

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

FEDERAL NATIONAL
MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION,

Appellant,

vs.

WESTLAND LIBERTY VILLAGE,
LLC, a Nevada limited liability
company; and WESTLAND
VILLAGE SQUARE, LLC, a Nevada
limited liability company,

Respondents.

Electronically Filed
Feb 26 2021 04:05 p.m.
Elizabeth A. Brown
Clerk of Supreme Court

Supreme Court Case No. 82174

District Court Case No. A-20-819412-B

APPEAL

**From the Eighth Judicial District Court
The Honorable Kerry Earley/ The Honorable Mark Denton¹**

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Kelly H. Dove, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 10569)
Nathan G. Kanute, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 12413)
Bob L. Olson, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 3783)
SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 1100
Las Vegas, NV 89169
Telephone: (702) 784-5200
Facsimile: (702) 784-5252

Attorneys for Appellant Federal National Mortgage Association

¹ This challenged order in this matter was issued by Judge Kerry Earley after the case had been transferred to Judge Mark Denton.

Introduction

Federal National Mortgage Association (“Fannie Mae”) appealed the district court’s Order Granting Westland’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction and Denying Application for Appointment of Receiver (the “Order”) and sought a limited stay of certain mandatory injunction provisions pending appeal. This Court granted Fannie Mae’s request in part by not requiring Fannie Mae to rescind its recorded notices of default, but declined to stay other aspects of the injunction, including section 5(o), which provides that Fannie Mae may not:

take *any adverse action* against *any Westland entity in relation to other loans*, discriminate against or blacklist any Westland entity *on new loan or loan refinancing applications*, including by placing Westland on “a-check,” adding a fee to any loan quoted or adding an interest rate surcharge to such applications, based on the purported default that arose from failing to deposit the additional \$2.85 million into escrow.

APP1511 (emphasis added). Fannie Mae now seeks reconsideration of the Court’s declining to stay this overextensive provision because it goes beyond barring retaliation against Defendants and improperly forces Fannie Mae to lend or refinance in the future to strangers to the litigation, against its will and in frustration of its mission, lest any refusal to lend to any affiliate of Westland for any reasons be deemed an “adverse action.” If Westland is allowed to enforce this provision as it intends, Fannie Mae will either face contempt proceedings or be coerced *into brand new multi-year lending relationships*, extending tens or hundreds of millions of

dollars in credit to strangers to the litigation. This is untenable and should be stayed.

Argument

I. If the Injunction Is Enforced as Westland Intends, Fannie Mae Will Face Contempt or Be Forced to Enter New Multi-Year, Multi-Million-Dollar Lending Transactions with other “Westland Entities” Against Its Will.

Section 5(o) – which was never briefed in the district court because it wasn’t part of Westland’s counter-motion for an injunction or discussed at the hearing on the injunction – requires that Fannie Mae treat Defendants and non-party “Westland entities” in particular ways, including what fees or interest Fannie Mae can charge in relation to new and other loans, i.e., not the loans at issue in this case, and purports to prohibit Fannie Mae from using its ACheck system to regulate its lending activity in accordance with its business practices and its mission.

A. Enjoining Fannie Mae from Using Its ACheck System Undermines Its Underwriting Process and Ability to Fulfill Its Mission.

Some background and explanation are helpful to understanding the implications of enjoining Fannie Mae from using its ACheck system. Fannie Mae is a government-sponsored enterprise, but is neither the government nor a government agency. Initially chartered in 1938, Fannie Mae does not make loans directly to prospective borrowers, but operates as a private corporation in the “secondary market” providing liquidity to lenders by purchasing loans the lenders originate. Congress has confirmed that Fannie Mae’s “continued ability ... to accomplish their public missions is important to providing housing in the United

States and the health of the Nation’s economy.” 12 U.S.C. § 4501; *see also Lightfoot v. Cendant Mortg. Corp.*, 137 S. Ct. 553, 557 (2017) (discussing Fannie Mae’s role as a purchaser of mortgages). To fill the nationwide gap in multifamily financing, particularly for affordable rental housing, Fannie Mae created a separate business division dedicated to purchasing multifamily loans.² Fannie Mae sought to enhance underwriting standards in the multifamily space and in 1988 initiated the Delegated Underwriting and Servicing (“DUS”) program to expand its purchases of individual multifamily loans. *See supra*, n.2.

The standard industry practice is for a multifamily loan purchaser to underwrite each loan prior to deciding whether to purchase or guaranty the loan. *See supra*, n.3. In contrast, DUS is a unique business model.³ Under the DUS model, pre-approved lenders are authorized to underwrite, close, and sell loans on multifamily properties to Fannie Mae without prior Fannie Mae review. *Id.* In other words, pre-approved DUS lenders who abide by rigorous credit and underwriting criteria originate loans, and Fannie Mae is contractually obligated to purchase conforming loans under the DUS program. *Id.* As a policy matter, underwriting and

² Delegated Underwriting & Servicing (DUS®) – (available at <https://multifamily.fanniemae.com/media/6241/display>). The Court may take judicial notice of the Guide and these publicly available materials. *See Daisy Trust v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, 135 Nev. 230, 445 P.3d 846, n.3 (2019) (taking judicial notice of servicing guide).

³ <https://capitalmarkets.fanniemae.com/media/4046/display>.

servicing guidelines and standardized loan documents facilitate delegation and create efficiencies in originating and closing loans and enables lenders to respond to customers rapidly, with the authority to approve a loan within prescribed parameters.

One of the gatekeeping tools the DUS program employs for underwriting purposes requires the originating lender to perform an “Applicant Experience Check” or “ACheck” for the borrower, each key principal of the borrower, each guarantor, and any person who owns or controls any entity key principal.⁴ If the result of the ACheck is “continue processing,” the lender proceeds with the application. *Id.* If the response is “do not process,” it is an indication that the sponsor “need[s] to have direct communication with Fannie Mae,” before proceeding to underwrite a mortgage loan.⁵ *Id.* By placing a pause in the delegated model of the DUS program, this tool allows Fannie Mae to address any concerns it may have with a borrower, sponsor, principal, guarantor, or key principal before new financing is provided by a DUS lender. It serves as an important risk management tool to reduce potential losses on new loan transactions delivered to Fannie Mae.

But the injunction requires that the DUS lender and Fannie Mae forego part of the prudent underwriting process to their detriment and to various Westland entities’ benefit. This directly undermines Fannie Mae’s ability to operate its

⁴ Multifamily Selling and Servicing Guide (January 1, 2021) (*available at* <https://mfguide.fanniemae.com/fnmf-pdf/download>) (at § 307).

⁵ ACheck responses are required to be kept confidential.

programs in a prudent, safe and sound manner increasing the risk of loss to Fannie Mae, and can similarly undermine DUS lenders, who share in the risk of loss on DUS loans the lender delivers to Fannie Mae. Further, the injunction has the real potential of being abused by using the threat of contempt in an attempt to leverage favorable terms as to dozens of other entities.

The form of order Westland submitted and Judge Earley signed directs that Fannie Mae may not put any “Westland entity ... on a-check” for any new loan or refinance. Though Fannie Mae had no opportunity to be heard on this issue or to vet it before the district court, owing to Westland’s never actually moving for this relief, it is clear that Westland intends that Fannie Mae be broadly prohibited from employing the ACheck system as to any “Westland entity,” including entities created after the injunction was entered. In light of how the DUS program works, section 5(o) removes the one of Fannie Mae’s important and prudent risk management tools to ensure it can review loans before purchasing them, rather than buying them sight-unseen. Westland should not be permitted to use this litigation to force Fannie Mae to disregard knowledge and information that have a bearing on safe and sound credit decision-making and engage in unwanted lending to unspecified and undisclosed Westland affiliates under threat of contempt.

B. The Injunction Requires Forced Contracting, which Is in Direct Contravention of Nevada Public Policy.

Nevada public policy supports the “the greatest freedom of contracting, and

contracts, when entered into freely and voluntarily.” *Royce Int’l Broad. Corp. v. Gordon & Rees, LLP*, 134 Nev. 1005, 429 P.3d 656 (2018). “Nevada has long recognized public interest in protecting the freedom of persons to contract.” *Id.* (citing *Holcomb Condo. Homeowners’ Ass’n v. Stewart Venture, LLC*, 129 Nev. 181, 187, 300 P.3d 124, 128 (2013)). Indeed, it is “hornbook law that the freedom of contract entails the freedom not to contract.” *Blue Cross & Blue Shield Mut. of Ohio v. Blue Cross & Blue Shield Ass’n*, 110 F.3d 318, 333 (6th Cir. 1997); *Shelley v. Trafalgar H. Pub. Ltd. Co.*, 973 F.Supp. 84, 89 (D.P.R. 1997) (“The freedom not to contract should be protected with the same zeal as the freedom to contract.”); *Lugassy v. Lugassy*, 298 So. 3d 657, 659 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 2020) (recognizing that the “freedom of contract entails the freedom not to contract,” and reversing a district court order requiring the defendant to enter future lending contracts).

This Court should stay section 5(o), which violates Fannie Mae’s right not to enter unwanted long-term lending relationships, which have the real potential to result in more litigation.

II. The Injunction Improperly Compels Affirmative Commercial Conduct with Non-Parties, Whether Presently in Existence or Not, and Outside of Nevada, None of Which Is Consistent With NRCP 65(d).

The injunction is overextensive because it is not only affirmative instead of prohibitive, but what it affirmatively compels Fannie Mae to do is to deal with entities that are not parties to this case. Worse yet, it compels Fannie Mae to do

these things everywhere (outside of Nevada) and with entities Westland may form that do not even exist at present. This case is vastly narrower – Defendants in this action, Westland Liberty Village, LLC and Westland Village Square, LLC, are Nevada single-purpose entities. Yet the injunction ignores that relevant narrowness and context by categorically prohibiting Fannie Mae from taking “*any* adverse action against *any* Westland entity” in relation to any other loans and new loans and refinancing applications. The injunction thus purports to prevent Fannie Mae from regulating its own lending relationships with countless entities not party to the litigation – wherever and whenever those compelled loans happen.

While the injunction does not specifically identify what counts as a “Westland entity,” Westland’s demands to Fannie Mae make clear its intent to enforce it expansively. Westland Real Estate Group’s business model involves incorporating single-purpose entities for each property or project, meaning that there are dozens of Westland LLCs throughout Nevada and California, with new Westland entities being (or capable of being) created for each new undertaking. Indeed, based on a search of the Secretary of State’s business records, there appear to be more than 50 Westland entities in Nevada alone, with additional entities in California. *See Exhibit 1*. Moreover, Westland could and likely will incorporate new LLCs that were not even in existence at the time the injunction was issued, and yet argue that these new entities would be under the injunction’s umbrella.

But requiring Fannie Mae to enter into unrelated loan agreements with non-party entities relating to properties not connected with this case far exceeds the scope of NRCP 65(d). A court ordinarily does not have power to issue orders concerning non-parties. *Richards v. Jefferson Cty., Ala.*, 517 U.S. 793, 798 (1996) (“[a] judgment or decree among parties to a lawsuit resolves issues as among them, but it does not conclude the rights of strangers to those proceedings.”) (internal citations omitted). Here, any “Westland entity” other than the two named Defendants were not parties in the district court and Fannie Mae should not be restricted in its dealings with the more than 60 non-party entities (and counting).

III. Section 5(o) of the Injunction Is a Gross Abuse of Discretion Because the District Court Made No Findings or Conclusions to Support the Extraordinary Injunctive Relief It Granted.

The record is clear that the district court never even considered the injunctive relief ordered in section 5(o), let alone that it made appropriate findings in satisfaction of the injunctive relief standard, as this relief was never before the district court until Westland submitted its proposed form of order.

Section 5(o) compels Fannie Mae to give unspecified “Westland entities” preferential status for multi-family mortgage loans, making the injunction mandatory and thus subject to a higher standard. *Garcia v. Google, Inc.*, 786 F.3d 733, 740 (9th Cir. 2015) (holding that the burden to support a mandatory injunction is “doubly demanding” and should be denied “*unless the facts and law clearly favor*

the moving party”); *Leonard v. Stoebling*, 102 Nev. 543, 551, 728 P.2d 1358, 1363 (1986) (holding that courts should “exercise restraint and caution” in issuing mandatory injunctions, which “undo wrongful conditions” or “restore the status quo”). Regardless, even if the Court were to treat this provision as merely prohibitory, it still does not satisfy the standard. The ultimate purpose of a prohibitory injunction is to preserve the status quo to prevent irreparable harm. *Dixon v. Thatcher*, 103 Nev. 414, 415, 742 P.2d 1029 (1987). The irreparable harm must be articulated in specific terms by the issuing order. *Dep’t of Conservation v. Foley*, 121 Nev. 77, 80, 109 P.3d 760, 762 (2005).

Here, following Fannie Mae’s application for the appointment of a receiver, Westland opposed the application and counter-moved to enjoin any foreclosure sale of the Properties. APP1291-1324. But nowhere in the thirty pages of its opposition and countermotion did Westland ask for the relief in section 5(o) or even mention loans involving non-parties, future lending activity, refinancing of unrelated loans, or ACheck. *Id.* None of those subjects were addressed at the hearing or supported by argument or evidence, and the motion does not even include the term “ACheck.”

As such, the district court’s focus was enjoining a foreclosure sale pending the adjudication of the parties’ rights and obligations. It did not conclude that the facts and the law “clearly favored” Westland with respect to the relief it afforded. Rather, it stated: “I feel there is a factual dispute on whether there is a default.”

APP1497. Even the deeply flawed written order that Westland prepared and the district court signed concluded only that “there are substantial factual disputes related to whether any default occurred” and that Fannie Mae’s pursuit of foreclosure “*may* amount to a breach of contract,” and “*may* support the other claims and damages in Westland’s Counterclaim.” APP1506 (emphasis added).

The district court’s support for enjoining the foreclosure sale was finding the irreparable harm “standard is met because it is property,” which clearly refers only to the foreclosure of the Properties. The district court did not make *any* findings or conclusions about future loans outside the litigation involving non-parties these issues, let alone of the type required to justify injunctive relief.

Conclusion

This Court should reconsider in part its prior ruling and stay section 5(o) pending appeal because it is a manifest abuse of discretion and, absent a stay, Westland will use the threat of contempt proceedings to coerce lending activity across two states involving an unknown population of non-party entities.

DATED: February 26, 2021

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.

/s/ Kelly H. Dove

Kelly H. Dove, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 10569)

Nathan G. Kanute, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 12413)

Bob L. Olson, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 3783)

*Attorneys for Appellant Federal National
Mortgage Association*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury, that I am over the age of eighteen (18) years, and I am not a party to, nor interested in, this action. On February 26, 2021, I caused to be served a true and correct copy of the foregoing **MOTION TO RECONSIDER** upon the following by the method indicated:

- ☐ **BY E-MAIL:** by transmitting via e-mail the document(s) listed above to the e-mail addresses set forth below and/or included on the Court's Service List for the above-referenced case.
- ☒ **BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION:** submitted to the above-entitled Court for electronic filing and service upon the Court's Service List for the above-referenced case.
- ☐ **BY U.S. MAIL:** by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Las Vegas, Nevada addressed as set forth below:

/s/ Maricris Williams

An Employee of SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.

4812-2186-6460.4

EXHIBIT 1

EXHIBIT 1

BUSINESS ENTITY AND MARK SEARCH RESULT							
Name	Status	Filing Date	Type	NV Business ID	Entity Number	Mark Number	Actions
WEST LAND BUSINESS SUPPORT, INC.	Active	10/15/2007	Domestic Corporation (78)	NV20071649167	E0726992007-5		Manage th
WESTLAND - RE, LLC	Active	08/09/2012	Foreign Limited-Liability Company	NV20121488657	E0416172012-9		Manage th
WESTLAND AMBER RIDGE LLC	Active	12/18/2017	Domestic Limited-Liability Company (86)	NV20171814135	E0588812017-9		Manage th
WESTLAND AMT, LLC	Active	08/16/2013	Domestic Limited-Liability Company (86)	NV20131491971	E0402192013-6		Manage th
WESTLAND ARVILLE PARK LLC	Active	07/16/2015	Foreign Limited-Liability Company	NV20151432902	E0345882015-1		Manage th
WESTLAND ASPEN MEADOW LLC	Active	03/24/2015	Foreign Limited-Liability Company	NV20151187440	E0148772015-9		Manage th
WESTLAND BEL AIRE LLC	Active	05/20/2016	Domestic Limited-Liability Company (86)	NV20161300008	E0231042016-5		Manage th

WESTLAND NABANA LLC	Active	02/02/2017	Foreign Limited- Liability Company	NV20171076581	E0056432017-	Mark	Manage th
Name	Status	Date	Type	NV Business ID	Entity Number	Number	Actions
WESTLAND CAPITAL LLC	Active	03/10/2016	Domestic Limited- Liability Company (86)	NV20161146733	E0112452016-0		Manage th
WESTLAND CORONA LLC	Active	06/07/2016	Domestic Limited- Liability Company (86)	NV20161336579	E0258092016-1		Manage th
WESTLAND DEVELOPMENT LLC	Active	05/07/2014	Domestic Limited- Liability Company (86)	NV20141313067	E0244382014-8		Manage th
WESTLAND DISTRIBUTING PARTNERS, LLC	Active	06/08/2018	Foreign Limited- Liability Company	NV20181413760	E0278772018-9		Manage th
WESTLAND EMERALD BAY LLC	Active	01/11/2017	Foreign Limited- Liability Company	NV20171041668	E0030012017-0		Manage th
WESTLAND EMERALD PARK LLC	Active	08/11/2017	Domestic Limited- Liability Company (86)	NV20171512727	E0385792017-0		Manage th
WESTLAND ENTERPRISES, LLC	Active	06/15/2011	Domestic Limited- Liability Company (86)	NV20111400318	E0340842011-8		Manage th
WESTLAND FINANCIAL SERVICES, INC.	Active	04/25/2001	Foreign Corporation (80)	NV20011281893	C10533-2001		Manage th

WESTLAND GREENVILLE PARK LLC	Active	Filing Date	07/16/2015	Foreign Limited- Liability Company	NV20151432885	E0345872015-	Mark Number	Manage th
	Status				NV Business ID	Entity Number		Actions
WESTLAND HACIENDA HILLS LLC	Active	04/06/2016	Domestic Limited- Liability Company (86)	NV20161206156	E0158582016- 9			Manage th
WESTLAND HAMPTON COURT LLC	Active	01/10/2017	Domestic Limited- Liability Company (86)	NV20171032586	E0023322017- 8			Manage th
WESTLAND HARMON LLC	Active	07/27/2017	Domestic Limited- Liability Company (86)	NV20171476163	E0357732017- 0			Manage th
Westland Harmon Property LLC	Active	01/22/2021	Foreign Limited- Liability Company	NV20211997419	E11849862021- 0			Manage th
Westland Kingsway LLC	Active	09/27/2019	Domestic Limited- Liability Company (86)	NV20191584931	E1870582019- 5			Manage th
WESTLAND LAKE SAHARA LLC	Active	07/16/2015	Foreign Limited- Liability Company	NV20151432941	E0345922015- 7			Manage th
WESTLAND LIBERTY VILLAGE LLC	Active	07/09/2018	Domestic Limited- Liability Company (86)	NV20181489847	E0327822018- 6			Manage th

WESTLAND LV	Active	01/08/2016	Domestic	NV20161015660	E0010872016-	Mark	Manage th
PROPERTIES	Status	Date	Type	NV Business ID	Entity Number	Number	Actions
LLC			Liability Company (86)				

< Previous

...

1

2

3

...

Next >

Page 1 of 3, records 1 to 25 of 55

Go to Page

Return To Search

BUSINESS ENTITY AND MARK SEARCH RESULT							
Name	Status	Filing Date	Type	NV Business ID	Entity Number	Mark Number	Actions
WESTLAND MIRABELLA LLC	Active	08/21/2017	Foreign Limited-Liability Company	NV20171534614	E0401752017-7		Manage t
Westland Orland LLC	Active	09/27/2019	Domestic Limited-Liability Company (86)	NV20191584986	E1871042019-3		Manage t
WESTLAND PACIFIC CONSTRUCTION, INC.	Active	12/14/2004	Foreign Corporation (80)	NV20041682346	C33695-2004		Manage t
WESTLAND PARK VISTA LLC	Active	07/16/2015	Foreign Limited-Liability Company	NV20151432939	E0345912015-6		Manage t
WESTLAND PARKWOOD LLC	Active	07/16/2015	Foreign Limited-Liability Company	NV20151432925	E0345902015-5		Manage t
Westland Pennwood LLC	Active	09/27/2019	Domestic Limited-Liability Company (86)	NV20191584998	E1871262019-5		Manage t
WESTLAND PINE VILLAGE LLC	Active	04/25/2016	Domestic Limited-Liability Company (86)	NV20161245972	E0189022016-0		Manage t

WESTLAND PROPERTIES, LLC	Active	Filing Date	03/20/2007	Domestic Limited- Liability Company (86)	NV20071321261	Entity Number	2007- 07-18	Mark Number	Manage t Actions
WESTLAND QOF #1 LLC	Active	06/22/2018		Domestic Limited- Liability Company (86)	NV20181457680	E0307332018- 3			Manage t Actions
WESTLAND QOF #2 LLC	Active	07/06/2018		Domestic Limited- Liability Company (86)	NV20181486167	E0325462018- 0			Manage t Actions
WESTLAND QOF #3 LLC	Active	01/09/2019		Domestic Limited- Liability Company (86)	NV20191041330	E0019122019- 0			Manage t Actions
WESTLAND QOF #4 LLC	Active	01/09/2019		Domestic Limited- Liability Company (86)	NV20191041353	E0019142019- 2			Manage t Actions
Westland QOF Number 5 LLC	Active	09/16/2019		Domestic Limited- Liability Company (86)	NV20191641705	E2914722019- 2			Manage t Actions
Westland QOF Number 6 LLC	Active	09/16/2019		Domestic Limited- Liability Company (86)	NV20191641717	E2915002019- 4			Manage t Actions
Westland QOF Partners, LLC	Active	08/22/2019		Domestic Limited- Liability Company (86)	NV20191559481	E1378972019- 0			Manage t Actions

NAME	Active Status	Entity Date	Foreign Type	NV Business ID	Entity Number	Mark Number	Manage t Actions
RANCHO ALVARADO, LLC		05/07/2014	Foreign Limited-Liability Company	NV20141311146	E0212732014-		
WESTLAND REGENCY HEIGHTS LLC	Active	05/07/2015	Foreign Limited-Liability Company	NV20151292454	E0229522015-8		Manage t
WESTLAND REGENCY LLC	Active	10/21/2016	Domestic Limited-Liability Company (86)	NV20161625736	E0463462016-5		Manage t
WESTLAND REGENCY MEADOWS LLC	Active	10/21/2016	Domestic Limited-Liability Company (86)	NV20161625743	E0463472016-6		Manage t
WESTLAND SAGE POINT LLC	Active	07/13/2016	Domestic Limited-Liability Company (86)	NV20161412181	E0311802016-4		Manage t
WESTLAND SONTERRA LLC	Active	09/15/2016	Foreign Limited-Liability Company	NV20161549540	E0408482016-0		Manage t
WESTLAND TARA VISTA LLC	Active	08/10/2018	Domestic Limited-Liability Company (86)	NV20181583254	E0384602018-9		Manage t
WESTLAND THUNDERBIRD LLC	Active	01/15/2016	Foreign Limited-Liability Company	NV20161032473	E0024122016-4		Manage t
WESTLAND TOSCANA LLC	Active	09/15/2016	Foreign Limited-Liability Company	NV20161549538	E0408472016-9		Manage t

WESTLAND	Active	06/14/2017	Foreign	NV20171383963	Entity	0000402017-	Mark	Manage t
NAME	Status	Date	Type	NV Business ID	Number	Number	Number	Actions
VILLAS LLC			Liability Company					

< Previous

...

1

2

3

...

Next >

Page 2 of 3, records 26 to 50 of 55

Go to Page

Return To Search

BUSINESS ENTITY AND MARK SEARCH RESULT							
Name	Status	Filing Date	Type	NV Business ID	Entity Number	Mark Number	Actions
WESTLAND TROPICANA ROYALE LLC	Active	08/21/2017	Domestic Limited-Liability Company (86)	NV20171534633	E0401762017-8		Manage this Bus
WESTLAND VELLAGIO ENSENADA LLC	Active	05/03/2017	Foreign Limited-Liability Company	NV20171293092	E0217772017-5		Manage this Bus
WESTLAND VILLAGE MHP LLC	Active	12/22/2017	Domestic Limited-Liability Company (86)	NV20171826918	E0598392017-9		Manage this Bus
WESTLAND VILLAGE SQUARE LLC	Active	07/06/2018	Domestic Limited-Liability Company (86)	NV20181486200	E0325502018-6		Manage this Bus
WESTLAND VILLAS AT DESERT POINTE LLC	Active	07/16/2015	Foreign Limited-Liability Company	NV20151432918	E0345892015-2		Manage this Bus
<div> < Previous ... 1 2 3 ... Next > </div> <div> Page 3 of 3, records 51 to 55 of 55 <input type="text"/> Go to Page </div>							

[Return To Search](#)