2 THE COURT: I was late because I was conferring
3 with Chief Justice Parraguirre and we were talking about
4 some various cases and issues, and he said, "I so miss
5 the trial courts. I miss the action."

6 I said, "Yeah, you're in the land of the living
7 dead now." So I don't know if it's the best job in the
8 world but it's probably very intellectually stimulating.

9 So that's our plan. If you guys are going to beef
10 about Noble's depo, file your motions and go see
11 Commissioner Ayres. As to the tax returns, it sounds
12 like you guys can meet and confer. We'll reset the trial
13 to give you more time.

14 And as to Mr. Bernstein, I'd like you to get some
15 move-up dates, give them some options, and get him done
16 sooner rather than later. And if that's going to be a
17 problem and we're going to have, you know -- he can do
18 whatever he's going to do, I guess, in the California
19 courts, but it's not going to get any better for him.
20 And he could be a solo practitioner but why did they
21 involve him in all this if he's a one little guy office
22 and he doesn't have any support? What's the story there?

23 MR. GILMORE: That will come out in the trial.

24 THE COURT: It may come out, I don't know. So,

1 anyway, you think it's one day. Six hours is a full day
2 deposition. But if he wants to do it on a weekend, then
3 make yourself available. Do a 5:00 to 9:00, you know,
4 one evening and then the next morning, you know. How
5 much tax stuff could the guy have? It's all a
6 QuickBooks; right? It's all done by the computer.

7 All right. Do we have anything else that we need
8 to take up?

9 Now that you're all here, stay here, look at your
10 calendars for the Bernstein -- I just keep thinking of
11 the Bernstein Bears when I see this guy's name.

12 Mr. Murtha, anything from your side of the
13 audience?

14 MR. MURTHA: No, your Honor, nothing from the
15 bankruptcy arena.

16 THE COURT: So is that what happened with Judge
17 Zive? Did he say, "Who is taking the file?"

18 MR. MURTHA: It wasn't the file itself that was
19 the question, it was only whichever personnel didn't know
20 about the case. I don't think it was, "Where is the
21 file," "Where are the depositions"; it was just, "Who are the
22 attorneys?"

23 THE COURT: Well, I think John Desmond just wanted
24 out.

1 MR. MURTHA: I don't know. Could be.

2 MR. GILMORE: You were there when the judge --
3 when Judge Zive asked them that.

4 MR. MURTHA: I was there when the judge said,
5 "What's going to happen," yes.

6 MR. BRESLOW: As was I.

7 THE COURT: But there was no, "This will be
8 seamless and elegant."

9 MR. GILMORE: Different hearing. Different
10 hearing.

11 MR. MURTHA: Not that I can recall.

12 THE COURT: All right. I think I've tortured you
13 all sufficiently enough this afternoon. Anything else
14 for the good of the order? Anything else we need to take
15 up?

16 MR. BRESLOW: Not from this side, your Honor.

17 THE COURT: So what we're going to do is we're
18 going to reset trial date. And, also, I forgot to tell
19 you, I'll want another pre-trial here and we will see
20 where we are with everything. So where we are today?
21 Why don't we set, looking at your calendar, sometime the
22 week of April 11th, sometime that week? And I'll tell
23 Tiffany. And if that week is not going to work, then
24 maybe the first week of May. But look at those and then

---** SUNSHINE LITIGATION **---

1 Tiffany -- if you'll come into my office, she will do the
2 resetting form and we'll get all that on there.

3 So I'll reset the trial so we have almost three
4 weeks, we'll do another pre-trial to see where the issues
5 are, and then you guys are going to be in deposition
6 heaven for the month of March; right?

7 MS. PILATOWICZ: And one last question, your
8 Honor.

9 Your pre-trial order indicates that the parties to
10 be present at the pre-trial conference. I notice the
11 defendants aren't here. I want to clarify whether you
12 expect the parties to be present at the hearing, at the
13 pre-trial conferences?

14 THE COURT: Do you want them here?

15 MS. PILATOWICZ: I just want to be able to confer
16 with the client on days that we're going to require him
17 to be here. He certainly is here today as part of this
18 process.

19 THE COURT: I'm so sorry about that. Have you had
20 an enjoyable day?

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: A wonderful day, your
22 Honor.

23 THE COURT: I'm so happy you enjoyed it. You
24 know, I forget that we put that nonsense in that order

1 and good lawyers such as yourselves -- this is such a
2 weird deal. If you want to be here -- it's always kind
3 of good but the purpose is generally to try to do
4 settlement.

5 And I forgot to ask you, we're not settling this
6 case; is that right? Have we had any settlement
7 conferences?

8 MS. PILATOWICZ: We have not had a settlement
9 conference to date. From our side, we're always open to
10 a settlement conference. I never see them being harmful.
11 We haven't discussed it.

12 THE COURT: Have you discussed it with your
13 client?

14 MR. GILMORE: Here's what I'd be willing to say.
15 There's has been settlement overture. That's as specific
16 as I'm willing to make it today. We are definitely open
17 to the idea. I think it gets a little bit complex
18 because a settlement that we agreed to here has to then
19 go on to Booth Street, has to get the process run through
20 by Mr. Leonard and whoever else, but --

21 THE COURT: No, we can do a global. I've done
22 global settlements in bankruptcy court and federal court.
23 What we do is we just all come together. I can go over
24 to Booth Street and we can do a global over there. But

1 I'm the trial judge so I can get somebody else to go do a
2 global over there, if you like.

3 MR. GILMORE: We actually had an offer in one of
4 the first couple of hearings where Judge Zive actually
5 presided over a global. The problem is that we have
6 essentially three different trials going in kind of three
7 different tracks. So Mr. Murtha is lead counsel on an
8 adversarial action just sort of ramping up in this case
9 in Booth Street, and then here we're sort of nearing
10 trial, and then I have another case with your partner,
11 Mark Weisenmiller on another essentially complaint that
12 is pending in the bankruptcy and that's just right in its
13 infancy.

14 MR. BRESLOW: Excuse me.

15 Your Honor, what I understood you to say, global
16 as to resolving this case in front of your Honor, not
17 necessarily all the issues that are currently in front of
18 the Judge Zive and the bankruptcy court because that
19 would take -- that would take a long, long time because
20 of all -- so many moving parts here, unless I
21 misunderstood your Honor.

22 MS. HAMM: I will point out that Judge Zive is
23 mediating the Orange County case so he's pretty good at
24 the whole --

1 MR. GILMORE: He offered and we said absolutely,
2 if we could to get in a position to do that we would want
3 to.

4 THE COURT: You have to finish your discovery. We
5 have to get Mr. Bernstein apparently and get that
6 hammered down. And then as I understood Mr. Gilmore's
7 comments is that the only way we could get this case
8 settled is to --

9 MR. BRESLOW: No, your Honor. I think what
10 Mr. Gilmore is saying is if we resolve this, we would
11 need the blessing of the bankruptcy court, because right
12 now it's the trustee's case and the trustee can propose a
13 settlement that is brokered by your Honor or some other
14 qualified person but it would still be subject to
15 approval by the bankruptcy court.

16 MR. GILMORE: And it could be opposed -- excuse
17 me -- could be potentially opposed by other creditors for
18 the estate. So if I misunderstood the court's reference
19 to *global*, I thought that you meant that we all go over
20 to Booth Street and sort of everybody who has a stake in
21 this thing, that is still a potential and Mr. Murtha and
22 I have actually talked about that, but I don't think
23 we're there yet.

24 I do believe that we could exchange settlement

1 overtures and see if this case alone could be settled and
2 packaged in a way that it could be sent to Booth Street
3 and most likely streamlined for approval.

4 THE COURT: Why don't we do this? I know you
5 don't think you're in that position as yet, but what
6 again happens in many civil actions is about the time you
7 think you're in that position, we're on the eve of trial
8 and there's hundreds of hours of trial preparation,
9 witness preparation, witness fees, costs associated.
10 This will be a costly trial, even though it's a non-jury,
11 so what I'd like you to do, again, while you're all here
12 today, is to talk about perhaps setting a settlement
13 conference sometime in April or the first part of May
14 because -- I mean, it would be better in April because by
15 May you have to turn to trial prep and I -- I've got lots
16 of cases and lots of various dockets going on, so what
17 most attorneys do is they sort of think, I'm going to
18 wait until I get ready. And then, okay, do you want have
19 a to settlement conference? Yeah. Well, there's nobody
20 available.

21 In this type of complex civil litigation with
22 multiple jurisdictions, you're going to need somebody who
23 can get their head around this pretty quickly. So if
24 Judge Zive has indicated a willingness, that's fine. If

 ** SUNSHINE LITIGATION **

1 you want Judge Zive and I to work together, your clients
2 would all have to sign a waiver because this is a
3 non-jury trial, or if you want to get another judge in
4 this district who would be amenable to going over to the
5 bankruptcy court and working with Judge Zive on this
6 case, that's fine too. But, you know, I'm more than
7 willing to do whatever we have to do but you need to get
8 it set down.

9 No judge will ever be upset if you say, "Hey, you
10 know what, we need to cancel that settlement conference."
11 But judges will say, "Gosh, you're on the eve of trial
12 and you want a two-day settlement conference or an all
13 day settlement conference?" I mean, we do the best we
14 can to accommodate folks like that because it's generally
15 just -- because you're waiting to get where you want to
16 get, but you're going to get there because you have a
17 trial date coming up. You're what? You're eight weeks
18 from trial?

19 MR. GILMORE: Four months and change, I think.

20 THE COURT: Four months? I'm not good at math.
21 Where are we? March, April, May --

22 MS. PILATOWICZ: Three-and-a-half.

23 THE COURT: Three months, four months.

24 MR. BRESLOW: We're close.

1 THE COURT: We're close. We're close. You know
2 what I'm saying? All right.

3 So let's -- let's talk about that, get those dates
4 set. And do I need to issue a settlement form? I mean,
5 I don't think I do in this kind of case, do I? We don't
6 have any carriers or any insurance. We're fighting over
7 limited funds; right?

8 MR. GILMORE: We don't have anything like a
9 carrier that would be required to be compelled to be
10 here. I can tell you that my clients, if they believed
11 that the plaintiffs were interested in actually engaging
12 in good faith settlement, they would both be here.

13 One of my clients is part-time, he winters in
14 Scottsdale and he summers at his family's home in St.
15 Catharines in Ontario, so it's not easy to just get
16 people here, but they would come for that. They would.

17 MS. PILATOWICZ: Mr. Leonard would certainly make
18 himself available.

19 THE COURT: Let's work on this. This is Tiffany
20 Clements, my administrative assistant. You all can stay
21 in here and chat amongst yourselves, pick your dates,
22 fight over your dates.

23 Tiffany, I'd like to see them on the next
24 pre-trial if we have availability the week of April 11th.

-----** SUNSHINE LITIGATION **-----

1 Answering your question again, I kind of went off
2 the rails there, normally as we -- when we confirm trial,
3 I do like the parties here, because a lot of times -- I
4 tried a case not long ago where the guy, he did come and
5 I did warn him, but he didn't just think he could ever
6 lose and then the jury verdict was \$750,000 against him
7 and he just didn't get it.

8 But you guys have folks who -- I mean I think you
9 know the back story on this and you know what litigation
10 costs. That's generally why we want the parties here.
11 If there's a question or if your clients are -- I imagine
12 they know what is going on; right?

13 MR. GILMORE: (No audible response.)

14 THE COURT: And they know the perils of trial?
15 Particularly from somebody like me. I mean, my gosh,
16 you're all in trouble now.

17 All right. So we'll get this set up and I always
18 welcome the clients being here, but I hate to impose upon
19 folks. And I apologize, I know the order said that. You
20 can always call and just say, "My client doesn't want to
21 come, is that okay?"

22 MS. PILATOWICZ: Mr. Leonard was happy to come.

23 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Thank you, sir.

24 All right. So we'll let you get set up and if any

1 issues come up, she can grab me. Pleasure visiting with
2 all of you. Love to hear about the bankruptcy court.
3 It's just like shock and awe over there; right?

4 Thank you.

5 MS. PILATOWICZ: Thank you.

6 (At 3:00 p.m., the hearing concluded.)

7 * * *

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

—** SUNSHINE LITIGATION **—

1 STATE OF NEVADA)
2) ss.
3 COUNTY OF WASHOE)

4 I, ERIN T. FERRETTO, an Official Reporter
5 of the Second Judicial District Court of the State of
6 Nevada, in and for the County of Washoe, DO HEREBY
7 CERTIFY:

8 That I was present in Department No. 1 of
9 the above-entitled Court on WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 24TH,
10 2016, and took verbatim stenotype notes of the
11 proceedings had upon the matter captioned within, and
12 thereafter transcribed them into typewriting as herein
13 appears;

14 That the foregoing transcript is a full,
15 true and correct transcription of my stenotype notes of
16 said proceedings.

17 DATED: This 5th day of January, 2020.

20 /s/ Erin T. Ferretto

21 _____
22 ERIN T. FERRETTO, CCR #281
23
24

_____*_* SUNSHINE LITIGATION *_*_____