## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

Supreme Court Case No. 82448
MOTI PARTNERS, LLC; MOTI PARTNERS 16, LLC; LLTQ
ENTERPRISES, LLC; LLTQ ENTERPRISES 16, EleCtronically Filed
TPOV ENTERPRISES, LLC; TPOV ENTERPRISES A®rI19C2021 01:55 p.m. FERG, LLC; FERG 16, LLC; DNT ACQUISITION, LLC, Elizab\&fthifABrown
 GLOBAL SOLUTIONS, LLC,

Petitioners, v.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK, AND THE HONORABLE TIMOTHY C. WILLIAMS, DISTRICT JUDGE, DEPT. XVI,

Respondent,
and

DESERT PALACE, INC.; PARIS LAS VEGAS OPERATING COMPANY, LLC; PHWLV, LLC; and BOARDWALK REGENCY CORPORATION d/b/a/ CAESARS ATLANTIC CITY,

Real Parties in Interest.

## SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX

James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027
JJP@pisanellibice.com
Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695
DLS@pisanellibice.com
Jordan T. Smith, Esq., Bar No. 12097
JTS@pisanellibice.com
M. Magali Mercera, Esq., Bar No. 11742

MMM@pisanellibice.com
Pisanelli Bice pllc
400 South 7th Street, Suite 300
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Telephone: 702.214.2100
Attorneys for Real Parties in Interest

## CHRONOLOGICAL \& ALPHABETICAL INDEX

| Date | Description | Bates no. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $6 / 25 / 2018$ | Notice of Intent to Take Default of Defendant <br> DNT Acquisition, LLC | $0001-0003$ |
| $6 / 25 / 2018$ | Notice of Intent to Take Default of Defendant <br> FERG 16, LLC | $0004-0006$ |
| $6 / 25 / 2018$ | Notice of Intent to Take Default of Defendant <br> FERG, LLC | $0007-0009$ |
| $6 / 25 / 2018$ | Notice of Intent to Take Default of Defendant <br> LLTQ Enterprises 16, LLC | $0010-0012$ |
| $6 / 25 / 2018$ | Notice of Intent to Take Default of Defendant <br> LLTQ Enterprises, LLC | $0013-0015$ |
| $6 / 25 / 2018$ | Notice of Intent to Take Default of Defendant MOTI <br> Partners 16, LLC | $0016-0018$ |
| $6 / 25 / 2018$ | Notice of Intent to Take Default of Defendant MOTI <br> Partners, LLC | $0019-0021$ |
| $6 / 25 / 2018$ | Notice of Intent to Take Default of Defendant <br> TPOV Enterprises 16, LLC | $0022-0024$ |
| $6 / 25 / 2018$ | Notice of Intent to Take Default of Defendant <br> TPOV Enterprises, LLC | $0025-0027$ |
| $11 / 6 / 2019$ | Reporter's Transcript of Hearing | $0028-0067$ |
| $2 / 12 / 2020$ | Reporter's Transcript of Caesars' Motion for Leave to <br> File First Amended Complaint; and Ex Parte <br> Application for Order Shortening Time; Motion to Seal <br> Certain Exhibits to Opposition to Caesars' Motion for <br> Leave to File First Amended Complaint | $0068-0103$ |
| $2 / 17 / 2021$ | Reporter's Transcript of Hearing | $0104-0162$ |
|  |  |  |

DATED this 19th day of April 2021.

## Pisanelli Bice pllc

By: /s/ James J. Pisanelli
James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027
Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695
Jordan T. Smith, Esq., Bar No. 12097
M. Magali Mercera, Esq., Bar No. 11742

400 South 7th Street, Suite 300
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Attorneys for Real Parties in Interest

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I am an employee of PisANELLI Bice pllc, and that on this 19th day of April 2021, I electronically filed and served a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX properly addressed to the following:

John R. Bailey, Esq.
Dennis L. Kennedy, Esq.
Joshua P. Gilmore, Esq.
Paul C. Williams, Esq.
Stephanie J. Glantz, Esq.
BAILEY KENNEDY
8984 Spanish Ridge Avenue
Las Vegas, NV 89148-1302
JBailey@BaileyKennedy.com
DKennedy@BaileyKennedy.com
JGilmore@BaileyKennedy.com
PWilliams@BaileyKennedy.com
SGlantz@BaileyKennedy.com
Attorneys for Petitioners

VIA EMAIL
John D. Tennert, Esq.
Wade Beavers, Esq.
FENNEMORE CRAIG, P.C.
7800 Rancharrah Parkway
Reno, NV 89511
jtennert@fclaw.com
wbeavers@fclaw.com
Attorneys for Gordon Ramsay

VIA EMAIL
Alan Lebensfeld, Esq.
LEBENSFELD SHARON \&
SCHWARTZ, P.C.
140 Broad Street
Red Bank, NJ 07701
alan.lebensfeld@lsandspc.com
Mark J. Connot, Esq.
Kevin M. Sutehall, Esq.
FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP
1980 Festival Plaza Drive, \#700
Las Vegas, NV 89135
mconnot@foxrothschild.com ksutehall@foxrothschild.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff in Intervention The Original Homestead Restaurant, Inc.

VIA EMAIL
Hon. Timothy C. Williams
District Judge
Eighth Judicial District Court
Regional Justice Center
200 Lewis Avenue
Las Vegas, NV 89155
Dept16lc@clarkcountycourts.us
Dept16ea@clarkcountycourt.us
Respondent

By: /s/ Cinda Towne
An employee of PisANELLI Bice pllc

James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027 jjp@pisanellibice.com
Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695
dls@pisanellibice.com
M. Magali Mercera, Esq., Bar No. 11742
mmm@pisanellibice.com
Brittnie Watkins, Esq., Bar No. 13612
btw@pisanellibice.com
PisANELLI BICE PLLC
400 South 7th Street, Suite 300
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Telephone: 702.214.2100
Attorneys for Desert Palace, Inc.;
Paris Las Vegas Operating Company, LLC;
PHWLV, LLC; and Boardwalk Regency
Corporation d/b/a Caesars Atlantic City
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
ROWEN SEIBEL, an individual and citizen of New York, derivatively on behalf of Real Party in Interest GR BURGR LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

Plaintiff,
v.

PHWLV, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company; GORDON RAMSAY, an individual; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X,

Defendants,
and
GR BURGR LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

Nominal Plaintiff.

AND ALL RELATED MATTERS.

To: Defendant DNT Acquisition, LLC;
To: Daniel R. McNutt, Esq. and Matthew C. Wolf, Esq., McNutt Law Firm, P.C., its attorneys of record; and

To: Paul Sweeney, Certilman Balin AdLer \& Hyman, Llp, its attorneys of record;

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiffs Desert Palace, Inc., Paris Las Vegas Operating Company, LLC, PHWLV, LLC; and Boardwalk Regency Corporation d/b/a Caesars Atlantic City intend to take the default of Defendant DNT Acquisition, LLC, unless an answer or other responsive pleading is filed on or before three days from the date of this Notice.

DATED this 20 day of June 2018.
Pisanelli Bice pllc


## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I am an employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLC and that, on this
$\qquad$ day of June 2018, I caused to be served via the Court's e-filing/e-service system true and correct copies of the above and foregoing NOTICE OF INTENT TO TAKE DEFAULT OF DEFENDANT DNT ACQUISITION, LLC to the following:

Daniel R. McNutt, Esq.
Matthew C. Wolf, Esq.
MCNUTT LAW FIRM, P.C.
625 South Eighth Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
Paul Sweeney
CERTILMAN BALIN
ADLER \& HYMAN, LLP
90 Merrick Avenue
East Meadow, NY 11554
Attorneys for Rowen Seibel, DNT Acquisition LLC, Moti Partners, LLC, Moti Parther 16s, $L L C$,
LLTQ Enterprises, LLC, LLTQ Enterprises 16, LLC, TPOV Enterprises, LLC, TPOV Enterprises 16, LLC, FERG, LLC, and FERG 16, LLC

Allen J. Wilt, Esq.
John D. Tennert III, Esq.
300 East Second Street, Suite 1510
Reno, NV 89501
Attorneys for Gordon Ramsay
VIA U.S. MAIL
Kurt Heyman, Esq.
300 Delaware Ave., Suite 200
Wilmington, DE 19801
Trustee for GR Burgr, LLC

Nathan O. Rugg, Esq.<br>Barack Ferrazzano Kirschbaum \&<br>Nagelberg LLP<br>200 W. Madison St., Suite 3900<br>Chicago, IL 60606<br>Steven B. Chaiken, Esq,<br>ADELMAN \& GETTLEMAN, LTD.<br>53 W. Jackson blvd., Suite 1050<br>Chicago, IL 60604<br>Attorneys for LLTQ Enterprises, LLC;<br>LLTQ Enterprises 16, LLC, FERG, LLC;<br>FERG 16, LLC; MOTI Partners, LLC; and MOTI Partners 16, LLC

James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027
jjp@pisanellibice.com
Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695
dls@pisanellibice.com
M. Magali Mercera, Esq., Bar No. 11742
mmm@pisanellibice.com
Brittnie Watkins, Esq., Bar No. 13612
btw@pisanellibice.com
Pisanelli Bice pllc
400 South 7th Street, Suite 300
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Telephone: 702.214.2100
Attorneys for Desert Palace, Inc.;
Paris Las Vegas Operating Company, LLC;
PHWLV, LLC; and Boardwalk Regency
Corporation d/b/a Caesars Atlantic City

## EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

## CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

ROWEN SEIBEL, an individual and citizen of New York, derivatively on behalf of Real Party in Interest GR BURGR LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

Plaintiff,
v.

PHWLV, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company; GORDON RAMSAY, an individual; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X,

Defendants,
and
GR BURGR LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

Nominal Plaintiff.

AND ALL RELATED MATTERS.

To: Defendant FERG 16, LLC;
To: Daniel R. McNutt, Esq. and Matthew C. Wolf, Esq., McNutt Law Firm, P.C., its attorneys of record;

To: Paul Sweeney, Certilman Balin Adler \& Hyman, Llp, its attorneys of record;

To: Nathan O. Rugg, Esq., Barack Ferrazzano Kirschbaum \& Nagelberg LLP, its attorneys of record; and

To: Steven B. Chaiken, Esq., Adelman \& Gettleman, Ltd, its attorneys of record.
PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiffs Desert Palace, Inc., Paris Las Vegas Operating Company, LLC, PHWLV, LLC; and Boardwalk Regency Corporation d/b/a Caesars Atlantic City intend to take the default of Defendant FERG 16, LLC, unless an answer or other responsive pleading is filed on or before three days from the date of this Notice.

DATED this 25 day of June 2018.
Pisanelli Bice PLLC

By: | Jarnes J/Pissanelli, Esq., \#4027 |
| :--- |
| Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., \#9695 |
| M. Magali Mercera, Esq., \#11742 |
| Britnie T. Watkins, Esq,, \#13612 |
| 400 South 7th Street, Suite 300 |
| Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 |
| Attorneys for Desert Palace, Inc.; |
| Paris Las Vegas Operating Company, LLC; |
| PHWLV, LLC; and Boardwalk Regency |
| Corporation d/b/a Caesars Atlantic City |

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I am an employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLC and that, on this 25 day of June 2018, I caused to be served via the Court's e-filing/e-service system true and correct copies of the above and foregoing NOTICE OF INTENT TO TAKE DEFAULT OF

DEFENDANT FERG 16, LLC to the following:

Daniel R. McNutt, Esq.
Matthew C. Wolf, Esq.
MCNUTT LAW FIRM, P.C.
625 South Eighth Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
Paul Sweeney
CERTILMAN BALIN
ADLER \& HYMAN, LLP
90 Merrick Avenue
East Meadow, NY 11554
Attorneys for Rowen Seibel, DNT Acquisition LLC, Moti Partners, $L L C$, Moti Partner 16s, $L L C$,
LLTQ Enterprises, LLC, LLTQ Enterprises 16, LLC, TPOV Enterprises, LLC, TPOV Enterprises 16, LLC, FERG, LLC, and FERG 16, LLC

Allen J. Wilt, Esq.
John D. Tennert III, Esq.
300 East Second Street, Suite 1510
Reno, NV 89501
Attorneys for Gordon Ramsay
VIA U.S. MAIL
Kurt Heyman, Esq.
300 Delaware Ave., Suite 200
Wilmington, DE 19801
Trustee for GR Burgri LLC

Nathan O. Rugg, Esq
Barack Ferrazzano Kirschbaum \&
Nagelberg LLP
200 W. Madison St., Suite 3900
Chicago, IL 60606
Steven B. Chaiken, Esq.
ADELMAN \& GETTLEMAN, LTD.
53 W, Jackson blvd., Suite 1050
Chicago, IL 60604
Attorneys for LLTQ Enterprises, LLC;
LLTQ Enterprises 16, LLC, FERG, LLC;
FERG 16, LLC; MOTI Partners, LLC; and MOTI Partners 16, LLC

Robert E. Atkinson
ATKINSON LAW ASSOCIATES LTD.
8965 S. Eastern Ave., Suite 260
Las Vegas, NV 89123
Attorneys for J. Jeffrey Frederick


An employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLC

James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027
jjp@pisanellibice.com
Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695
dls@pisanellibice.com
M. Magali Mercera, Esq., Bar No. 11742
mmm@pisanellibice.com
Brittnie Watkins, Esq., Bar No. 13612
btw@pisanellibice.com
PISANELLI BICE PLLC
400 South 7th Street, Suite 300
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Telephone: 702.214.2100
Attorneys for Desert Palace, Inc.;
Paris Las Vegas Operating Company, LLC,
PHWLV, LLC; and Boardwalk Regency
Corporation d/b/a Caesars Atlantic City
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
ROWEN SEIBEL, an individual and citizen of New York, derivatively on behalf of Real Party in Interest GR BURGR LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

Plaintiff,
v.

PHWLV, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company; GORDON RAMSAY, an individual; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X,

Defendants,
and
GR BURGR LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

Nominal Plaintiff.

AND ALL RELATED MATTERS.

To: Defendant FERG, LLC;
To: Daniel R. McNutt, Esq. and Matthew C. Wolf, Esq., McNutt Law Firm, P.C., its attorneys of record;

To: Paul Sweeney, Certilman Balin AdLER \& Hyman, llp, its attorneys of record;

To: Nathan O. Rugg, Esq., Barack Ferrazzano Kirschbaum \& Nagelberg LLP, its attorneys of record; and

To: Steven B. Chaiken, Esq., Adelman \& Gettleman, LTd, its attorneys of record.
PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiffs Desert Palace, Inc., Paris Las Vegas Operating Company, LLC, PHWLV, LLC; and Boardwalk Regency Corporation d/b/a Caesars Atlantic City intend to take the default of Defendant FERG, LLC, unless an answer or other responsive pleading is filed on or before three days from the date of this Notice.

DATED this $25^{\star}$ day of June 2018.
Pisanelli Bice pllc


## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I am an employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLC and that, on this
$\qquad$ day of June 2018, I caused to be served via the Court's e-filing/e-service system true and correct copies of the above and foregoing NOTICE OF INTENT TO TAKE DEFAULT OF DEFENDANT FERG, LLC to the following:

Daniel R. McNutt, Esq.
Matthew C. Wolf, Esq.
MCNUTT LAW FIRM, P.C.
625 South Eighth Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
Paul Sweeney
CERTILMAN BALIN
ADLER \& HYMAN, LLP
90 Merrick Avenue
East Meadow, NY 11554
Attorneys for Rowen Seibel, DNT Acquisition LLC, Moti Partners, LLC, Moti Partner 16s, LLC,
LLTQ Enterprises, LLC, LLTQ Enterprises 16, LLC, TPOV Enterprises, LLC, TPOV Enterprises 16, LLC, FERG, LLC, and FERG 16, LLCC

Allen J. Wilt, Esq.
John D. Tennert III, Esq.
300 East Second Street, Suite 1510
Reno, NV 89501
Attorneys for Gordon Ramsay
VIA U.S. MAIL
Kurt Heyman, Esq.
300 Delaware Ave., Suite 200
Wilmington, DE 19801
Trustee for GR Burgr, LLC

Nathan O, Rugg, Esq.
Barack Ferrazzano Kirschbaum \&
NAGelberg LLP
200 W. Madison St., Suite 3900
Chicago, IL 60606
Steven B. Chaiken, Esq.
ADELMAN \& GETTLEMAN, LTD.
53 W. Jackson blvd., Suite 1050
Chicago, IL 60604
Attorneys for LLTQ Enterprises, LLC;
LLTQ Enterprises 16, LLC, FERG, LLC; FERG 16, LLC; MOTI Partners, LLC; and MOTI Partners 16, LLC

Robert E. Atkinson
ATKINSON LAW ASSOCIATES LTD.
8965 S. Eastern Ave., Suite 260
Las Vegas, NV 89123
Attorneys for J. Jeffrey Frederick

James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027
jjp@pisanellibice.com
Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695
dls@pisanellibice.com
M. Magali Mercera, Esq., Bar No. 11742
mmm@pisanellibice.com
Brittnie Watkins, Esq., Bar No. 13612
btw@pisanellibice.com
PISANELLI BICE PLLC
400 South 7th Street, Suite 300
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Telephone: 702.214.2100
Attorneys for Desert Palace, Inc.;
Paris Las Vegas Operating Company, LLC;
PHWLV, LLC; and Boardwalk Regency
Corporation $d / b / a$ Caesars Atlantic City
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

ROWEN SEIBEL, an individual and citizen of New York, derivatively on behalf of Real Party in Interest GR BURGR LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

Plaintiff,
v.

PHWLV, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company; GORDON RAMSAY, an individual; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X ,

Defendants,
and
GR BURGR LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

Nominal Plaintiff.

AND ALL RELATED MATTERS.

To: Defendant LLTQ Enterprises 16, LLC;
To: Daniel R. McNutt, Esq. and Matthew C. Wolf, Esq., McNutt Law Firm, P.C., its attorneys of record;

To: Paul Sweeney, Certilman Balin Adler \& Hyman, llp, its attorneys of record;

To: Nathan O. Rugg, Esq., Barack Ferrazzano Kirschbaum \& Nagelberg LLP, its attorneys of record; and

To: Steven B. Chaiken, Esq., Adelman \& Gettleman, LTD, its attorneys of record.
PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiffs Desert Palace, Inc., Paris Las Vegas Operating Company, LLC, PHWLV, LLC; and Boardwalk Regency Corporation d/b/a Caesars Atlantic City intend to take the default of Defendant LLTQ Enterprises 16, LLC, unless an answer or other responsive pleading is filed on or before three days from the date of this Notice.

DATED this $25^{\text {thy }}$ day of June 2018.
Pisanelli Bice pllc


## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I am an employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLC and that, on this
$\qquad$ day of June 2018, I caused to be served via the Court's e-filing/e-service system true and correct copies of the above and foregoing NOTICE OF INTENT TO TAKE DEFAULT OF

DEFENDANT LLTQ ENTERPRISES 16, LLC to the following:

Daniel R. McNutt, Esq.
Matthew C. Wolf, Esq.
MCNUTT LAW FIRM, P.C.
625 South Eighth Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
Paul Sweeney
CERTILMAN BALIN
ADLER \& HYMAN, LLB
90 Merrick Avenue
East Meadow, NY 11554
Attorneys for Rowed Seibel, DNT Acquisition LLC, Mott Partners, $L L C$, Moi Partner 16s, $L L C$,
LLTQ Enterprises, LLC, LLTQ Enterprises 16, LLC, TPOV Enterprises, LLC, TPOV Enterprises 16, LLC, FERG, LLC, and FERG 16, LLC

Allen J. Wilt, Esq.
John D. Tenner III, Esq.
300 East Second Street, Suite 1510
Reno, NV 89501
Attorneys for Gordon Ramsay
VIA USS. MAIL
Kurt Heyman, Esq.
300 Delaware Ave., Suite 200
Wilmington, DE 19801
Trustee for GR Burgr, LLC

Nathan O. Rugs, Esq.
Barack Ferrazzano Kirschbaum \&
Nagelberg LLP
200 W. Madison St., Suite 3900
Chicago, IL 60606
Steven B. Chaiken, Esq.
ADELMAN \& GETTLEMAN, LTD.
53 W. Jackson blvd., Suite 1050
Chicago, IL 60604
Attorneys for LLTQ Enterprises, LLC;
LLTQ Enterprises 16, LLD, ERG, LDC;
FERG 16, LLC; MOTI Partners, LLC; and MOTI Partners 16, LLC

Procne
An employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLC

James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027
jjp@pisanellibice.com
Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695
dls@pisanellibice.com
M. Magali Mercera, Esq., Bar No. 11742
mmm@pisanellibice.com
Brittnie Watkins, Esq., Bar No. 13612
btw@pisanellibice.com
PISANELLI BICE PLLC
400 South 7th Street, Suite 300
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Telephone: 702.214.2100
Attorneys for Desert Palace, Inc.;
Paris Las Vegas Operating Company, LLC;
PHWLV, LLC; and Boardwalk Regency
Corporation $d / b / a$ Caesars Atlantic City

## EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

ROWEN SEIBEL, an individual and citizen of New York, derivatively on behalf of Real Party in Interest GR BURGR LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

Plaintiff,
v.

PHWLV, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company; GORDON RAMSAY, an individual; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X,

Defendants,
and
GR BURGR LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

Nominal Plaintiff.

AND ALL RELATED MATTERS.

To: Defendant LLTQ Enterprises, LLC;
To: Daniel R. McNutt, Esq. and Matthew C. Wolf, Esq., McNutt Law Firm, P.C., its attorneys of record;

To: Paul Sweeney, Certilman Balin Adler \& Hyman, llp, its attorneys of record;

To: Nathan O. Rugg, Esq., Barack Ferrazzano Kirschbaum \& Nagelberg LLP, its attorneys of record; and

To: Steven B. Chaiken, Esq., Adelman \& Gettleman, Ltd, its attorneys of record.
PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiffs Desert Palace, Inc., Paris Las Vegas Operating Company, LLC, PHWLV, LLC; and Boardwalk Regency Corporation d/b/a Caesars Atlantic City intend to take the default of Defendant LLTQ Enterprises, LLC, unless an answer or other responsive pleading is filed on or before three days from the date of this Notice.

DATED this $25^{\text {d }}$ day of June 2018.
Pisanelli Bice Pllc


Attorneys for Desert Palace, Inc.; Paris Las Vegas Operating Company, LLC;
PHWLV, LLC; and Boardwalk Regency
Corporation d/b/a Caesars Atlantic City

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I am an employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLC and that, on this
$\qquad$ day of June 2018, I caused to be served via the Court's e-filing/e-service system true and correct copies of the above and foregoing NOTICE OF INTENT TO TAKE DEFAULT OF DEFENDANT LLTQ ENTERPRISES, LLC to the following:

Daniel R. McNutt, Esq.
Matthew C. Wolf, Esq.
MCNUTT LAW FIRM, P.C.
625 South Eighth Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
Paul Sweeney
CERTILMAN BALIN
ADLER \& HYMAN, LLP
90 Merrick Avenue
East Meadow, NY 11554
Attorneys for Rowed Seibel, DNT Acquisition LLC, Mott Partners, $L L C$, Mot Partner Ios, $L L C$,
LLTQ Enterprises, LLC, LLTQ Enterprises 16, LLC, TPOV Enterprises, LLC, TPOV Enterprises 16, LLC, FERG, LLC, and FERG 16, LLC

Allen J. Wilt, Esq.
John D. Tennert III, Esq.
300 East Second Street, Suite 1510
Reno, NV 89501
Attorneys for Gordon Ramsay
VIA USS. MAIL
Kurt Heyman, Esq. 300 Delaware Ave., Suite 200
Wilmington, DE 19801
Trustee for GR Burg, LLC

Nathan O. Rugs, Esq.<br>Barack Ferrazzano Kirschbaum \&<br>Nagelberg LLP<br>200 W. Madison St., Suite 3900<br>Chicago, IL 60606<br>Steven B. Chaiken, Esq.<br>ADELMAN \& GETTLEMAN, LTD.<br>53 W. Jackson blvd., Suite 1050<br>Chicago, IL 60604<br>Attorneys for LLTQ Enterprises, LLC;<br>LLTQ Enterprises 16, LLC, FERG, LLC: FERG 16, LLC; MOTI Partners, LLC; and MOTI Partners 16, LLC

Robert E. Atkinson
ATKINSON LAW ASSOCIATES LTD.
8965 S. Eastern Ave., Suite 260
Las Vegas, NV 89123
Attorneys for J. Jeffrey Frederick

Gere
An employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLC

James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027
jjp@pisanellibice.com
Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695
dls@pisanellibice.com
M. Magali Mercera, Esq., Bar No. 11742
mmm@pisanellibice.com
Brittnie Watkins, Esq., Bar No. 13612
btw@pisanellibice.com
PisANELLI BICE PLLC
400 South 7th Street, Suite 300
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Telephone: 702.214.2100
Attorneys for Desert Palace, Inc.;
Paris Las Vegas Operating Company, LLC,
PHWLV, LLC; and Boardwalk Regency
Corporation d/b/a Caesars Atlantic City

## EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADAROWEN SEIBEL, an individual and citizen of New York, derivatively on behalf of Real Party in Interest GR BURGR LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

Plaintiff,
v.

PHWLV, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company; GORDON RAMSAY, an individual; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X,

Defendants,
and
GR BURGR LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

Nominal Plaintiff.

AND ALL RELATED MATTERS.
Case No.: A-17-751759-B
Dept. No.: XV
Consolidated with A-17-760537-B

NOTICE OF INTENT TO TAKE DEFAULT OF DEFENDANT MOTI PARTNERS 16, LLC

To: Defendant MOTI Partners 16, LLC;
To: Daniel R. McNutt, Esq. and Matthew C. Wolf, Esq., McNutt Law Firm, P.C., its attorneys of record;

To: Paul Sweeney, Certilman Balin Adler \& Hyman, Llp, its attorneys of record;

To: Nathan O. Rugg, Esq., Barack Ferrazzano Kirschbaum \& Nagelberg LLP, its attorneys of record; and

To: Steven B. Chaiken, Esq., Adelman \& Gettleman, Ltd, its attorneys of record.
PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiffs Desert Palace, Inc., Paris Las Vegas Operating Company, LLC, PHWLV, LLC; and Boardwalk Regency Corporation d/b/a Caesars Atlantic City intend to take the default of Defendant MOTI Partners 16, LLC, unless an answer or other responsive pleading is filed on or before three days from the date of this Notice.

DATED this 25 day of June 2018.
PisAnelli Bice Pllc


James J. Pisanelli, Esq., \#4027
Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., \#9695
M. Magali Mercera, Esq., \#11742

Brittnie T. Watkins, Esq., \#13612
400 South 7th Street, Suite 300
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Attorneys for Desert Palace, Inc, ;
Paris Las Vegas Operating Company, LLC;
PHWLV, LLC; and Boardwalk Regency
Corporation d/b/a Caesars Atlantic City

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I am an employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLC and that, on this 25 day of June 2018, I caused to be served via the Court's e-filing/e-service system true and correct copies of the above and foregoing NOTICE OF INTENT TO TAKE DEFAULT OF DEFENDANT MOTI PARTNERS 16, LLC to the following:

Daniel R. McNutt, Esq.
Matthew C. Wolf, Esq.
MCNUTT LAW FIRM, P.C,
625 South Eighth Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101.
Paul Sweeney
CERTILMAN BALIN
ADLER \& HYMAN, LLP
90 Merrick Avenue
East Meadow, NY 11554
Attorneys for Rowen Seibel, DNT Acquisition LLC, Moti Partners, LLC, Moti Partner 16s, LLC,
LLTQ Enterprises, LLC, LLTQ Enterprises 16, LLC, TPOV Enterprises, LLC, TPOV Enterprises 16, LLC, FERG, LLC, and FERG 16, LLC

Allen J. Wilt, Esq.
John D, Tennert III, Esq.
300 East Second Street, Suite 1510
Reno, NV 89501
Attorneys for Gordon Ramsay
VIA U.S. MAIL
Kurt Heyman, Esq.
300 Delaware Ave., Suite 200
Wilmington, DE 19801
Trustee for GR Burgr, LLC

Nathan O. Rugg, Esq.
Barack Ferrazzano Kirschbaum \&
Nagelberg LLP
200 W. Madison St., Suite 3900
Chicago, IL 60606
Steven B. Chaiken, Esq.
ADELMAN \& GETTLEMAN, LTD.
53 W. Jackson blvd., Suite 1050
Chicago, IL 60604
Attorneys for LLTQ Enterprises, $L L C$;
LLTQ Enterprises 16, LLC, FERG, LLCC;
FERG 16, LLC; MOTI Partners, LLC; and MOTI Partners 16, LLC

Robert E. Atkinson
ATKINSON LAW ASSOCIATES LTD.
8965 S. Eastern Ave., Suite 260
Las Vegas, NV 89123
Attorneys for J, Jeffrey Frederick


An employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLC

James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027
jjp@pisanellibice.com
Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695
dls@pisanellibice.com
M. Magali Mercera, Esq., Bar No. 11742
mmm@pisanellibice.com
Brittnie Watkins, Esq., Bar No. 13612
btw@pisanellibice.com
PISANELLI BICE PLLC
400 South 7th Street, Suite 300
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Telephone: 702.214.2100
Attorneys for Desert Palace, Inc.;
Paris Las Vegas Operating Company, LLC,
PHWLV, LLC; and Boardwalk Regency
Corporation d/b/a Caesars Atlantic City

## EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
ROWEN SEIBEL, an individual and citizen of New York, derivatively on behalf of Real Party in Interest GR BURGR LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

Plaintiff,
v.

PHWLV, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company; GORDON RAMSAY, an individual; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X ,

Defendants,
and
GR BURGR LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

Nominal Plaintiff.

AND ALL RELATED MATTERS.

To: Defendant MOTI Partners, LLC;
To: Daniel R. McNutt, Esq. and Matthew C. Wolf, Esq., McNutt Law Firm, P.C., its attorneys of record;

To: Paul Sweeney, Certilman Balin Adler \& Hyman, Llp, its attorneys of record;

To: Nathan O. Rugg, Esq., Barack Ferrazzano Kirschbaum \& Nagelberg LLP, its attorneys of record; and

To: Steven B. Chaiken, Esq., Adelman \& Gettleman, Ltd, its attorneys of record.
PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiffs Desert Palace, Inc., Paris Las Vegas Operating Company, LLC, PHWLV, LLC; and Boardwalk Regency Corporation d/b/a Caesars Atlantic City intend to take the default of Defendant MOTI Partners, LLC, unless an answer or other responsive pleading is filed on or before three days from the date of this Notice.

DATED this day of June 2018.
Pisanelli Bice pllc


James J/Pisaņelli, Esq., \#4027
Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., \#9695
M. Magali Mercera, Esq., \#11742

Brittnie T. Watkins, Esq., \#13612
400 South 7th Street, Suite 300
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Attorneys for Desert Palace, Inc.;
Paris Las Vegas Operating Company, LLC;
PHWLV, LLC; and Boardwalk Regency
Corporation d/b/a Caesars Atlantic City

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I am an employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLC and that, on this
$\qquad$ day of June 2018, I caused to be served via the Court's e-filing/e-service system true and correct copies of the above and foregoing NOTICE OF INTENT TO TAKE DEFAULT OF DEFENDANT MOTI PARTNERS, LLC to the following:

Daniel R. McNutt, Esq.
Matthew C. Wolf, Esq.
MCNUTT LAW FIRM, P.C.
625 South Eighth Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
Paul Sweeney
CERTILMAN BALI
ADLER \& HYMAN, LLP
90 Merrick Avenue
East Meadow, NY 11554
Attorneys for Rowe Seibel, DNT Acquisition LLC, Moti Partners, LLC, Moi Partner Ios, LLC,
LLTQ Enterprises, LLC, LLTQ Enterprises 16, LLC, TPOV Enterprises, LLC, TPOV Enterprises 16, LLC, FERG, LLC, and FERG 16, LLC

Allen J. Wilt, Esq.
John D. Tenners III, Esq.
300 East Second Street, Suite 1510
Reno, NV 89501
Attorneys for Gordon Ramsay
VIA USS. MAIL
Kurt Heyman, Esq.
300 Delaware Ave., Suite 200
Wilmington, DE 19801
Trustee for GR Burgr, LLC

Nathan O. Rugs, Esq.<br>Barack Ferrazzano Kirschbaum \&<br>Nagelberg LLP<br>200 W. Madison St., Suite 3900<br>Chicago, IL 60606<br>Steven B. Chaiken, Esq.<br>ADELMAN \& GETTLEMAN, LTD. 53 W. Jackson blvd., Suite 1050<br>Chicago, IL 60604<br>Attorneys for LLTQ Enterprises, LLC;<br>LLTQ Enterprises 16, LLC, FERG, LLC;<br>FERG 16, LLC; MOTI Partners, LLC; and MOTI Partners 16, LLC

Robert E. Atkinson
ATKINSON LAW ASSOCIATES LTD.
8965 S. Eastern Ave., Suite 260
Las Vegas, NV 89123
Attorneys for J. Jeffrey Frederick

3 Pune
An employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLC

James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027
jjp@pisanellibice.com
Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695
dls@pisanellibice.com
M. Magali Mercera, Esq., Bar No. 11742
mmm@pisanellibice.com
Brittnie Watkins, Esq., Bar No. 13612
btw@pisanellibice.com
PISANELLI BICE PLLC
400 South 7th Street, Suite 300
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Telephone: 702.214.2100
Attorneys for Desert Palace, Inc.;
Paris Las Vegas Operating Company, LLC;
PHWLV, LLC; and Boardwalk Regency
Corporation d/b/a Caesars Atlantic City

## EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADAROWEN SEIBEL, an individual and citizen of New York, derivatively on behalf of Real Party in Interest GR BURGR LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

Plaintiff,
v.

PHWLV, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company; GORDON RAMSAY, an individual; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X ,

Defendants,
and
GR BURGR LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

Nominal Plaintiff.

AND ALL RELATED MATTERS.

To: Defendant TPOV Enterprises 16, LLC;
To: Daniel R. McNutt, Esq. and Matthew C. Wolf, Esq., McNutt Law Firm, P.C., its attorneys of record; and

To: Paul Sweeney, Certilman Balin Adler \& Hyman, llp, its attorneys of record;

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiffs Desert Palace, Inc., Paris Las Vegas Operating Company, LLC, PHWLV, LLC; and Boardwalk Regency Corporation d/b/a Caesars Atlantic City intend to take the default of Defendant TPOV Enterprises 16, LLC, unless an answer or other responsive pleading is filed on or before three days from the date of this Notice.

DATED this day of June 2018.
Pisanelli Bice pllc


Attorneys for Desert Palace, Inc.; Paris Las Vegas Operating Company, LLC; PHWLV, LLC; and Boardwalk Regency Corporation d/b/a Caesars Atlantic City

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I am an employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLC and that, on thisday of June 2018, I caused to be served via the Court's e-filing/e-service system true and correct copies of the above and foregoing NOTICE OF INTENT TO TAKE DEFAULT OF DEFENDANT TPOV ENTERPRISES 16, LLC to the following:

Daniel R. McNutt, Esq
Matthew C. Wolf, Esq.
MCNUTT LAW FIRM, P.C.
625 South Eighth Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
Paul Sweeney
CERTILMAN BALIN
ADLER \& HYMAN, LLP
90 Merrick Avenue
East Meadow, NY 11554
Attorneys for Rowen Seibel, DNT Acquisition LLC, Moti Partners, $L L C$, Moti Partner $16 s$, LLC,
LLTQ Enterprises, LLC, LLTQ Enterprises 16, LLC, TPOV Enterprises, LLC, TPOV Enterprises 16, LLC, FERG, LLC, and FERG 16, LLC

Allen J. Wilt, Esq.
John D. Tennert III, Esq.
300 East Second Street, Suite 1510
Reno, NV 89501
Attorneys for Gordon Ramsay
VIA U.S. MAIL
Kurt Heyman, Esq.
300 Delaware Ave., Suite 200
Wilmington, DE 19801
Trustee for GR Burgr, LLC

Nathan O. Rugg, Esq.
Barack Ferrazzano Kirschbaum \&
Nagelberg LLP
200 W. Madison St., Suite 3900
Chicago, IL 60606
Steven B. Chaiken, Esq.
ADELMAN \& GETTLEMAN, LTD.
53 W. Jackson blvd., Suite 1050
Chicago, IL 60604
Attorneys for LLTQ Enterprises, LLC;
LLTQ Enterprises 16, LLC, FERG, LLC;
FERG 16, LLC; MOTI Partners, LLC; and MOTI Partners 16, LLC

Robert E. Atkinson
ATKINSON LAW ASSOCIATES LTD.
8965 S. Eastern Ave., Suite 260
Las Vegas, NV 89123
Attorneys for J. Jeffrey Frederick

James J. Pisanelli, Esq., Bar No. 4027
jjp@pisanellibice.com
Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., Bar No. 9695
dls@pisanellibice.com
M. Magali Mercera, Esq., Bar No. 11742
mmm@pisanellibice.com
Brittnie Watkins, Esq., Bar No. 13612
btw@pisanellibice.com
PisANELLI BICE PLLC
400 South 7th Street, Suite 300
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Telephone: 702.214.2100
Attorneys for Desert Palace, Inc.;
Paris Las Vegas Operating Company, LLC,
PHWLV, LLC; and Boardwalk Regency
Corporation d/b/a Caesars Atlantic City
EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA
ROWEN SEIBEL, an individual and citizen of New York, derivatively on behalf of Real Party in Interest GR BURGR LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

Plaintiff,
v.

PHWLV, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company; GORDON RAMSAY, an individual; DOES I through X; ROE CORPORATIONS I through X ,

Defendants,
and
GR BURGR LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

Nominal Plaintiff.

AND ALL RELATED MATTERS.

To: Defendant TPOV Enterprises, LLC;
To: Daniel R. McNutt, Esq. and Matthew C. Wolf, Esq., McNutt Law Firm, P.C., its attorneys of record; and

To: Paul Sweeney, Certilman Balin Adler \& Hyman, Llp, its attorneys of record;

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiffs Desert Palace, Inc., Paris Las Vegas Operating Company, LLC, PHWLV, LLC; and Boardwalk Regency Corporation d/b/a Caesars Atlantic City intend to take the default of Defendant TPOV Enterprises, LLC, unless an answer or other responsive pleading is filed on or before three days from the date of this Notice.

DATED this day of June 2018.
Pisanelli Bice pllc


Debra L. Spinelli, Esq., \#9695
M. Magali Mercera, Esq., \#11742

Brittnie T. Watkins, Esq., \#13612
400 South 7th Street, Suite 300
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Attorneys for Desert Palace, Inc.;
Paris Las Vegas Operating Company, LLC;
PHWLV, LLC; and Boardwalk Regency
Corporation d/b/a Caesars Atlantic City

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I am an employee of PISANELLI BICE PLLC and that, on this 25 day of June 2018, I caused to be served via the Court's e-filing/e-service system true and correct copies of the above and foregoing NOTICE OF INTENT TO TAKE DEFAULT OF DEFENDANT TPOV ENTERPRISES, LLC to the following:

Daniel R. McNutt, Esq.
Matthew C. Wolf, Esq.
MCNUTT LAW FIRM, P.C.
625 South Eighth Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
Paul Sweeney
CERTILMAN BALIN
ADLER \& HYMAN, LLP
90 Merrick Avenue
East Meadow, NY 11554
Attorneys for Rowen Seibel, DNT Acquisition LLC, Moti Partners, $L L C$, Moti Partner 16s, $L L C$,
LLTQ Enterprises, LLC, LLTQ Enterprises 16, LLC, TPOV Enterprises, LLC, TPOV Enterprises 16, LLC, FERG, LLC, and FERG 16, LLC

Allen J. Wilt, Esq.
John D. Tennert III, Esq.
300 East Second Street, Suite 1510
Reno, NV 89501
Attorneys for Gordon Ramsay
VIA U.S. MAIL
Kurt Heyman, Esq.
300 Delaware Ave., Suite 200
Wilmington, DE 19801
Trustee for GR Burgr, LLC
Thsee for GR Burgr, LLC

Nathan O, Rugg, Esq.
Barack Ferrazzano Kirschbaum \&
Nagelberg LLP
200 W. Madison St., Suite 3900
Chicago, IL 60606
Steven B. Chaiken, Esq.
ADELMAN \& GETTLEMAN, LTD.
53 W. Jackson blvd., Suite 1050
Chicago, IL 60604
Attorneys for LLTQ Enterprises, $L L C$;
LLTQ Enterprises 16, LLC, FERG, LLC;
FERG 16, LLC; MOTI Partners, LLC; and MOTI Partners 16, LLC

Robert E. Atkinson
ATKINSON LAW ASSOCIATES LTD.
8965 S. Eastern Ave., Suite 260
Las Vegas, NV 89123
Attorneys for J. Jeffrey Frederick


APPEARANCES:
FOR GORDON RAMSEY:
CORIX GROUP OF COMPANIES
BY: ALLEN WILT, ESQ.
1005 TERMINAL WAY
SUITE 294
RENO, NV 89502
(775) 300-1628
AWILT@ALLEN.WILT@CORIX.COM
FOR PHWLV LLC:
PISANELLI BICE PLLC
BY: MARIA MAGALI MERCERA,ESQ.
400 SOUTH SEVENTH STREET
SUITE 300
LAS VEGAS, NV 89101
(702) 214-2100
(702) 214-2101 Fax
JJP@PISANELIIBICE.COM
Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR
(702) 671-4402-CROERT48@GMAIL.COM

APPEARANCES CONTINUED:
FOR THE DEFENDANTS:
FOR LLTQ ENTERPRISES; LLTQ ENTERPRISES 16, LLC; FERG,
LLC; FERG 16, LLC; MOTI PARTNERS LLC; AND MOTI PARTNERS
16 LLC:
SCAROLA ZUBATOV SCHAFFZIN PLLC
BY: DANIEL J. BROOKS, ESQ.
1700 BROADWAY
41ST FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10019
(212) 757-0007
9212) 757-0469 Fax
DBROOKS@SZSLAW.COM
AND
RICE REUTHER SULLIVAN \& CARROLL, LLP
BY: ANTHONY DIRAIMONDO, ESQ.
3800 HOWARD HUGHES PARKWAY
SUITE 1200
LAS VEGAS, NV 89169
(702) 732-9099
(702) Fax
ADIRAIMONDO@RRSC-LAW.COM
Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR
(702) 671-4402-CROERT48@GMAIL.COM
Pursuant to NRS 239.053 , illegal to copy without payment.

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA; WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2019

$$
10: 50 \text { A. M. }
$$

$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\mathbf{P} & R & O & C & E & E & D & I & N & G & S\end{array}$ * * * * * * *

THE COURT: Next up, page 8. Rowen Seibel versus PHWLV LIC.

And what we're going to do, we're going to take -- how long do you think this will take?

MS. MERCERA: I don't think it will take --
MR. BROOKS: This motion?
THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BROOKS: This is a Daniel J. Brooks with Scarola Zubatov Schaffzin for the movants. I've been admitted pro hac. $\quad$ would think probably ten minutes. Maybe less.

THE COURT: Can you promise me ten minutes?
MS. MERCERA: From my argument - -
MR. BROOKS: My argument will be less than ten.

MS. MERCERA: My argument will be less than ten minutes.

THE COURT: All right. And let's go ahead and place our appearances for the record. Did we place our appearances on the record?

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR
(702)671-4402-CROERT48@GMAIL.COM

Pursuant to NRS 239.053 , illegal to copy without payment.

10:51:25 1

10:51:5010

MR. BROOKS: I think I just did. Yes. Daniel J. Brooks Scarola Zubatov Schaffzin. Admitted pro hac for the movants, LLTQ and FERG.

THE COURT: And can you say it one more time sir, slowly?

MR. BROOKS: Sure. The name of the firm?

THE COURT: Your name too for the court reporter.

MR. BROOKS: Okay. All right. Daniel J.
Brooks. And the name of the firm is Scarola,
S-C-A-R-O-L-A; Zubatov, Z-U-B-A-T-O-V, Schaffzin S-C-H-A-F-F-Z-I-N. We are -- represent the plaintiff in the first captioned action. And this, we're representing the movants on this motion. And the movants are $L L T Q$ and FERG, F-E-R-G.

THE COURT: You got that?
THE COURT REPORTER: Yes. Thank you.
And $I$ forgot to ask. Do you guys want this reported?

MS. MERCERA: Yes, please.
THE COURT: And everyone placed their
appearances on the record in open court.
MR. DIRAIMONDO: Your Honor, Anthony
DiRaimondo co-counsel for Mr. Brooks representing the same parties.

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR
(702)671-4402-CROERT48@GMAIL.COM
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| $10: 52: 35$ | 1 | MS. MERCERA: Good morning, your Honor. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | Magali Mercera on behalf of PHWLV, Paris Las Vegas |
|  | 3 | Operating Company, Boardwalk Regency Corporation, and |
|  | 4 | Desert Palace Inc., and Caesars parties. |
| 10:52:47 | 5 | MR. WILT: Good morning, your Honor. Allen |
|  | 6 | Wilt for Gordon Ramsey. |
|  | 7 | THE COURT: All right. Once again, good |
|  | 8 | morning. And it's my understanding we have a motion to |
|  | 9 | amend defendant's answer, affirmative defenses, and |
| 10:53:00 | 10 | counterclaims; is that correct? |
|  | 11 | MR. BROOKS: Yes, your Honor. Really werre |
|  | 12 | just trying to -- we're just trying to get permission |
|  | 13 | to amend the LLTQ counterclaim. We're not asking to |
|  | 14 | change anything in the answer or the affirmative |
| 10:53:15 | 15 | defenses. |
|  | 16 | THE COURT: You can go ahead, sir. |
|  | 17 | MR. BROOKS: Okay. Thank you, your Honor. |
|  | 18 | Thank you for allowing me to participate over the |
|  | 19 | phone. |
| 10:53:28 | 20 | As you're aware these actions involve a number |
|  | 21 | of restaurants that were opened in various properties |
|  | 22 | belonging to Caesars Palace by Mr. Seibel through a |
|  | 23 | number of different entities. There's one entity for |
|  | 24 | each restaurant. |
| 10:53:46 | 25 | So in this case LLTQ entered into an agreement |
|  |  | Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR <br> (702) 671-4402-CROERT48@GMAIL.COM |
|  |  | Pursuant to NRS 239.053, illegal to copy without payment |


| 10:53:531 |  | with Caesars in 2012 to open a Gordon Ramsey pub, GR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | Pub. The counterclaim as it exists -- and this motion |
|  | 3 | really seeks only to make explicit what's already, |
|  | 4 | think, apparent in the existing counterclaim. |
| 10:54:10 | 5 | But the basis of the counterclaim of the |
|  | 6 | existing one and what we want to add by way of |
|  | 7 | amendment is paragraph 13.22 of the LLTQ agreement with |
|  | 8 | Caesars, which you can find on page 21 of Exhibit 1 to |
|  | 9 | the motion. Exhibit 1 to the motion is simply the |
| 10:54:34 | 10 | existing counterclaim. |
|  | 11 | But this provision which survives termination |
|  | 12 | Of the agreements requires Caesars if it wishes to open |
|  | 13 | another restaurant similar to the Gordon Ramsey Pub to |
|  | 14 | do so with LLTQ or an affiliate on the same terms of |
| 10:54:56 | 15 | this agreement. |
|  | 16 | It also says that if Caesars wants to open a |
|  | 17 | steak restaurant similar to the one that TPOV had |
|  | 18 | opened in the Paris Hotel, it also needs to include |
|  | 19 | LLTQ or an affiliate. Now let me just backup because |
| 10:55:14 | 20 | this becomes relevant later. But TPOV opened a Gordon |
|  | 21 | Ramsey steak restaurant in the Paris Hotel prior to the |
|  | 22 | LLTQ agreement. |
|  | 23 | That agreement does not have a provision |
|  | 24 | similar to 13.22. So 13.22 not only deems as |
| 10:55:35 | 25 | restricted restaurant ventures, which require the |

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR
(702) 671-4402-CROERT48@GMAIL.COM
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| 10:55:38 | 1 2 | participation of LLTQ or an affiliate, not just pubs similar to the Gordon Ramsey Pub but also steak |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | restaurants similar to the one that TPOV opened in the |
|  | 4 | Paris Hotel here in Las Vegas. |
| 10:55:52 | 5 | Now, the TPOV restaurant in the Paris Hotel is |
|  | 6 | part of a separate lawsuit, a related federal lawsuit |
|  | 7 | in federal court. And that becomes significant later |
|  | 8 | in this -- in this discussion. |
|  | 9 | The original counterclaim says that Caesars |
| 10:56:17 | 10 | opened restricted restaurant ventures without LLTQ's |
|  | 11 | participation. One is a fish and chips restaurant. |
|  | 12 | And then if you look at on page 26 of the original |
|  | 13 | counterclaim, beginning on page 26 paragraph 66 through |
|  | 14 | 7--69--70, rather, refer to a GR. And GR stands |
| 10:56:39 | 15 | for Gordon Ramsey, GR Steak Baltimore steakhouse. And |
|  | 16 | it says that was improperly opened without LITQ's |
|  | 17 | participation. |
|  | 18 | Now, the focus of this motion is to add |
|  | 19 | specific allegations about a GR Steak Atlantic City |
| 10:56:56 | 20 | restaurant. |
|  | 21 | But if you look at paragraph 71 of the |
|  | 22 | original counterclaim it says, "Upon information and |
|  | 23 | belief Ramsey intends to open additional restaurants in |
|  | 24 | the United States. And one or more such restaurant |
| 10:57:10 | 25 | ventures is, $A$, between Ramsey and Caesars or one of |
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| 10:59:01 | 1 | damages specific to the GR Steak Atlantic City even |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | though the counterclaim doesn't specifically mention |
|  | 3 | GR Steak Atlantic City. |
| 10:59:17 | 4 | And then also interestingly is Exhibit 6 to |
|  | 5 | our reply. So you'll recall I mentioned that TPOV had |
|  | 6 | brought a federal action in Las Vegas with respect to |
|  | 7 | the GR Steak Las Vegas, the one that's in the Paris |
| 10:59:39 | 8 | Hotel. |
|  | 9 | And in that case TPOV sought production of |
|  | 10 | financial records, profit and loss statements for |
|  | 11 | GR Steak Baltimore and also for GR Steak Atlantic City. |
| 11:00:00 | 12 | And in Exhibit 6 to our reply, you will see counsel for |
|  | 13 | Caesars saying that they were not going to --by the |
|  | 14 | way, this happened back on a January 18th; although, |
|  | 15 | Exhibit 6 memorializing that is dated later in |
|  | 16 | February |
| 11:00:18 | 17 | But there was a meet and confer on January 18, |
|  | 18 | and an email. And that significantly predates the |
|  | 19 | deadline for filing amendments to pleadings in this |
|  | 20 | case. |
|  | 21 | Now this relates to the federal case, though. |
| 222324$11: 00: 34-25$ |  | And so Caesars is saying that because TPOV in the |
|  |  | federal action had not asserted any claims related to |
|  |  | future restaurants, Paris, which is the defendant in |
|  |  | that the case, was not going to produce any financial |

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR
(702) 671-4402-CROERT48@GMAIL.COM

Pursuant to NRS 239.053 , illegal to copy without payment.
documents for the Atlantic City -- the steak restarant in Atlantic City or Baltimore. And then this is what is significant. They then say, Additionally the LLTQ/FERG defendants, the movants in this case, have asserted claims related to future restaurants in the action pending before the Nevada state court. That's this case. And has conceded plaintiffs/LLTQ cannot obtain nor do you intend to seek duplicate recovery in both actions.

In other words Caesars or one of its
affiliates Paris is refusing to turn over profit and loss statements for $G R$ Steak Baltimore and GR Steak Atlantic City because those claims are the subject of this action, and, therefore, presumably those documents would be produced in this action. And any recovery with respect to those restaurants would occur in this action not in the federal action.

Then we've attached email correspondence showing numerous meet and confers through february, March, and April to the end of April 2019 , this year.

And if you were to look at Exhibit $H$ to the reply as late as April 29 Caesars was still acting as if they might produce those records for GR Steak AC even though the counterclaim does not explicitly ask for those records. And they -- you'll see in Exhibit A

(702)671-4402-CROERT48@GMAIL.COM Pursuant to NRS 239.053 , illegal to copy without payment.
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| 11:05:27 | 1 | Exhibit 3, and the clean version is Exhibit 4 to our |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | motion. |
|  | 3 | It only adds six paragraphs on pages 28 and |
|  | 4 | 29. Paragraph 73 to 78. And those pertain to the fact |
| 11:05:41 | 5 | that Caesars affiliate has opened a steak restaurant |
|  | 6 | similar to the one, the TPOV one here, in Atlantic City |
|  | 7 | and hasn't allowed LLTQ or any of its affiliates to |
|  | 8 | participate. |
|  | 9 | And that's what those six paragraphs say. And |
| 11:06:00 | 10 | then paragraph 86 has been changed. I hope it's a |
|  | 11 | little bit more artfully pleaded than it's -- the |
|  | 12 | original paragraph, which just said that there haven't |
|  | 13 | been payments. It now says there must be payments for |
|  | 14 | these other restricted restaurant ventures including |
| 11:06:23 | 15 | the one in Atlantic City, the GR Steak Atlantic City. |
|  | 16 | And it also says to make more explicit which |
|  | 17 | what I believe is implied, at least implied in the |
|  | 18 | original one, that if you go and open any others in the |
|  | 19 | future, and there have been in the press that they |
| 11:06:40 | 20 | might be opening one in Kansas City, I believe, that |
|  | 21 | you'll also be liable if you don't include us and don't |
|  | 22 | pay us our share of the profits. |
|  | 23 | So those are the facts. We've - there's |
|  | 24 | no -- there's no prejudice here to Caesars. They've |
| 11:06:59 | 25 | been on notice for a very long time that LLTQ, or one |
|  |  | Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR <br> (702)671-4402 - CROERT48@GMAIL.COM |
|  |  | Pursuant to NRS 239.053, illegal to copy without payment |


| 11:07:06 |  | of its affiliates, would try to hold it liable for not |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | including it in all restricted restaurant ventures and |
|  | 3 | not paying their share of the profits. They've known |
|  | 4 | that. |
| 11:07:18 | 5 | They even use that as a reason in the federal |
|  | 6 | action, if you look at Exhibit 6, to refuse to turn |
|  | 7 | over financial records about a steak restaurant in |
|  | 8 | Baltimore and the one in Atlantic City. They said |
|  | 9 | you're going to get that in the state case. You have |
| 11:07:37 | 10 | claims for that in the state case. |
|  | 11 | They've known that all along. There's no |
|  | 12 | prejudice they've been on notice. And the important |
|  | 13 | other issue is what effect would this have on case |
|  | 14 | management in this case? And the answer is none. |
| 11:07:53 | 15 | They finally have turned over some of the P\&Ls |
|  | 16 | for the other seven restaurants; although, not |
|  | 17 | completely. |
|  | 18 | Hopefully they will or else there will be, you |
|  | 19 | know, get more motion practice. So they would just |
| 11:08:07 | 20 | have to answer seven new paragraphs which i'm sure |
|  | 21 | would take less than an hour. Quite a bit less than an |
|  | 22 | hour. And turn over P\&Ls for GR Steak Atlantic City as |
|  | 23 | they've done -- as they're done reluctantly and slowly |
|  | 24 | for the others. |
| 11:08:23 | 25 | So and the reason is we want to turn them over |
|  |  | Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR <br> (702) 671-4402-CROERT48@GMAIL.COM |
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| $11: 08: 251$ |  | to our expert witness so he can try to calculate the |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11:08:25 | 2 | damages. That's due in February of next year. All the |
|  | 3 | discovery has been pushed back. Depositions have been |
|  | 4 | happening all the time. We've been trying to work very |
| 11:08:41 | 5 | diligently in moving this case forward. |
|  | 6 | Allowing this technical minor amendment of a |
|  | 7 | counterclaim when -- as I've said before, and I don't |
|  | 8 | want to beat a dead horse, arguably this claim is |
|  | 9 | already part of the existing claim. But f (hink for |
| 11:08:59 | 10 | the sake of clarity so everyone knows what the case is |
|  | 11 | about and what documents have to be produced, it would |
|  | 12 | be preferable if the court would see fit to grant this |
|  | 13 | motion and allow us -- we'll serve it immediately. Let |
|  | 14 | them answer. And we can move forward. |
| 11:09:15 | 15 | It will not impede what's going on in this |
|  | 16 | case one iota. And that constitutes good cause under |
|  | 17 | Rule 16 (b). The fact that they're on notice, the |
|  | 18 | completely lack of prejudice, and the lack of any |
|  | 19 | impact on case management. |
| 11:09:29 | 20 | And we -- we cited a Ninth Circuit case. I've |
|  | 21 | noticed that in this state, because your Rules of |
|  | 22 | Federal -- Civil Procedure track the federal ones, |
|  | 23 | often the courts in this state will cite Ninth circuit |
|  | 24 | cases. And we've cited one. It's on page 5 of the |
| 11:09:5125 |  | reply. It's in the original one. It's C.R.ex rel |


| 11:09:54 | 1 | Farnan vs Capistrano School District. It's a Ninth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | Circuit court case in 2011? |
|  | 3 | THE COURT: Can you say that again? Say that |
|  | 4 | again because I have -- |
| 11:10:03 | 5 | MR. BROOKS: I'm sorry. |
|  | 6 | THE COURT: What you just - you cited a Ninth |
|  | 7 | Circuit federal case on page 5 -- |
|  | 8 | MR. BROOKS: Yeah. |
|  | 9 | THE COURT: -- of your reply. Something like |
| 11:10:09 | 10 | that. |
|  | 11 | MR. BROOKS: Yeah. Okay. And the name of the |
|  | 12 | case is C.F. ex rel Farnan, F-A-R-N-A-N, versus |
|  | 13 | Capistrano Unified School District. 654 F3d 975, 1984 |
|  | 14 | to 85, Ninth Circuit, 2011. Which says that good cause |
| 11:10:39 | 15 | is shown where there's no case management issues and |
|  | 16 | where the opposing party was on notice. |
|  | 17 | We cited that same case in our original |
|  | 18 | motion, your Honor. |
|  | 19 | I just want to have one last thing to say. As |
| 11:10:52 | 20 | I've been on the call listening to the other cases |
|  | 21 | before us, I could hear everything you're saying, your |
|  | 22 | Honor, but I've been having trouble hearing what some |
|  | 23 | Of the counsel are saying. I'm not sure what the |
|  | 24 | reason is. So 1 would request that whoever is opposing |
| 11:11:07 | 25 | this motion speak loudly as possible so I can hear. |
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| 11:11:12 | 1 | THE COURT: $\quad$ I understand, sir. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | I mean, ultimately, and $I$ understand your |
|  | 3 | discussion. It appears to me that the opposing party's |
|  | 4 | taking the position that Nutton, $\mathrm{N} \mathbf{- U - T - T - O - N , ~ v s . ~}$ |
| 11:11:22 | 5 | Sunset Station Inc. controls this matter. |
|  | 6 | And it's a recent Nevada Supreme Court matter |
|  | 7 | that places a burden on the moving party to establish |
|  | 8 | good cause when a motion to amend is filed pursuant to |
|  | 9 | Rule 15 to amend a pleading. And Nutton has a specific |
| 11:11:45 | 10 | standard that appears slightly different from the Ninth |
|  | 11 | Circuit case. What do I do with that? |
|  | 12 | MR. BROOKS: Well, your Honor, we cited that |
|  | 13 | case too in our original motion. I think what that |
|  | 14 | case says is you have to -- when the -- |
| 11:11:58 | 15 | THE COURT: Because it's your -- it's your |
|  | 16 | burden. |
|  | 17 | (Multiple speaker cross-talk) |
|  | 18 | THE COURT: It's your burden. Right. |
|  | 19 | MR. BROOKS: It's our burden to show why |
| 11:12:07 | 20 | there's been delay and whether that delay has |
|  | 21 | prejudiced -- is likely to prejudice anyone or |
|  | 22 | impede -- |
|  | 23 | THE COURT: Or whether there's -- |
|  | 24 | MR. BROOKS: -- the effective administration |
| $11: 12: 15$ | 25 | Of this case. |
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| 11:12:15 | 1 2 | THE COURT: Whether there's good cause for delay because it's my understanding it's six months; |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | right? |
|  | 4 | MR. BROOKS: Well -- |
| 11:12:21 | 5 | MS. MERCERA: It's a little more -- |
|  | 6 | MR. BROOKS: It is. |
|  | 7 | MS. MERCERA: A little more than that. |
|  | 8 | MR. BROOKS: It is longer than that. But what |
|  | 9 | I was trying to say is 1 think counsel, predecessor |
| 11:12:29 | 10 | counsel may well have been lead to believe when they |
|  | 11 | were arguing, it's the same counsel in the federal |
|  | 12 | case, and they were told by Caesars, Well, you'll get |
|  | 13 | the documents in the state case because you have |
|  | 14 | asserted these claims in the state case. |
| 11:12:44 | 15 | That was right before the deadline expired for |
|  | 16 | amending pleadings. And we've consensually extended |
|  | 17 | every other deadline for everything else in this case: |
|  | 18 | Expert disclosure, depositions, document production. |
|  | 19 | You know, and there was a change of counsel in there. |
| 11:13:07 | 20 | And there were discussions where it seemed as though |
|  | 21 | Caesars would produce the documents. They'd want to |
|  | 22 | know which ones. |
|  | 23 | So, you know, 1 think -- 1 think the case you |
|  | 24 | referred to says you have to blend the liberal amended |
| 11:13:26 | 25 | policy under Rule 50 with the good cause standard under |
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| $11: 13: 32$ | 1 | Rule 16 when a deadline has been missed. But that |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | doesn't mean -- it's in your discretion, your Honor. |
|  | 3 | This -- |
|  | 4 | THE COURT: Well, see, here's the thing. And |
| 11:13:40 | 5 | I think this is important to point out. I'm given |
|  | 6 | discretion, but all the discretion I'm given is |
|  | 7 | tempered depending on the facts and the rule - - |
|  | 8 | MR. BROOKS: Yes. |
|  | 9 | THE COURT: -- that's applicable. |
| 11:13:52 | 10 | MR. BROOKS: I agree. |
|  | 11 | THE COURT: So I can't do whatever I want to |
|  | 12 | do. It's my understanding -- $I$ haven't read Nutton in |
|  | 13 | a while, but Nutton recognizes the tension between |
|  | 14 | Rule 15C and Rule 16. And they say - - |
| 11:14:05 | 15 | MR. BROOKS: Right. |
|  | 16 | THE COURT: -- yes, normally when motions to |
|  | 17 | amend should be freely granted. However, when there's |
|  | 18 | a scheduling order issued by the trial court has run, |
|  | 19 | then the standard is, no, not Rule 15, but yourll |
| 11:14:19 | 20 | follow Rule 16. And as a trial judge, I have to make a |
|  | 21 | determination as to whether there's good cause as |
|  | 22 | articulated in Nutton as the basis for any decision $I$ |
|  | 23 | make. |
|  | 24 | And it really comes down to that. Because I |
| 11:14:33 | 25 | would love to do whatever I want to do, but I can $\mathrm{l}^{\text {d }}$ |


| 11:14:36 | 1 | Right? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | And so unless I can articulate on the record |
|  | 3 | good cause, I have to deny the motion. It's really |
|  | 4 | that simple. |
| 11:14:46 | 5 |  |
|  | 6 | you can articulate that here. I think there is good |
|  | 7 | cause because they've known about this since -- since |
|  | 8 | the -- since February. They took advantage of it. |
|  | 9 | Declined to produce documents in the federal case. |
| 11:15:02 | 10 | There is no prejudice. They have been on notice. And |
|  | 11 | this isn't going to affect one iota the progress of |
|  | 12 | this case. |
|  | 13 | And let me just read something from -- from |
|  | 14 | that case. Because $I$ think -- well, this is another |
| 11:15:29 | 15 | case. But oh, yeah, it's Nutton. Yeah. So on page 5. |
|  | 16 | I'm sorry. |
|  | 17 | On page 5 of our original motion we cited the |
|  | 18 | Nutton case. And then we quoted -- quoted from the |
|  | 19 | Nutton case which says. Disregarding the scheduling |
| 11:15:47 | 20 | order should not be permitted where it, quote: |
|  | 21 | "Would undermined the Court's ability to |
|  | 22 | control its docket, disrupt the agreed-upon |
|  | 23 | course of the litigation and reward the |
|  | 24 | indolent and the cavalier." |
| 11:16:00 | 25 | And that's Nutton quoting Johnson vs. Mammoth |
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| 11:16:03 | 1 | Recreations. It's another Ninth Circuit case. So as I |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | said, the Supreme Court -- well, it's actually the |
|  | 3 | Court of Appeals, the Nutton case, 1 believe, deciding |
|  | 4 | a Ninth Circuit case. |
| 11:16:14 | 5 | But here if you look at the language they |
|  | 6 | quoted from the Ninth Circuit granting this motion, |
|  | 7 | your Honor, will not undermine your ability to control |
|  | 8 | your docket. It will not disrupt the agreed-upon |
|  | 9 | course of the litigation. And it will not reward the |
| 11:16:30 | 10 | indolent and the cavalier. |
|  | 11 | I mean, we are rowing upstream here. We've |
|  | 12 | come into this. This is an enormously complex case. |
|  | 13 | We've been juggling all kinds of -- all kinds of issues |
|  | 14 | since the minute we got in here. We've been -- 1 don't |
| 11:16:45 | 15 | know how many times my partner has been out to |
|  | 16 | Las Vegas to argue motions, to take depositions. I've |
|  | 17 | been out there twice, and I'm going back next week. |
|  | 18 | It's hard to even fit in this motion practice |
|  | 19 | amid all of that. And as $I$ said, I'm just repeating |
| 11:17:01 | 20 | myself, but ${ }^{\prime}$ 'm quoting from what Nutton says, quoting |
|  | 21 | the Ninth Circuit. $\quad$ don't think those problems - - and |
|  | 22 | I understand those problems are present here. |
|  | 23 | So you've got Nutton. And I could be wrong. |
|  | 24 | I don't think it is the Nevada Supreme Court. It says |
| 11:17:2325 |  | Court of Appeals. |


| 11:17:23 | 1 | THE COURT: No. It's the Court of Appeals. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | That's fine. |
|  | 3 | MR. BROOKS: Okay. All right. But anyway |
|  | 4 | it's citing a Ninth Circuit case. It's warning about |
| 11:17:31 | 5 | certain kinds of things that could happen. Which I |
|  | 6 | agree with. They make sense. They're not going to |
|  | 7 | happen here. Nothing is going to happen here if you |
|  | 8 | allow this. They'll have to do it -- they've got the |
|  | 9 | answer on their -- you know, in the word document. |
| 11:17:45 | 10 | They'll just add. They'll deny the other six |
|  | 11 | paragraphs or admit them. And we'll move on. |
|  | 12 | It's not going to disrupt anything. We didn't |
|  | 13 | do it on purpose. There has been a change of counsel. |
|  | 14 | Original counsel, you know, they make another point |
| 11:18:02 | 15 | that this restaurant in Atlantic City had opened before |
|  | 16 | the original counterclaim was filed. And that's true. |
|  | 17 | It opened in late May 2018. And the original |
|  | 18 | counterclaim was filed on July 6, 2018. |
|  | 19 | And, obviously, prior counsel didn't -- even |
| 11:18:19 | 20 | though the restaurant had opened in Atlantic city, they |
|  | 21 | didn't know about it. If they had known about it, |
|  | 22 | obviously they would have alleged it as they did with |
|  | 23 | the Baltimore restaurant. |
|  | 24 | This is -- 1 think it is completely |
| 11:18:3325 |  | discretionary, but $I$ don't think elevating form over |
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11:18:50 5
substance and punishing unnecessarily somebody who is not causing any prejudice to opposing party or to the Court's ability to control its docket, $I$ think, well, it's within your discretion. We agree about that, your Honor.

I think you have ample reasons to allow this modest technical amendment. And don't forget. I mean, this already may be included in the original counterclaim. It talks about getting -- requesting damages for all future restricted restarant ventures, and it alleges that on information and belief Caesars intends to open more, which is what happened.

THE COURT: Thank You, sir.
Ma' am.

MS. MERCERA: Thank you, your Honor.
MR. BROOKS: Thank you.
MS. MERCERA: Your Honor, this motion really
is about the seibel parties not believing that the rules apply to them. That's true of their theory of the case where they maintain that a convicted felon had no duty to disclose not only his action but his ultimate conviction to Caesars, a gaming licensee. And it's also true now, your Honor, when they seek to disregard the scheduling order that was entered in this case.
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| 11:23:18 | 1 | motions -- the amendment of the pleadings. <br> MS. MERCERA: It was February 4, 2019 , I |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | believe, your Honor. Yes, February 4, 2019. |
|  | 4 | THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. |
| 11:23:33 | 5 | MS. MERCERA: Thank you, your Honor. |
|  | 6 | MR. BROOKS: Your Honor, may I be heard on one |
|  | 7 | point that counsel made? |
|  | 8 | THE COURT: Yes. |
|  | 9 | MR. BROOKS: So she said that -- I'm |
| 11:23:53 | 10 | specifically referring to Exhibit 6 to our reply. |
|  | 11 | She's saying that the -- when they said they wouldn't |
|  | 12 | produce financial records pertaining to certain |
|  | 13 | restaurants because those restaurants -- those future |
|  | 14 | restaurants were subject -- were the subject of this |
| 11:24:18 | 15 | action, but not the federal action. |
|  | 16 | She said that didn't include GR Steak -- GR |
|  | 17 | Steak Atlantic City. That's not true. If you look at |
|  | 18 | the Exhibit 6. It's a February 15, 2019 , email from |
|  | 19 | counsel who just spoke to you. And it says - I'll |
| 11:24:40 | 20 | read it into the record: |
|  | 21 | "Additionally the LLTQ/FERG defendants have |
|  | 22 | asserted claims related to future restaurants |
|  | 23 | in the action pending before the Nevada state |
|  | 24 | court" -- this case - "and as conceded |
| 11:24:56 | 25 | plaintiff/LLTQ cannot obtain nor do you intend |
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| 11:25:01 | 1 2 | to seek duplicative recovery of both actions." <br> I read that to you before. But then the next |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | sentence is the important sentence here. |
|  | 4 | "Accordingly, we do not believe that TPOV |
| 11:25:11 | 5 | 16" -- that's the federal plaintiff -- Mis |
|  | 6 | entitled to discovery related to the two |
|  | 7 | restaurants in Baltimore and Atlantic City. If |
|  | 8 | you believe an additional meet and confer is |
|  | 9 | necessary please let us know." |
| 11:25:24 | 10 | Again, I think, there is good cause on this |
|  | 11 | record to allow this very modest technical amendment. |
|  | 12 | THE COURT: Here's my last question before 1 |
|  | 13 | make a determination. Was there a specific discovery |
|  | 14 | request as it relates to written discovery requesting |
| 11:25:47 | 15 | the identification of all restaurants that, past and |
|  | 16 | current, that would meet the guidelines of the |
|  | 17 | contracts in place in this case? |
|  | 18 | MR. BROOKS: A request by us? |
|  | 19 | THE COURT: Yes. |
| 11:26:04 | 20 | MR. BROOKS: I'm not sure. I know there was a |
|  | 21 | request for financial information about this particular |
|  | 22 | restaurant. |
|  | 23 | THE COURT: Because the reason why $I$ am asking |
|  | 24 | this, $\mathrm{I}^{\prime} \mathrm{m}$ asking this because it appears to me this |
| 11:26:17 | 25 | could have been solved as a result of a simple |
|  |  | Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR <br> (702)671-4402-CROERT48@GMAIL.COM |
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| 11:26:22 | 1 | interrogatory requesting the identity of any and all |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | restaurants that potentially would come under the |
|  | 3 | contractual agreements entered into between the |
|  | 4 | parties; right? |
| 11:26:31 | 5 | And if for whatever reason the plaintiffs |
|  | 6 | failed to properly identify the restaurant pursuant to |
|  | 7 | that discovery request, it could be said that, you |
|  | 8 | know, Judge, that is good cause. They were supposed to |
|  | 9 | disclose this. They have a duty and responsibility to |
| 11:26:46 | 10 | seasonably supplement their discovery. Consequently, |
|  | 11 | if that didn't occur, Judge, it's on them; not on us. |
|  | 12 | That would be good cause, your Honor. |
|  | 13 | MR. BROOKS: Your Honor. |
|  | 14 | THE COURT: I think -- |
| 11:26:58 | 15 | MR. BROOKS: I'm not - - |
|  | 16 | THE COURT: Go ahead. |
|  | 17 | MR. BROOKS: I'm sorry. I'm not aware of such |
|  | 18 | an interrogatory. $\quad$ mean, I just don't know one way or |
|  | 19 | the other. |
| 11:27:09 | 20 | THE COURT: Okay. Anything else? Is that it? |
|  | 21 | MR. BROOKS: Not from me. |
|  | 22 | THE COURT: This is what I'm going to do. And |
|  | 23 | it's based upon the current facts of this case. We had |
|  | 24 | the discovery cutoff -- I'm sorry, a motion to amend |
| 11:27:2825 |  | deadline of February 4, 2019. And that's, what, ten |

11:27:33
months ago, give or take. That's a fairly significant time period.

And just as important too, it seems to me that under the current posture of the case during the open discovery time period there could have been either interrogatories or requests for production of documents regarding additional restaurants that come under the purview and umbrella of this contractual agreement between the parties. That wasn't done. And I don't know why it wasn't, but it wasn't.

And if that wouldn't have been properly responded to, there would be clearly good cause here. And so under the facts and based upon the delay, I can't say there is currently.

So regarding the motion to amend, I'm going to deny that.

Can you prepare an order, ma'am?
MS. MERCERA: We will. And we'll run it by
opposing counsel, your Honor.
THE COURT: Yeah.
Everyone enjoy your day.
(Proceedings were concluded.)
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ROWEN SEIBEL v.
PHWLV LLC
November 6, 2019


ROWEN SEIBEL v.
PHWLV LLC

| A | $25$ |  |  | confers [1] 11/19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ask [4] 5/18 11/24 |  | 31/1 | 16/ | consensually [1] |
| 12/24 12/25 |  | C | 17/2 17/7 | 19/16 |
| asked [1] 13/2 | been [30] 4/14 | C.F [1] | 22/4 22/6 22/21 | Consequently |
| asking [3] 6/13 | been [30] $4 / 14$ $12 / 18$ 12/19 12/20 | C.R [1] 16/25 | $\begin{aligned} & 22 / 4 \\ & 23 / 4 \end{aligned}$ | $30 / 10$ |
|  | 12/20 12/22 14/10 | Caesars [26] 6/4 | cite [1] 16/2 | constitutes [2] |
|  | 14/13 14/19 14/25 | 6/22 7/1 7/8 7/12 | cited [6] 16/20 | 16/16 32/10 |
| 19/14 28/22 | 15/12 16/3 16/3 | 7/16 8/9 8/25 9/5 | 16/24 17/6 17/17 | CONTINUED |
| at [20] 8/12 8/21 | 16/4 17/20 17/22 | 9/11 9/16 9/19 9/24 | 18/12 21/17 | 3/1 |
| 9/17 9/23 11/21 | 18/20 19/10 20/1 | 10/13 10/22 11/10 | citing [1] 23/4 | contracts [1] |
| 12/11 13/10 13/18 | 21/10 22/13 22/14 | 11/22 12/1 12/5 | City [22] $8 / 19$ 9/21 | 29/17 |
| 14/17 15/6 22/5 | 22/15 22/17 23/13 | 13/4 14/5 14/24 | 10/1 10/3 10/11 | contractual |
| 25/6 25/8 25/16 | 26/16 27/15 29/25 | 19/12 19/21 24/11 | 11/1 11/2 11/13 | 30/3 31/8 |
| 25/25 26/11 26/22 | 31/ | 24/22 | /13 14/6 14/15 | ntradicts [ |
| 28/17 32/6 32/8 | before [10] 1/18 | calculate [1] 16/1 | 14/15 14/20 15/8 | 25/13 |
| Atlantic [20] 8/19 | 11/6 16/7 17/21 | call [1] 17/20 | 15/22 23/15 23/2 | control [3] 21 |
| 9/21 10/1 10/3 | 19/15 23/15 28/23 | came [3] 9/7 13/1 | 25/15 26/3 26/10 | 22/7 24/3 |
| 10/11 11/1 11/2 | 29/2 29/12 32/6 | 27/11 | 28/17 29/7 | ntrols [1] 18/5 |
| 11/13 13/13 14/6 | BEFORE-ENTITLED | can [15] | Civil [1] 16/22 | victed [1] |
| 14/15 14/15 $15 / 8$ | [1] | 6/16 7/8 16/1 16/14 | claim [3] 12/6 16/8 | 24/20 |
| 15/22 23/15 23/20 | beginning [1] | /3 17/25 21/2 |  | nviction [1] |
| 25/15 26/3 28/17 | behalf [1] $6 / 2$ | 21/6 26/15 26/ | claims [6] 10/2 | 24/22 |
| 29/7 | belief [2] 8/23 | 26/24 27/17 31/ | /5 11/13 15/ | [1] 13/21 |
| attached [1] 11/18 |  | can't [3] 20/11 | 19/14 28/22 | ] $2 / 3$ |
| August [1] 27/10 | ve | 31/ | clarification [1] | ORIX.COM [1] |
| aware [3] 6/20 |  |  |  |  |
| 26/18 30/17 |  |  | arity [1] 1 | Corporation [1] |
| AWILT [1] 2/9 |  |  | CLARK [3] 1/7 32 | 6/3 |
| B | BEST [1] 32/11 | caps [1] 9/ | clean [1] 14/1 | 1 27 |
|  | between [4] | captioned [1] 5/13 | clearly [3] 27/3 | correspor |
|  | 20/13 30/3 31/9 | CARROLL [1] 3/15 | 27/16 31/12 | [2] 11/18 12 |
| backup | BICE [1] 2/15 | case [53] | [1] 5/2 | could [7] 17/ |
| Baltimore [10] | bit [2] 14/11 15/ | cases [3] | co-counsel [1] | 22/23 23/5 25/15 |
| 8/15 9/15 10/11 | blend [1] 19/2 |  |  | 29/25 30/7 31/5 |
| 11/2 11/12 12/7 | Boardwalk [1] 6/3 | catch [1] 12/23 | come [3] 22/1 | counsel [2] |
| 15/8 23/23 25/23 | both [3] 11/9 | cause [12] 16/1 | 30/2 31/7 | 9/19 9/24 10/12 |
| 29/7 | 12/19 29/1 | 19/1 18/819/1 | comes [1] 20/2 | /1 12/12 13/5 |
| bankrupt [1] 9/7 | brief [1] 2 | 19/25 20/21 21/3 | communication | 17/23 19/9 19/10 |
| $\text { based [3] } 26 / 25$ | BROADWAY [1] | 21/7 29/10 30/8 | [1] 25/17 | 19/11 19/19 23/13 |
| 30/23 31/13 | 3/7 | 30/12 31/12 | COMPANIES [1] | 23/14 23/19 25/2 |
| basis [2] 7/5 20/22 | BROOKS [5] 3/6 | causing [1] 24/2 | 2/3 | 27/11 28/7 28/19 |
| Bates [1] 12/21 | 4/13 5/2 5/10 5/24 | cavalier [2] 21/24 | Company [1] 6/3 | 31/19 |
| be [19] 4/19 4/21 | brought [1] |  | completed [1] | unterclaim [ |
| 11/15 14/13 14/20 | burden [5] 18/7 |  | 26 | 13 7/2 7/4 7/ |
| 14/21 15/18 16/11 | 18/16 18/18 18/19 | certain [3] 23/5 | completely [3] | 7/10 8/9 8/13 8/22 |
| 16/12 20/17 21/20 | 25/10 | 26/19 28/12 | 15/17 16/18 23/2 | 9/4 9/20 10/2 11/24 |
| 22/23 24/8 26/9 | busy [1] 12/22 | CERTIFICATE [1] | complex [1] 22/12 | 12/10 13/7 |
| 26/14 28/6 30/7 | but [31] $7 / 57 / 11$ | 32/1 | concede [1] 25/18 | 13/9 13/15 13/25 |
| 30/12 31/12 | 7/20 8/2 8/21 9/8 | CERTIFIED [1] | conceded [3] 11/7 | 16/7 23/16 23/18 |
| beat [1] 16/8 | 10/17 12/8 12/22 | 32/4 | 25/2 28/24 | 25/2 25/16 |
| because [21] 7/19 | 12/24 13/22 16/9 | CERTIFY [1] 32/5 | concluded [1] | 5/20 26/1 27/5 |
| 10/22 11/13 12/6 |  | change [3] 6/14 |  |  |
| 12/7 12/9 13/6 | 2 | 23/13 | ducted [1] | nterclaims [ |
| 13/19 16/21 17/4 | 20/25 21/15 22/5 | d [1] $14 / 10$ |  | 6/10 |
| 18/15 19/2 19/13 | 22/20 23/3 23/25 | ging [1] | confer [2] 10/1 | OUNTY [3] 1/7 |
| 20/24 21/7 21/14 | 24/21 25/8 26/23 | $\left\|\begin{array}{lll} 13 / 23 \\ \text { chips [3] } & 8 / 11 & 9 / 15 \end{array}\right\|$ | 29/8 | 2/3 32/14 |
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| C |  | $18 / 1118 / 1120 / 11$ | ENTERPRISES [2] | $25$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| course [2] 21/23 | 20 | 20/12 20/25 20/25 |  |  |
| 22/9 | 2 |  | entire [1] 13/13 | 19/16 25/7 |
| court [18] $1 / 61 / 19$ | de | 28/25 29/4 30/22 | entities [1] 6/2 | [1] |
| 5/7 5/22 8/7 11/6 | /3 19/18 | 32/ | entitled [2] 29/ | F |
| 16/12 17/2 18/6 | DEPT [1] $1 / 3$ | 21/22 22/8 24/3 |  | F-E-R-G [1] 5/15 |
| 20/18 22/2 22/3 | DEPT [1] 1/3 <br> Desert [1] 6/4 | document [3] | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { entity [1] 6/23 } \\ \text { ESQ [3] } 2 / 43 / 6 \end{array}$ | F3d [1] 17/13 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}22 / 24 & 22 / 25 ~ 23 / 1 \\ 27 / 17 & 27 / 20 \\ 28 / 24\end{array}$ | determination [2] | $13 / 20 \text { 19/18 23/ }$ | $3 / 16$ | facilities [1] 9/ |
| 27/17 27/20 28/24 | $20 / 2129 / 13$ | documents [10] | establish [1] 18/7 | fact [3] 14/4 16/17 |
|  | determine [1] | 11/1 11/14 12/21 | even [12] 9/19 | 27/15 |
|  | 25/11 | 16/11 19/13 19/2 | 10/1 11/24 13/2 | facts [6] 14/23 |
| cross [1] 18/17 | did [10] | 21/9 25/14 25/24 | 15/5 22/18 23/19 | 20/7 26/20 26/23 |
|  | 9/22 9/25 12 | 31/6 | 25/10 26/9 26/21 | 30/23 31/13 |
|  | 12/24 12/25 13/9 | does [3] 7/23 9/20 | 26/22 27/11 | failed [1] 30/6 |
| current [3] 2 | 23/22 25/25 | 11/24 | every [1] 19/17 | fairly [1] 31/1 |
| $30 / 2331 / 4$ | didn't [8] | doesn't [3] 10/2 | everyone [3] 5/2 | lls [1] 27/16 |
|  | 23/19 23/2 | 20/ | 16/10 31/21 | far [2] 27/18 27/ |
|  | 27/9 27/14 28/16 | don't [14] | everything [2] | Farnan [2] 17/1 |
| cutoff [1] 30/24 |  | /6 13/20 |  | 17/12 |
| cycle [1] 12/17 | different [3] | 4/2 | [1 | fast [1] 12/ |
|  | 13/3 18/10 | 22/14 22/21 22/24 | evince [1] | Fax[3] 2/21 |
| D | diligently [ | 23/25 24/7 30/18 | ex [2] 16/25 17 | 3/2 |
|  | DIRAIMONDO [2] |  | exactly [1] | Feb |
| /13 10/ | 3/16 5/24 | done [3] 15/23 | exchange [1] 12/3 | 11/19 16/2 21/8 |
|  | DIRECTION [1] | 15/23 31/9 | Exhibit [17] 7/8 | 27/11 28/2 28/3 |
| DANIEL [4] | 32/9 | down [2] 20/ | 7/9 9/18 10/4 10/12 | 28/18 30/25 |
| $4 / 135 / 15 / 9$ | disclose [2] 2 | 32/5 | 10/15 11/21 11/25 | February 15 [1] |
| date [2] 12/ | 30 | downloaded [1] | 12/24 13/1 13/10 | 28/18 |
| dated [3] 1 | di |  | 13/18 14/1 14/1 | ebruary |
|  |  |  | 15/6 28/10 28/18 | 28/2 28/3 30/25 |
| day [1] 31/21 | disclosures | due [1] 1 | Exhibit 1 [2] 7/8 | federal [15] 8/6 |
|  | 9/21 9/25 | duplicate [1] 1 | 7/9 | 8/7 10/6 10/21 |
| ad [1] $16 / 8$ | discovery [15] | duplicative [1] | Exhibit 2 [3] 12/24 | 10/23 11/17 15/5 |
| deadline [10] | 12/18 16/3 25/ | 29/1 | 13/1 13/10 | 16/22 16/22 17/7 |
| 10/19 19/15 19/1 | 25/12 26/11 26/14 | during [1] 31/4 | Exhibit 3 [1] 13/18 | 19/11 21/9 25/1 |
| 20/1 25/9 27/18 | 26/19 27/13 29/6 | duty [2] 24/21 | Exhibit 4 [1] 14/1 | 28/15 29/5 |
| 27/22 27/24 27/2 | 29/13 29/14 30/7 | 30/9 | Exhibit 5 [1] 9/18 | lon [1] 24/20 |
| 30/25 | 30/10 30/24 31/ | E | Exhibit 6 [5] 10/4 | RG [6] 3/3 |
| deadlines [1] 25/7 | di |  | 15/6 28/10 | $5 / 3$ $5 / 15$ <br> filed $11 / 4$ <br> 6$]$ $28 / 21$ |
| December [1] |  | each [1] 6/24 | Exhibit A [1] 11/25 | 23/16 23/18 25/3 |
| 27/11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { discretionary [1] } \\ & 23 / 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { early [2] } 12 / 11 \\ & 12 / 15 \end{aligned}$ | Exhibit A [1] 11/25 <br> Exhibit H [1] 11/21 | $\begin{aligned} & 23 / 16 ~ 23 / 18 ~ 25 / 3 \\ & 27 / 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| deciding [1] 22/3 | 23/25 <br> discussion [2] 8/8 | effect [1] 15/13 | Exhibit H [1] 11/21 existing [5] 7/4 | filing [2] 10/19 |
|  |  | effective [1] 18/24 | 7/6 7/10 9/4 16/9 | 26/17 |
|  | discussions [1] | eight [1] $13 / 3$ | exists [1] 7/2 | finally [2] 12/5 |
| endant [2] 1/ |  | either [1] 31/ | expert [2] 16/ | 15/15 |
|  | disputes [1] 12/18 | elevating [1] |  | ancial [7] 10/ |
| fendant's [1] | disregard [1] | 23/25 | experts [1] 26/15 | 10/25 12/2 12/25 |
|  |  | else [3] 15/18 | expired [2] 19/15 | 15/7 28/12 29/21 |
| defendants [3] 3/2 | Disregarding [1] | 17 30/20 | 27/19 | ancials [1] |
|  |  | email [4] 9/23 | explanation [3] | find [1] 7/8 |
| defenses [2] | disrupt [3] 21/2 | 1811/18 28/ | 13/14 26/5 27/8 | fine [1] 23/2 |
| 6/15 | 22/8 23/12 |  | explicit [2] 7/3 | firm [3] 5/6 5/10 |
| ay [6] | DISTRICT [4] 1/ | enjoy [1] 31/2 | 14/16 | 12/14 |
| 20 19/2 27/6 | 1/19 17/1 17/13 | enormously [1] | explicitly [5] 11/24 | first [2] 5/13 9/1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 27 / 1531 / 13 \\ & \text { deny }[4] 21 / 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { do [19] 4/8 4/9 } \\ & 5 / 187 / 149 / 1611 / 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22/12 } \\ & \text { entered [3] } 6 / 25 \\ & 24 / 2430 / 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 / 812 / 10 \quad 13 / 7 \\ & 26 / 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} \text { fish [3] } & 8 / 11 & 9 / 14 \\ 25 / 23 & & \\ \text { fit [2] } & 16 / 12 & 22 / 18 \end{array}$ |
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| F | 11 | h | including [3] | $15$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| /8 | 13/6 13/13 14/15 | Hopefully | 25/3 | 27/12 |
| ] $8 / 18$ | 15/22 25/23 28/16 |  | DICATED [1] | 6/ |
| ow [1] 20/20 | grant [1] 16/12 | horse [1] 16/8 | 32/7 | 6/12 7/19 8/1 9 |
| following [1] | granted [2] 12/13 | Hotel [5] 7/18 7/21 | indolent [2] 21/24 | 9/14 14/12 15/19 |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Tollow } \\ 13 / 12 \end{gathered}\right.$ | 20/17 | 8/4 8/5 10/8 | 22/10 | 17/6 17/19 21/13 |
| FOREGOING | granting [1] 22/6 | hour [2] 15/2 | information [5] | 22/19 23/10 25/2 |
| 32/10 | GROUP [1] 2/3 | 15/2 | 8/22 24/11 25/19 | 26/6 28/19 30/18 |
| forget [1] 24/7 | guidelines [1] | how [3] | 26/2 29/21 | 31/3 |
| forgot [1] 5/18 | guys [1] 5/18 |  | initial [3] 9/10 9/21 9/25 | K |
| form [1] 23/25 |  | However [2] 13/7 | intend [2] 11/8 | Kansas [2] 14/20 |
| forward [3] 16/5 | H | $\begin{aligned} & \text { However [2] 13/7 } \\ & 20 / 17 \end{aligned}$ | intend [2] $11 / 8$ | Kansa 26/10 |
|  | hac | HUGHES [1] 3/17 | intends [2] 8/23 | kind [1] 12/16 |
|  | had [10] 7/17 10/5 | I | 24/12 | kinds [3] 22/13 |
| future [9] 10/24 | 10/23 23/15 23/20 | I | intent [ | 22/13 23/5 |
| 11/5 14/19 24/10 | 23/21 24/20 30/23 | I'l | interesting | knew [2] 25/13 |
| 25/19 26/7 26/9 | 32/6 32/12 | I'm [20] 13/1 | 26/4 | 27/12 |
| 28/13 28/22 | happen [3] 23/5 | 15/20 17/5 17/23 | interest | know [16] 9/16 |
|  | 23/7 | 20/5 20/6 21/16 | 10/4 | 13/21 15/19 19/1 |
| G | happened | 22/17 22/19 22/20 | interrogatories [1] | 19/22 19/23 22/ |
| gaming [1] | 10/ | 27/24 28/9 29/20 | 31/6 | 23/9 23/14 23/21 |
| $\text { get [5] } 6 / 12 \text { 15/9 }$ | happening [1] | 29/24 30/15 30/17 | interrogatory [2] | 26/13 29/9 29/20 |
| 15/19 19/12 26/15 | 16 | 30/17 30/22 30/2 | 30/1 30/18 | 30/8 30/18 31/10 |
| getting [1] 24/9 | hard [1] 22/1 | 31/15 | into [6] 6/25 12/16 | known [4] 15/3 |
| give [7] 12/5 12/6 | has [17] 9/9 11/7 | I've [6] 4/14 1 | 22/12 28/20 30/3 | 15/11 21/7 23/21 |
| 12/9 13/6 13/8 | 13/4 13/21 14/5 | 16/20 17/20 17 | 32/8 | knows [1] 16/10 |
| 13/12 31/1 | 1 |  | involve [1] 6/20 | L |
| given [2] 20/5 20/6 | $\begin{aligned} & 18 / 2020 / 120 / 18 \\ & 22 / 1523 / 1326 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | identif 29/15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { iota [2] } 16 / 1 \\ & 21 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | lack [2] 16/18 |
| go [5] 4/23 6/16 | $27 / 15 \text { 27/19 27/20 }$ | identify [1] 30/6 | is [68] | 16/18 |
| 14/18 25/7 30/16 |  | identity [1] 30/1 | isn't [1] 21/11 | language [1] 22/5 |
| going [15] $4 / 84 / 8$ $10 / 1310 / 2512 / 5$ | have [39] | if [27] 7/12 7/16 | isnt [1] $21 / 11$ ISOM [3] $1 / 2432 / 4$ | $\text { LAS [8] } 2 / 193 / 19$ |
| 10/13 10/25 12/5 | haven't [2] 14/12 | $\begin{gathered} \text { If }[27] \text { ]/12 //16 } \\ 8 / 128 / 219 / 179 / 23 \end{gathered}$ | ISOM [3] $32 / 17$ | $4 / 16 / 28 / 410 / 6$ |
|  | 20/12 | 11/21 11/23 13/8 | issue [1] 15 | 10/7 22/16 |
| 23/12 26/13 30/22 | having [1] 17/22 | 13/10 13/18 13/21 | issued [1] 20/18 | Las Vegas [5] 6/2 |
| $31 / 15$ | he [2] 13/4 16/1 | 13/22 14/18 14/21 | issues [2] 17/15 | 8/4 10/6 10/7 22/16 |
| good [15] | hear [2] 17/21 | 15/6 16/12 22/5 |  | last [2] 17/19 |
| 6/7 16/16 17 | 17/25 | 23/7 23/21 25/13 | it | 29/12 |
| 18/8 19/1 19/25 | heard [2] 26/5 | 26/25 28/17 29/7 | it's [43] | late [2] 11/22 |
| 20/21 21/3 21/6 | 28/6 | 30/5 30/11 31/11 | its [7] 9/1 | 23/17 |
| 29/10 30/8 30/12 | hearing [2] 1/16 | immediately [1] | 11/10 14/7 15/1 | later [3] 7/20 8 |
| 31/12 | 17 |  | 21/22 24/3 | 15 |
| GORDON [9] $2 / 2$ |  |  | J | w [1] 27/16 |
| 6/6 7/1 7/13 7/20 | $22 / 1122 / 1422 / 22$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { imped } \\ 18 / 22 \end{array}$ | January [2] 10/1 | lawsuit [2] 8/6 |
| 8/2 8/15 25/22 26/2 | $23 / 7 \text { 23/7 26/23 }$ | implied [2] 14/17 | Ja/17 | ad [1] $19 / 10$ |
| got [4] 5/16 22/14 | $\begin{aligned} & 23 / 7 \text { 23/7 26/23 } \\ & 29 / 331 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { implié } \\ 14 / 17 \end{array}$ | January 18 [1] | $\text { least [1] } 14 / 17$ |
| 22/23 23/8 | here's [2] 20/4 | importan | January 18 [1] $10 / 17$ | leave [2] 12/13 |
| GR [23] 7/1 8/14 | 29/12 | 15/12 20/5 26/8 | JJP [1] 2/2 | 27/21 |
| 8/14 8/15 8/19 9/15 $9 / 20 \quad 10 / 110 / 310 / 7$ | HEREBY [1] 32/5 | 29/3 31/3 | Johnson [1] 21/2 | less [5] 4/16 4/19 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}  \\ 10 / 11 & 10 / 11 & 11 / 12 \end{array}$ | HEREUNTO [1] | improperly [1] | judge [5] 1/18 | 4/21 15/21 15/21 |
|  | 32/13 | 8/16 | 1/19 20/20 30/8 | let [4] 7/19 16/13 |
|  | hire [1] 26/15 | in [104] | 30/11 | 21/13 29/9 |
| $16$ | his [2] 24/21 24/21 | Inc[2] 6/4 18/5 | juggling [1] 22/13 | let's [1] 4/23 |
| $16$ | hold [1] 15/1 | include [3] 7/18 | July [3] 23/18 27/6 | liable [2] 14/21 |
| $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { GR Steak [12] } \\ 10 / 310 / 710 / 11 \end{array}$ | Honor [33] <br> HONORABLE [1] <br> 1/18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14/21 28/16 } \\ & \text { included [3] } 24 / 8 \\ & 26 / 627 / 13 \end{aligned}$ | 27/9 <br> July 6 [1] 23/18 <br> jumping [1] $12 / 16$ | 15/1 <br> liberal [1] 19/24 <br> licensee [1] 24/22 |
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| L | 18/6 32/6 |  | 1/21 4/1 27/ | $\text { L] } 14$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| like [2] 12/16 17/9 | may [7] 12/12 | moved [1] 12/12 | now [7] 7/19 8/5 | Operating [1] $6 / 3$ |
| kely [1] 18/21 | 19/10 23/17 24/8 | moving [3] 12/17 | 8/18 10/21 14/13 | operation [1] 9/5 |
| ned [2] 13/18 | 26/20 27/7 28/6 | 16/5 18/7 | 24/23 25/4 | opposing [5] 17/1 |
| 13/25 | May 2018 [1] | Mr. [2] 5/24 6/2 | number [2] 6/20 | 17/24 18/3 24/2 |
| list [1] 25/21 |  | Mr. Brooks |  | 31/19 |
| listening [1] 17/20 |  |  |  | or [22] 6/14 7/14 |
| litigation [3] 21/23 | [9] 4/17 6/18 | Mr. Seibel [1] 6/2 | 11/19 25/6 | 7/19 8/1 8/24 8/25 |
| 22/9 25/1 | 7/19 18/3 21/13 | much [1] 27/6 | Nutton [12] 18/4 | 9/5 9/15 11/2 11/10 |
| little [3] 14/1 | 27/20 29/24 30/21 | Multiple [1] 18/1 | 18/9 20/12 20/13 | 4/7 14/25 15/18 |
| 19/5 19/7 | 31/3 | must [1] 14/13 | 20/22 21/15 21/18 | 18/21 18/23 23/11 |
| LLC [8] 1/ | mean [5] 18/2 20/2 | my [14] $4 / 184 / 19$ | 21/19 21/25 22/3 | 24/2 26/1 26/21 |
| $3 / 33 / 33 / 33 / 33 / 4$ | 22/11 24/7 30/18 | 4/21 6/8 12/14 13/2 | 22/20 22/23 | 30/18 31/1 31/6 |
| 4/7 | means [1] 9/9 | 19/2 20/12 22/15 | NV [4] 1/ | order [4] 20/18 |
| LLP [1] 3/15 | meet [4] 10/1 | 29/12 32/9 32/11 | 2/19 3/19 | 21/20 24/24 31/17 |
| LLTQ [19] 3/ |  | 32/ | NY [1] 3/9 | original [14] 8/9 |
| 5/3 5/15 6/13 6/25 |  |  | 0 | 8/12 8/22 9/3 14/12 |
| 7/7 7/14 7/19 7/22 |  | N |  | 14/18 16/25 17/17 |
| 8/1 9/12 11/4 11/7 |  | N-U-T |  |  |
| 12/2 14/7 14/25 |  | N-U-T | obtain [2] 11/ |  |
| 28/21 28/25 | $10 / 5 \text { 12/8 12/10 }$ | nam | 28/25 |  |
| LLTQ's [2] 8/10 | 13/7 26/10 |  | obviously [2] |  |
| 8/16 | Mercera [1] | necessary [1] 29/9 | 23/19 23/22 | $25 / 7 \text { 26/5 30/19 }$ |
| LLTQ/FERG [2] <br> 11/4 28/21 | MERCERA,ESQ [1] | need [1] 26/13 | occur [2] 11 | others [2] 14/18 |
| long [2] 4/9 14 | 2/16 | needs [2] 7/18 | 30 | 15/24 |
| nger [1] 19/8 | mi |  | October | our [14] 4/24 |
| ok [10] 8/12 8/21 |  | NEVADA [9] 1/7 | off [1] 26/12 | 9/17 9/18 10/5 |
| 9/17 9/23 11/21 | minor [1] 16/6 | 4/1 11/6 18/6 22/24 | OFFICE [1] 32/14 | 10/12 14/1 14/22 |
| 13/10 13/18 1 | minute [1] 22/14 | 27/16 28/23 32/2 | often [2] 16/ | 6/1 17/17 18/13 |
| 22/5 28/17 | minutes [3] 4/15 | 32/15 | 27/2 | 18/19 21/17 28/10 |
| loss [2] 10/ | 4/17 4/22 |  | 1] | out [5] 9/7 13/19 |
|  | missed [1] | 4] $3 / 913$ | Okay [5] 5/9 6/17 | 20/5 22/15 22/17 |
| [1] | modest [2] 24/7 | 15/20 27/11 | 17/11 23/3 30/20 | over [10] 6/18 |
| $\text { ve [1] } 20 / 25$ | 29/11 | next [5] 4/6 16/2 | on [46] | 11/11 15/7 15/15 |
| $\text { Ls [2] } 15 / 15 \quad 15 / 22$ | months [2] 19/2 | 22/17 26/16 29/2 | Once [1] | /22 15/25 23/25 |
|  |  |  |  | 25/1 25/3 25/5 |
| M | more | 16/23 17/1 17/6 | 7/17 | overlooked [1] |
| am [3] 2 | 14/11 14/16 15/19 | 17/14 18/10 22/1 | 8/24 8/25 9/14 10/7 | 27/3 |
| 28/4 31/17 | 19/5 19/7 24/ |  |  | P |
| machine [1] 12/17 | morning [3] | no [13] | /25 15/8 16/16 | 11] $4 / 6$ |
| made [2] 13/17 | 6/5 6/8 | 14/24 15/11 17/15 | 16/24 16/25 17/19 | /12 8/13 9/3 13/1 |
| MAGALI [2] | MOTI [2] 3/3 3/3 | 20/19 21/10 23/1 | 21/11 27/5 27/17 | 13/10 16/24 17/7 |
| $6 / 2$ | motion [25] 4/11 | 24/21 25/8 25/25 | 28/6 30/18 | 21/15 21/17 |
|  | 5/14 6/8 7/2 7/9 7/9 | 26/5 27/8 | ones [2] 16/22 | page 26 [2] 8/12 |
| $\text { lake [7] } 7 / 314 / 1$ | 8/18 12/19 12/25 | none [1] 15/14 |  | 8/13 |
| 20/20 20/23 23/6 | 13/2 13/17 14/2 | [2] $11 / 828$ | O | ge 5 [5] 13/ |
| 23/14 29/13 | 15/19 16/13 17/18 | mally [1] 20/1 | 3 24/21 26/ | 16/24 17/7 21/15 |
| Mammoth [1] | 17/25 18/8 18/13 | [40] | 26/24 | 21/17 |
| 21/25 | 21/3 21/17 22/6 | te [2] 26/4 26 | open [9] 5/22 | page 8 [1] 4/6 |
| managemen | 22/18 24/17 30/24 | TES [1] 32/8 | 7/12 7/16 8/23 | pages [2] 13/24 |
| $15 / 14 \text { 16/19 17/15 }$ | 31/15 | nothing [2] 13/23 | 14/18 24/12 25/4 | 14/3 |
| many [1] 22/15 | motions [3] 20/16 |  | 31/4 | Palace [2] 6/4 6/22 |
| March [2] 11/20 | 22/16 28/1 | 15/12 16/17 17/16 | opened [12] 6/21 | paragraph [7] |
| $25 / 14$ | movants [5] 4/14 | 15/12 16/17 17/16 | 7/18 7/20 8/3 8/10 | 8/13 8/21 14/4 |
| MARIA [1] 2/16 matter [3] 18/5 | $\begin{aligned} & 5 / 35 / 145 / 1511 / 4 \\ & \text { move [4] } 16 / 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21 / 10 \\ & \text { noticed [1] 16/21 } \\ & \text { NOVEMBER [3] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 / 169 / 1414 / 5 \\ & 23 / 1523 / 17 \quad 23 / 20 \\ & 27 / 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14 / 1014 / 1225 / 20 \\ & \text { paragraph } 13.22 \\ & {[1] 7 / 7} \end{aligned}$ |

ROWEN SEIBEL v.
PHWLV LLC
November 6, 2019


ROWEN SEIBEL v.

| R |  | si | st | termination [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| reward [2] 21/23 |  | 11 | 7/21 8/2 8/15 8/19 |  |
| 22/9 | scheduling [3] | 27/11 | 9/14 9/15 9/20 10/1 | terms [1] 7/ |
| RICE [1] 3/15 | 20/18 21/19 24/2 | sir [4] 5/5 6/1 | 10/3 10/7 10/11 | than [8] 4/19 4/ |
| ght [10] 4/23 5/9 | School [2] 17/1 | 18/1 24/13 | 10/11 11/1 11/12 | 4/11 15/21 15/21 |
| 6/7 18/18 19/3 | 17/13 | situations [2] | 11/12 11/23 12/7 | 19/7 19/8 26/5 |
| 19/15 20/15 21/1 | seasonably | 19 27/5 | 12/9 13/6 13/13 | Thank [8] 5/17 |
| 23/3 30/4 | 30/ | [4] 14/3 14 | 4/5 14/15 15/7 | 7 6/18 24/13 |
| RMR [2] 1/24 | see [5] | 19/2 23/10 | 15/22 25/23 28/1 | 24/15 24/16 28/4 |
| 32/17 | 13/20 16/12 20 | slightly [1] 18/10 | 28/17 | 28/5 |
| ROWEN [2] 1/9 4/6 | se | 2] | khou | [119] |
| rowing [1] 22/11 |  |  |  | ] 10 |
| RRSC [1] 3/22 | 29/1 | so [26] 6 | STENOTYPE [2] | 11/6 14/9 16/2 20 |
| RRSC-LAW.COM | seeking [5] 25/ | 7/24 10/5 10/ | 32/5 32/8 | 21/25 23/2 23/16 |
| $\text { [1] } 3 / 22$ | 25/19 25/22 25/24 | 13/17 14/23 15/19 | still [2] 11/22 | 24/19 26/24 27/2 |
| rule [11] $16 / 17$ | 26/2 | 15/25 16/1 16/10 | 25/16 | 27/3 28/17 29/5 |
| 18/9 19/25 20/1 | seeks [1] 7/3 | 17/24 17/25 19/23 | stipulate [1] | 30/25 31/1 |
| 20/7 20/14 20/14 | seemed [1] 19/20 | 20/11 21/2 21/15 | STREET [1] 2/17 | their [15] 5/21 |
| 20/19 20/20 27/2 | seems [1] 31/3 | 22/1 22/23 26/14 | subject [3] 11/13 | 15/3 23/9 24/19 |
| 27/3 | SEIBEL [6] 1/9 | 27/15 27/18 27/20 | 28/14 28/14 | 25/13 25/16 25/1 |
| Rule 15 [2] 18/9 | 6/22 24/18 25/8 | 28/9 31/13 31/15 | submitted [1] | 25/20 25/25 26/1 |
| 20/19 | 27/6 | solved [1] 29/25 | 27/21 | 26/7 26/15 26/22 |
| Rule 15C [1] 20/14 | self [1] | some [5] 12/13 | SUBSCRIBED [ | 27/14 30/10 |
| Rule 16 [4] 16/17 | sense [1] | 15 17/22 25/24 | 32/13 | them [8] 12/9 |
| 20/1 20/14 20/20 | sentence [3] 26/6 | 26/11 | substance [1] 24/ | 12/21 13/8 15/2 |
| Rule 50 [1] 19/25 | 29/3 29/3 | somebody [1] 24/1 | such [2] 8/24 | 16/14 23/11 24/19 |
| $\text { rules [3] } 16 / 21$ | separate [1] 8 |  |  | 30/11 |
| 24/19 26/21 | September [2] | [ | SUITE [3] 2/6 2/18 | then [13] 8/12 9/3 |
| run [2] 20/18 | 3/11 27/10 | sorry [5] 17/5 | 3/18 | 10/4 11/2 11/3 |
| $31 / 18$ | September 13th | 21/16 27/24 30/17 | SULLIVAN [1] | 11/18 12/4 13/4 |
| S |  | 30/2 | ] $18 / 5$ |  |
|  | seven [2] 15/ |  | 32 | eory [1] |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { S-C-A- } \\ 5 / 11 \end{gathered}$ | seven [2] | SOUTH [1] 2/17 | supplement [1] | there [31] 9/7 9/8 |
| -C-H-A-F-F-Z- | SEVENTH [1] 2/17 | speak [1] 17/25 | 30/10 | 10/17 12/2 12/18 |
| [1] $5 / 12$ | share [2] 14/22 | speaker [1] 18/17 | supposed [1] 30/8 | 12/18 12/19 12/20 |
| [1] | 15/3 | specific [4] $8 / 19$ | Supreme [3] 18/6 | 14/12 14/13 14/19 |
| $14 / 12 \text { 15/8 16/7 }$ | she [2] 28/9 28/16 | 10/1 18/9 29/13 | 22/2 22/24 | 15/18 19/19 19/19 |
| 22/2 22/19 26/9 | She's [1] 28/11 | specifically [5] 9/5 | sure [5] 5/6 13/19 | 19/20 21/5 21/6 |
| $28 / 9 \text { 28/11 } 28 / 1$ | shift [1] 25/10 | 9/20 10/2 25/21 | 15/20 17/23 29/20 | 21/10 22/17 23/13 |
| 30/7 32 | SHORTHAND [1] | 28/10 | survives [1] 7/11 | 25/21 26/9 26/19 |
| sake [1] 16/10 | 32/4 | spin [1] 12 | SZSLAW.COM [1] | 27/8 27/15 29/10 |
| same [4] 5/25 7/14 | shortly [1] | spoke [1] 28/1 | 3/12 | 9/13 29/20 31/5 |
| 17/17 19/11 | should [2] 20/17 | stamping [1] | T | /12 31/14 |
| say [10] 5/4 11/3 | 21/20 <br> show [1] 18/19 | standard [3] 18/10 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lere's [11] 6/23 } \\ & 3 / 2514 / 2314 / 24 \end{aligned}$ |
| 14/9 17/3 17/3 | show [1] 18/19 <br> showing [1] 11/19 | standard [3] 18/10 19/25 20/19 | $4 / 10 \quad 15 / 21 \quad 22 / 16$ | 15/11 17/15 18/20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 17 / 1919 / 920 / 14 \\ & 25 / 1031 / 14 \end{aligned}$ | shown [1] 17/15 | stands [1] $8 / 14$ | $31 / 1$ | 18/23 19/1 20/17 |
|  | significant [3] 8/7 | start [1] 12/14 | taking | 20/21 |
| 10/22 17/21 |  | started [1] 25/ | talk [1] 18/17 | thereafter [2] |
| 25/18 28/11 | significantly [1] | state [10] 11/6 |  | $132 / 7$ |
| says [14] 7/16 8/9 | 10/18 | 15/9 15/10 16/21 | technical [3] 16/6 | therefore [1] |
| 8/16 8/22 9/8 14/13 | similar [6] 7/13 | 16/23 19/13 19/14 | 24/7 29/11 | 11/14 |
| 14/16 17/14 18/14 | 7/17 7/24 8/2 8/3 | 28/23 32/2 32/14 | empered [1] 20/7 | hese [6] 6/20 |
| 19/24 21/19 22/20 | 14/6 | statements [2] | ten [5] 4/15 4/17 | 12/12 12/15 13/ |
| 22/24 28/19 | simple [2] 21/4 |  | /20 4/22 30/25 | 14/14 19/14 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SCAROLA [4] } 3 / 5 \\ & 4 / 145 / 25 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29/25 } \\ & \text { simply [1] } 7 / 9 \end{aligned}$ | States [1] 8/24 <br> Station [1] 18/5 | tens [1] 12/20 <br> tension [1] 20/13 <br> TERMINAL [1] $2 / 5$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { they [49] } \\ \text { They'd [1] } 19 / 21 \end{array}$ |

ROWEN SEIBEL v.

| T | trouble [1] 17/22 | 10/6 10/7 22/16 | 25/11 25/14 25/2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| They'Il [3] 23/8 | true [5] 23/16 | venture [2] 9/2 | 26/1 27/12 28/14 | won't [1] 12/8 |
| $23 / 10 \quad 23 / 10$ | 24/19 24/23 28/17 | 9/13 | 28/14 30/8 31/23 | word [1] 23/ |
| they're [5] 15/23 |  | ventures [9] 7/25 | 32/8 | words [1] 11/10 |
| 16/17 23/6 25/18 | try [3] 15/1 16/1 | 8/10 8/25 9/7 9/8 | at [24] 4/8 |  |
| 25/22 | 25/10 | 9/9 14/14 15/2 | 9/11 11/2 12/2 | would [22] 4/ |
| they've [7] 14/24 | trying [4] 6/12 | 24/10 | 13/23 14/9 14/17 | 9/12 11/15 11/16 |
| 15/3 15/11 15/12 | 6/12 16/4 19/9 | version [2] 13/25 | 15/13 16/10 16/11 | 12/2 13/9 15/1 |
| 15/23 21/7 23/8 | turn [4] 11/11 15/6 | 14/1 | 17/6 17/22 17/23 | 15/13 15/19 15/ |
| thing [2] 17/19 | 15/22 15/25 | versus [2] 4/7 | 18/11 18/13 19/8 | 16/11 16/12 17/24 |
| 20/4 | turned [1] 15/15 | 17/12 | 22/20 24/12 26/13 | 19/21 20/25 21/21 |
| things [1] $23 / 5$ | twice [1] 22/17 | very [6] 9/11 12/1 | 26/14 27/24 30/22 | 23/22 26/16 29/16 |
| think [27] 4/9 4/10 | two [2] 25/1 29/6 <br> TYPEWRITING [1] | $12 / 2214 / 2516 / 4$ | $30 / 25$ | $30 / 230 / 1231 / 12$ |
| 4/15 5/1 7/4 12/4 | TYPEWRITING [1] $32 / 8$ | 29/11 | what's [3] 7/3 $16 / 1526 / 4$ | wouldn't [4] 13/6 $13 / 12 \text { 28/11 31/11 }$ |
| $16 / 9$ 18/13 19/9 $19 / 23$ 19/23 20/5 | typo [1] 9/8 | W | 16/15 26/4 <br> whatever [3] | written [1] 29/14 |
| $21 / 521 / 521 / 6$ | U | want [9] | 20/11 20/25 30/5 | wrong [1] 22/23 |
| 21/14 22/21 22/24 |  |  |  | X |
| 23/24 23/25 24/3 | ultimately [1] 18/2 | 20/25 | 19/10 20/1 20/16 | XVI [1] 1/3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24 / 626 / 426 / 8 \\ & 27 / 1629 / 1030 / 14 \end{aligned}$ | umbrella [1] 31/8 | wanted [1] $13 / 8$ | 20/17 24/23 25/10 | Y |
| this [83] | $\begin{gathered} \text { under [9] } 16 / 16 \\ 19 / 25 \text { 19/25 } 27 / 2 \end{gathered}$ | warning [1] 23/4 | where [6] 17/15 | yeah [5] 17/8 |
| $\text { 15] } 9$ | 30/2 31/4 31/7 | was [23] 8/16 9/14 | 17/16 19/20 21/20 | 17/11 21/15 21/15 |
| 11/13 11/14 11/16 | 31/13 32/9 | 10/17 10/25 11/22 | 24/20 26/19 | 31/20 |
| 11/23 11/25 12/5 | undermine [1] | 12/2 13/4 17/16 | WHEREOF [1] | year [4] 11/20 16/2 |
| 14/4 14/9 14/23 | 22/7 | 19/9 19/15 19/19 | 32/13 | 25/3 26/16 |
| 22/21 22/22 27/5 | undermined [1] | 23/16 23/18 24/24 | whether [4] 18/20 | years [2] 25/1 |
| 28/13 28/13 <br> though [6] 9/ | 21/21 | 25/1 25/3 25/4 | 18/23 19/1 20/21 | 26/17 |
| though [6] 9/1 $10 / 2 \text { 10/21 } 11$ | understand [3] | 25/11 27/7 27/23 | which [16] 7/8 | yes [10] 4/12 5/1 |
| 10/2 10/21 11/ | 18/1 18/2 22/22 | 28/2 29/13 29/20 | 7/11 7/25 10/24 | 5/17 5/20 6/11 20/8 |
| thousands [1] | understanding [3] | washing [1] 12/17 | 12/13 14/12 14/16 | 20/16 28/3 28/8 |
| thousands [1] $12 / 21$ | 6/8 19/2 20/12 | wasn't [4] 27/13 | 15/20 17/14 19/22 | 29/19 |
| three [1] 26/1 | understood [2] | 31/9 31/10 31/10 | 21/19 23/5 24/12 | YORK [1] 3/9 |
| through [3] 6/22 | 9/11 9/16 | way [4] $2 / 57 / 6$ | 25/21 25/24 26/16 | you [57] |
| $8 / 1311 / 19$ | undue [1] 27/15 | 10/14 30/18 | while [1] 20/13 | you'll [5] 10/ |
| time [7] 5/4 12/14 | Unified [1] 17/13 | we [38] | who [2] 24/1 28/19 | 11/25 14/21 19/12 |
| 14/25 16/4 31/2 | United [1] 8/24 | we'll [4] 12/6 | whoever [1] 17/24 |  |
| 31/5 32/7 | unless [2] 21/2 | 16/13 23/11 31/18 | why [6] 18/19 26/6 | you're [3] 6/20 |
| times [1] 22/15 | 27/20 | we're [11] 4/8 4/8 | 27/8 27/9 29/23 | 17/21 |
| TIMOTHY [1] $1 / 18$ | unnecessarily [1] | 5/13 6/11 6/12 6/13 | 31/10 | you've <br> your [47] |
| today [1] 26/6 | until [1] 12/15 | $\begin{aligned} & 12 / 512 / 231 \\ & 13 / 2326 / 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { will [15] } 4 / 94 / 10 \\ & 4 / 194 / 21 \quad 10 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | $7$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { told [3] } 13 / 413 / 11 \\ & 19 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | up [2] 4/6 12/23 | we've [10] $11 / 18$ | 15/18 15/18 16/15 |  |
|  | upon [6] 8/22 | 12/22 12/22 14/23 | 16/23 22/7 22/8 | Z-U-B-A-T-0-V [1] |
| $26 / 531 / 3$ | 21/22 22/8 26/25 | 16/4 16/24 19/16 | 22/9 26/9 27/21 | 5/11 |
|  | 30/23 31/13 | 22/11 22/13 22/14 | 31/18 | ZUBATOV [4] 3/5 |
| took [2] 21/8 32/5 <br> TPOV [9] 7/17 7/20 | upstream [1] | website [1] 13/20 | WILLIAMS [1] | 4/14 5/2 5/11 |
| $8 / 38 / 510 / 5 \quad 10 / 9$ | 22/11 | WEDNESDAY [2] | 1/18 |  |
| 10/22 14/6 29/4 | us [11] 13/6 13/12 | 1/21 4/1 | WILT [2] 2/4 6/6 |  |
| track [1] 16/22 | 14/21 14/22 16/13 | week [1] 22/17 | [1] 7/12 |  |
| TRANSCRIBED [1] | 17/21 25/10 25/11 | well [12] 9/11 9/1 | withdraw [1] |  |
| 32/8 | 29/9 29/18 30/11 | 18/12 19/4 19/10 | 12/13 |  |
| TRANSCRIPT [2] | use [1] 15/5 | 19/12 20/4 21/5 | hin [2] 24/4 |  |
| 1/15 32/10 | V |  | 27/16 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { trial [5] 20/18 } \\ & 20 / 2026 / 1326 / 16 \\ & 26 / 22 \end{aligned}$ | various [1] 6/21 <br> VEGAS [8] $2 / 19$ <br> 3/19 4/1 6/2 8/4 | $\begin{array}{\|cc\|} \hline \text { were [17] } 6 / 21 \\ 10 / 13 ~ 11 / 21 & 13 / 11 \\ 19 / 11 & 19 / 12 \\ 19 / 20 \end{array}$ | $8 / 16$ <br> witness [2] 16/1 |  |
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*     *         *             *                 *                     *                         * 

THE COURT: All right. Good morning to everyone. Let's go ahead and place our appearances on the record.

MR. PISANELLI: Good morning, your Honor. James Pisanelli on behalf of the Caesars' entities.

MS. MECERA: Good morning. Magali Mecera on behalf of the Caesars entities.

MS. WATKINS: Good morning, your Honor. Brittnie Watkins on behalf of the Caesars entities. MR. WILT: Your Honor, Allen Wilt for Gordon Ramsey.

BR. BROOKS: Daniel J. Brooks for the Seibel entities, and seibel the person.

MR. CARROLI: David Carroll for the same.
THE COURT: All right. Once again good morning. And it's my understanding we have a couple of matters on. We have a motion for leave to file first amended complaint on an order shortening time. We also have a motion to seal exhibits. Let's go ahead and deal with the motion to amend first.


| 09:05:42 | 1 | case in hopes of prosecuting similar issues in federal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | court, bankruptcy courts, other courts across the |
|  | 3 | nation presumably because of his discomfort of coming |
|  | 4 | to a Nevada court to try and defend his actions against |
| 09:05:57 | 5 | the gaming licensee. But 1 leave that to him to |
|  | 6 | explain why he has been so uncooperative. |
|  | 7 | The point is this. The documents, the thread |
|  | 8 | that we started to pull that uncovered this second |
|  | 9 | fraud, were not produced in this action until after the |
| 09:06:16 | 10 | cutoff for amendments had already lapsed. As I said, |
|  | 11 | he took many months, six to eight months to even file |
|  | 12 | his answer in this case with all his delay tactics, and |
|  | 13 | that certainly carried over with his discovery |
|  | 14 | responses. |
| 09:06:32 | 15 | Now, those documents in and of themselves were |
|  | 16 | not a smoking gun that showed us what they were doing. |
|  | 17 | They were curious documents that didn't necessarily |
|  | 18 | have anything to do with his felony conviction and his |
|  | 19 | suitability. And surely, once we did get those |
| 09:06:46 | 20 | documents, had we run to court with no deposition |
|  | 21 | testimony even explaining what they were, first of all |
|  | 22 | we wouldn't have done it because $I$ don't think it would |
|  | 23 | satisfy my Rule 11 obligations before coming before |
|  | 24 | you. But they too, I'm sure Mr. Seibel and his counsel |
| 09:07:0025 |  | would have complained that we were running to court as |


| 09:07:03 | 1 | alarmists not even knowing what we were talking about. <br> So what we did is what $I$ think your Honor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | would expect us to do. We did our job. We set out to |
|  | 4 | do discovery on all issues in this case including what |
| 09:07:14 | 5 | these strange documents were, only to find one of the |
|  | 6 | co-conspirators, $\mathrm{I}^{\text {cll }}$ call them, denying any knowledge |
|  | 7 | what they were. Despite that we would later learn he |
|  | 8 | was actually the architect of the scheme. |
|  | 9 | He denied even knowing what they were in his |
| 09:07:29 | 10 | deposition, but Mr. Seibel brazenly told us what they |
|  | 11 | were and simply claimed that that's not a kickback |
|  | 12 | scheme. That is a marketing scheme. So whatever it |
|  | 13 | is, that's for your Honor and a jury to decide at a |
|  | 14 | later date. |
| 09:07:42 | 15 | The only defense that we see in the motion |
|  | 16 | today is not that there was no kickback scheme and that |
|  | 17 | is this is frivolous, or that this is futile. The only |
|  | 18 | defense is you should have caught us sooner, he says, |
|  | 19 | because in another case we planted a couple of those |
| 09:08:01 | 20 | documents, the needle in the proverbial haystack, with |
|  | 21 | a document dump about two months prior to our cutoff |
|  | 22 | here for amendments. |
|  | 23 | Well, first of all it was another case. |
|  | 24 | Second of all, it was, as 1 said, planted inside a |
| 09:08:20 | 25 | document dump where we didn't even know what those |


| 09:08:23 | 1 | documents were in ten-plus thousand documents. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | And third, those documents themselves were not |
|  | 3 | even usable for some time until after the expiration of |
|  | 4 | our cutoff here because they were not produced in |
| 09:08:36 | 5 | proper form in that action. |
|  | 6 | So it's a thin excuse. We -- we had no |
|  | 7 | ability respectfully to catch them at this sooner. |
|  | 8 | Certainly, even if that document in another case was a |
|  | 9 | smoking gun, we didn't realize what it was until the |
| 09:08:54 | 10 | depositions took place which were months after the |
|  | 11 | cutoff here. So we have plenty - - |
|  | 12 | THE COURT: I mean, you're not conducting |
|  | 13 | discovery in the other case, anyway so -- |
|  | 14 | MR. PISANELLI: Yeah. They're overlapping. |
| 09:09:04 | 15 | THE COURT: Yeah. |
|  | 16 | MR. PISANELLI: So we're using them for both |
|  | 17 | now . |
|  | 18 | THE COURT: I understand. |
|  | 19 | MR. PISANELLI: We're not asking to change the |
| 09:09:08 | 20 | trial date. We're not asking to do anything other than |
|  | 21 | bring all of Mr. Seibel's fraud before your Honor and |
|  | 22 | before the jury in this case to be efficient instead of |
|  | 23 | having two different lawsuits. We've already got |
|  | 24 | enough lawsuits. And this is a consolidated action to |
| 09:09:2025 |  | begin with. |



| 09:10:25 1 |  | a motion to amend. Now they say these are not smoking |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 09:10:25 | 2 | guns. If you look at Exhibit 6 and 9 to their motion, |
|  | 3 | it's very clearly stated that doesn't use the word |
|  | 4 | "kickback". It uses the word "rebaten. That in one |
| 09:10:39 | 5 | case one vendor is paying 5 percent rebate to one of |
|  | 6 | Mr. Seibel's entities. And then the other vendor is |
|  | 7 | paying 15 percent rebate. And if you look at our |
|  | 8 | Exhibit 1E, it states -- that email states that a 1099 |
|  | 9 | will be issued. |
| 09:10:56 | 10 | So that, those documents were all produced in |
|  | 11 | $C D$ form on December 7, 2018. The cutoff to amend |
|  | 12 | pleadings or add new parties was February 4, $2019 . \quad$ The |
|  | 13 | documents on their face clearly show a rebate being |
|  | 14 | paid. If they think that's unlawful, they were on |
| 09:11:20 | 15 | notice of that. |
|  | 16 | Now, I notice in this motion they filed here |
|  | 17 | and in their reply that they filed about a week ago and |
|  | 18 | in the oral argument that you just heard, they never |
|  | 19 | tell you when they found these documents. They never |
| 09:11:37 | 20 | tell you that. So you have to assume they got them by |
|  | 21 | Federal Express on December 8, and that's when they |
|  | 22 | knew . |
|  | 23 | If they didn't even notice them until may or |
|  | 24 | June or July, they would have told you that in their |
| 09:11:5125 |  | motion or in the oral argument you just heard. |


| 09:11:54 | 1 2 | Now, even indulging -- and it's not another case. It's a highly closely related case, and the |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | parties have agreed that all document discovery and |
|  | 4 | depositions in the two cases can be used |
| 09:12:10 | 5 | interchangeably. It's not some other random case. |
|  | 6 | It's a federal case here in Las Vegas involving the |
|  | 7 | same issues and the same parties. |
|  | 8 | And even if you want to take what they say at |
|  | 9 | face value that, Well, we don't like to run into court |
| 09:12:26 | 10 | and accuse people of things prematurely, they could |
|  | 11 | have asked to change the date, the deadiine for |
|  | 12 | amending pleadings or adding parties. They could have. |
|  | 13 | They didn't. And they say, Well, we didn't really |
|  | 14 | understand what happened until we took depositions on |
| 09:12:46 | 15 | September 6, 2019 , and September 24, 2019. |
|  | 16 | Yet, your Honor, on October 8, 2019 , after |
|  | 17 | those depositions, they filed with you voluntarily with |
|  | 18 | us a stipulation amending the scheduling order which |
|  | 19 | was filed in the Court on October 15, 2019. It's |
| 09:13:08 | 20 | Exhibit 6 to our opposition, your Honor. And on page 1 |
|  | 21 | of that scheduling order it states the time to amend |
|  | 22 | pleadings or add parties is closed. |
|  | 23 | They could have by then. They certainly even |
|  | 24 | by their admission they knew what -- they knew that |
| 09:13:25 | 25 | they thought they had a claim. Why didn't they say to |
|  |  | Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR <br> (702)671-4402-CROERT48@GMAIL.COM |
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| 09:13:28 | 1 | us, Hey, let's extend the time to amend pleadings or |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | add parties? And 1 think the answer to that, your |
|  | 3 | Honor, is they knew we wanted to amend our counterclaim |
|  | 4 | on behalf of one of these parties, LLTQ, and they |
| 09:13:45 | 5 | didn't want us to be able to. So they opposed that |
|  | 6 | successfully, the one I argued on the phone. And now |
|  | 7 | they want to change the rules. |
|  | 8 | Your Honor, in the opinion you wrote on |
|  | 9 | November 25 th, denying our motion, you laid out the |
| 09:14:05 | 10 | good cause standard under Rule 16. And you said what |
|  | 11 | was fatal to our attempt to amend was that we knew - |
|  | 12 | we knew the facts before the filing date -- I'm sorry, |
|  | 13 | before the deadline for amending pleadings and we |
|  | 14 | waited. That's exactly what they did. |
| 09:14:23 | 15 | And, in fact, they -- |
|  | 16 | THE COURT: Tell me this, though. How can you |
|  | 17 | know the facts without taking depositions? Because - - |
|  | 18 | MR. BROOKS: Because you -- |
|  | 19 | THE COURT: NO, I'm serious about this. |
| 09:14:33 | 20 | MR. BROOKS: I'm sorry. |
|  | 21 | THE COURT: Because, I mean, I took thousands |
|  | 22 | of depositions. |
|  | 23 | MR. BROOKS: Right. |
|  | 24 | THE COURT: Relying upon documents they |
| 09:14:38 | 25 | weren't necessary in the business court setting. |
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| 09:14:40 | 1 | MR. BROOKS: Right. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | THE COURT: But until you have testimony - - |
|  | 3 | MR. BROOKS: Right. |
|  | 4 | THE COURT: -- under oath, explaining what the |
| 09:14:49 | 5 | documents - - |
|  | 6 | MR. BROOKS : Um-hum. |
|  | 7 | THE COURT: -- were for and their purposes -- |
|  | 8 | MR. BROOKS: Um-hum. |
|  | 9 | THE COURT: -- and the like, you don't have |
| 09:14:55 | 10 | meaning. |
|  | 11 | MR. BROOKS: Right. |
|  | 12 | THE COURT: And that I think that's the |
|  | 13 | important issue when it comes to discovery. And that's |
|  | 14 | why we take depositions. |
| 09:15:01 | 15 | MR. BROOKS: So I have two responses to that, |
|  | 16 | your Honor. The first one I already said is if they |
|  | 17 | thought this looked suspicious, they should have moved. |
|  | 18 | They should have agreed with us to move the deadline |
|  | 19 | for amending pleadings. |
| 09:15:17 | 20 | The second thing is if you would just look at |
|  | 21 | Exhibit 6 to their motion, it was marked as |
|  | 22 | Exhibit C 37 in the deposition Mr. Pisanelli was just |
|  | 23 | talking about, and it's clear. It shows that they're |
|  | 24 | getting 5 percent of these proceeds of the sales of |
| 09:15:40 | 25 | steak by Pat LaFrieda to some of the Caesars |
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| 09:15:44 | 1 | restaurants. And it breaks it down. Paris Hotel, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | Caesars. It shows the amounts. And this is in 2011 |
|  | 3 | and '12. It says \$2.14 million. Pat LaFrieda Feeder |
|  | 4 | RS. That's Rowen Seibel 5 percent. |
| 09:16:00 | 5 | Then they calculated. The total owed to Rowen |
|  | 6 | Seibel per LaFrieda, \$107,031.79. Total paid to Rowen |
|  | 7 | Seibel through September 3, 2012, \$57,590.06. Total |
|  | 8 | owed to Rowen, they subtract what was paid from what |
|  | 9 | should have been paid. The total owed to Rowen is |
| 09:16:25 | 10 | \$49,000. And this is an email chain. It goes through. |
|  | 11 | It discusses the deal. It discusses the percent. |
|  | 12 | If you look at Exhibit 9 to their motion, this |
|  | 13 | is the other vendor, and it's in 9, l (hink a beer |
|  | 14 | distributor, same thing. Says we're going to get -- |
| 09:16:41 |  | we're going to give you 15 percent of rebates, and |
|  | 16 | we'll send you - on page TPOV00018823 it says we're |
|  | 17 | going to give you a 1099 at the end of the year for tax |
|  | 18 | purposes. |
|  | 19 | And those are only two of the emails. There |
| 09:17:00 | 20 | were four that we attached to our opposition. There |
|  | 21 | are taken off of a duplicate of the CD that was sent to |
|  | 22 | Caesars by former counsel, the firm that proceeded us |
|  | 23 | in the case. They made a duplicate CD. They sent it |
|  | 24 | by Federal Express. And we printed out exhibits -- in |
| 09:17:20 | 25 | our opposition Exhibits 1. Exhibit 1 is an affidavit |

09:18:0010

09:18:1615
from the attorney at the old firm who did this. And Exhibit $1 A$ is a letter that he sent to Caesars counsel enclosing the $C D s$ with the Bates page ranges.

Exhibit 1B, C, D -- excuse me, your Honor -and $E$ are four emails that very clearly show an agreement to get a rebate from these two vendors. And then we attached the next four exhibits to our opposition, are those documents with the same Bates page number at the bottom as marked as deposition Exhibits $37 \mathrm{GR} 3,4$, and 6 , I believe.

So they knew. And everything you said in the opinion, your Honor, on November 25 th applies here. And it applies, $I$ would say, more strongly. Because here, they're trying to add a party. And maybe they're not asking for the trial date to be changed yet, but they're going to want to embark on a lot of discovery. They've already been serving subpoenas to third parties. And they're adding a party.

All we were trying to do is get one more restaurant named, not as a party but it was one more restaurant which we allege they should have included us in because it was a restricted venture so-called involving Gordon Ramsey. And all it would have meant is if you would have granted that, is that we would have added that -- the name of that restaurant, and
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| 09:18:55 | 1 | they would have had to give us one more PNL for that |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | restaurant. They already give us PNLs for, I think, |
|  | 3 | six or seven other restaurants. |
|  | 4 | But you -- your Honor, you ruled and supported |
| 09:19:07 | 5 | by case law. You signed an order which actually |
|  | 6 | counsel for Caesars drafted at your request, and that |
|  | 7 | we agreed to. All the parties agreed to it. And it's |
|  | 8 | clearly if you look at Exhibit 7 to our opposition, you |
|  | 9 | said that: "The Court further finds that where a |
| 09:19:30 | 10 | scheduling order has entered, the lenient standard |
|  | 11 | under Rule 15 (a) which provides leave to amend shall be |
|  | 12 | freely given, must be balanced against the requirement |
|  | 13 | Of Rule $16(\mathrm{~b})$ that the Court's scheduling order shall |
|  | 14 | not be the modified except upon a showing of good |
| 09:19:45 | 15 | cause." |
|  | 16 | Then it continues: Disregarding the |
|  | 17 | scheduling order would undermine the Court's ability to |
|  | 18 | control its docket, dissupt the agreed-upon course of |
|  | 19 | the litigation, and reward the indolent and the |
| 09:19:55 | 20 | cavalier. |
|  | 21 | THE COURT: Okay. And for the record I agree |
|  | 22 | with all that. But, ultimately, at the end of the day |
|  | 23 | when a motion is made to somehow change the scheduling |
|  | 24 | order of the trial court, I'm required to conduct a |
| 09:20:0925 |  | good cause analysis under Nutton. |


| 09:20:11 |  | MR. BROOKS: Right. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | THE COURT: And you do that on an |
|  | 3 | issue-by-issue basis. And so I'm not really concerned |
|  | 4 | about prior decisions in this case. I'm concerned |
| 09:20:17 | 5 | about the four factors as set forth in the Nutton case. |
|  | 6 | MR. BROOKS : Okay. |
|  | 7 | THE COURT: And more specifically the |
|  | 8 | explanation for the untimely conduct. |
|  | 9 | Two, the importance of the requested untimely |
| 09:20:27 | 10 | action. |
|  | 11 | Three, the potential prejudice in allowing |
|  | 12 | untimely conduct. |
|  | 13 | And last, but not least, the availability of a |
|  | 14 | continuance to cure such prejudice. |
| 09:20:37 |  | And so I'm not really looking back |
|  | 16 | retrospectively as to what decisions I made in this |
|  | 17 | case. I'm looking at it on an issue-by-issue basis. |
|  | 18 | And 1 would love to remember all the argument that was |
|  | 19 | made back in the fall of last year. I can't. I have |
| 09:20:53 | 20 | too many cases. I have -- I have -- in fact, today I'm |
|  | 21 | looking at it. I'm trying to -- wondering why our |
|  | 22 | calendar is so clogged -- |
|  | 23 | MR. BROOKS: Right. |
|  | 24 | THE COURT: -- with matters. Because there's |
| 09:21:02 | 25 | certain matters I'd love to spend more time with. I |


| 09:21:05 | 1 | can't. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | But the bottom line is this, when I'm making |
|  | 3 | this decision, $I$ want an analysis under this case. |
|  | 4 | That's all. And if the -- and our Supreme Court said, |
| 09:21:15 | 5 | Look, the four factors are nonexclusive. It's right |
|  | 6 | out of the decision. |
|  | 7 | MR. BROOKS: Right. |
|  | 8 | THE COURT: And so, ultimately, that's going |
|  | 9 | to be my safe harbor on any decision I make today. I |
| 09:21:28 | 10 | just want to tell everybody that. |
|  | 11 | MR. BROOKS: Right. |
|  | 12 | THE COURT: That's what it's going to be. |
|  | 13 | MR. BROOKS: All ${ }^{\prime}$ 'm saying, your Honor, is |
|  | 14 | they were aware of these facts. They were aware of |
| 09:21:34 | 15 | them in December of 2018 , early December of 2018. |
|  | 16 | They're complaining about a document dump. That was |
|  | 17 | what was agreed to for the ESI, the electronically |
|  | 18 | stored information. It wasn't a document dump. |
|  | 19 | And I'll just repeat. I said it before. If |
| 09:21:50 | 20 | they -- if they actually only noticed those emails, the |
|  | 21 | needle in the haystack, after February 4, 2019, the |
|  | 22 | deadline in this case for amending or adding parties, |
|  | 23 | they would have told you. They would have said, you |
|  | 24 | know, we only noticed these emails on May 11, 2019 , and |
| 09:22:10 | 25 | this is how we came to notice them. |
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1
volumes. They knew before -- or if they saw them and they weren't sure exactly what they meant, and I submit they're pretty clear on their face, they could have tried to agree with us to amend to change the deadline for amending counterclaims -- claims and adding parties.

They didn't want to do that because they wanted to oppose our motion to amend our counterclaim, which they knew about. So I just think whether you want to refer to your prior decision or not that the logic is the same.

There's no good valid reason for this delay on their part. There's no good cause. Even according to what they say, they knew after the depositions on September 6 and 24 th of 2019 that they thought they had a claim. And, yet, they then, a couple of weeks later, stipulated with us in the third scheduling order, Exhibit 6 to our opposition, that the time for amending claims or adding parties was closed. So there is no good cause.

And this -- the good cause analysis stems from the fact that they missed the deadline, not that they're asking in this case to change the trial date. They missed a deadline. As you correctly pointed out

| 09:23:35 1 |  | in your previous order and as the Nutton case says, if |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | you miss the deadline, you're under Rule 16. You're in |
|  | 3 | that universe, not Rule 15. You have to have good |
|  | 4 | cause. They don't have good cause. |
| 09:23:47 | 5 | So with that said, your Honor, we will rest on |
|  | 6 | our papers. I think -- I've told you which exhibits we |
|  | 7 | think should be dispositive here. It's very clear they |
|  | 8 | had these emails. They used them in depositions. If |
|  | 9 | You read the four emails, Exhibits 1B, C, D, and E, no |
| 09:24:10 | 10 | reasonable person wouldn't understand what that was |
|  | 11 | referring to. We call it -- they called it an email, a |
|  | 12 | rebate program. They call it kickbacks. |
|  | 13 | We don't think it's illegal at all, but |
|  | 14 | that's -- we didn't brief that issue. We're not |
| 09:24:28 | 15 | arguing the merits of this relationship. I'll just say |
|  | 16 | Mr. Seibel and his entities were not fiduciaries of |
|  | 17 | Caesars. They were not partners of Caesars. They were |
|  | 18 | not employees of Caesars. And they had a relationship |
|  | 19 | with these two vendors, not just the Caesars |
| 09:24:46 | 20 | establishments. |
|  | 21 | They got 1099 s . It wasn't secret. But that's |
|  | 22 | not the point. The point is this case will be really |
|  | 23 | delayed if you allow this, your Honor. As I've said, |
|  | 24 | they've served third party subpoenas already on Pat |
| 09:25:06 | 25 | LaFrieda, the meat vendor, and I think other, other |


| 09:25:10 | 1 | entities. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | So, your Honor, unless you have some |
|  | 3 | questions, 1 lll rest on our papers. |
|  | 4 | THE COURT: Thank you, sir. |
| 09:25:16 | 5 | MR. BROOKS: Thank you. |
|  | 6 | MR. PISANELLI: I don't think this case is |
|  | 7 | going to be delayed for even one minute because of |
|  | 8 | this. |
|  | 9 | First of all, it's not a sin but actually a |
| 09:25:31 | 10 | good fact that we've already started the other |
|  | 11 | discovery with subpoenas to third parties. I'm sure we |
|  | 12 | would have been criticized had we done the opposite, |
|  | 13 | sat on our hands. |
|  | 14 | Secondly, this idea of a new party can be |
| 09:25:44 | 15 | brought in, new parties, Mr. Green who is the manager |
|  | 16 | Of all these defendants in this case has been sitting |
|  | 17 | as the $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ for those entities. So it's not like |
|  | 18 | he has to come up to speed on a new case and knows |
|  | 19 | nothing about it. He is more involved in these cases, |
| 09:26:01 | 20 | it seems, then Mr. Seibel himself. |
|  | 21 | And it was Mr. Green who delayed uncovering |
|  | 22 | what this kickback scheme was because he was not |
|  | 23 | truthful during his deposition when confronted with |
|  | 24 | these emails to tell us when asked what are they about. |
| 09:26:15 | 25 | He said "I don't know." But he did know. As I said he |


| 09:26:18 | 1 | was the architect of this -- of the scheme. <br> I find it interesting that counsel refers to |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | these documents. Like Exhibit 6 he referred to as the |
|  | 4 | smoking gun. I'm sure they're going to be running |
| 09:26:31 | 5 | backwards from that comment when we're in front of a |
|  | 6 | jury saying that it's no smoking gun. |
|  | 7 | But that said, just look at it, your Honor. |
|  | 8 | It's -- it's an audit. That's what it says. Pat |
|  | 9 | LaFrieda audit. Doesn't say ${ }^{\text {ckickback", "I hope }}$ |
| 09:26:46 | 10 | Caesars doesn't catch us, " "there's our illegal |
|  | 11 | scheme, " that type of smoking gun. It says audit. And |
|  | 12 | we were questioning audit of what. That's when the |
|  | 13 | thread that I referred to as the deposition started to |
|  | 14 | uncover what really was afoot here. |
| 09:27:00 | 15 | And finally, your Honor, it's worthy to note |
|  | 16 | that even the depositions -- put aside Mr. Green not |
|  | 17 | being forthright what these things were about. |
|  | 18 | Mr. Seibel himself seems to have had a bit of a |
|  | 19 | revolving door at his counsel table here with a number |
| 09:27:18 | 20 | of different lawyers coming in and out of this case, |
|  | 21 | which has delayed Mr. Seibel sitting down and giving |
|  | 22 | sworn testimony. |
|  | 23 | We were originally trying to get him to tell |
|  | 24 | us about these things in may of 2019. And they sought |
| 09:27:31 | 25 | delays of his depositions as they transitioned from one |


| 09:27:35 | 1 | counsel to the next, which I think werre about to see |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | yet again. |
|  | 3 | So the point is this. I hear your point, your |
|  | 4 | Honor, loud and clear about understanding what |
| 09:27:46 | 5 | documents mean, depositions shed light on cold |
|  | 6 | documents, typically, like emails in particular. |
|  | 7 | They're drafted between insiders. They don't spell out |
|  | 8 | everything they're referring to or where it all comes |
|  | 9 | from because they know. |
| 09:27:59 | 10 | We were not insiders to this kickback scheme, |
|  | 11 | but once we got to talk to those insiders and make them |
|  | 12 | raise their hands and swear to tell the truth, then |
|  | 13 | some light was shined on this scheme. That's when we |
|  | 14 | finally figured it out. That's when we came to you to |
| 09:28:14 | 15 | ask for leave. |
|  | 16 | Counsel's primary grievance, it sounds like, |
|  | 17 | is that we wanted to amend our pleading, as you said, |
|  | 18 | on a case-by-case basis, not just open up pleadings |
|  | 19 | again. Well, we uncovered a new claim against you, |
| 09:28:31 | 20 | and, therefore, we're obligated to change the amendment |
|  | 21 | date so that the defendants, the wrongdoers here, can |
|  | 22 | add more nonsense into this case? That's not how this |
|  | 23 | works. |
|  | 24 | Your Honor wouldn't, $I$ suspect, have allowed a |
| 09:28:45 | 25 | stipulation like that in the first place anyway. You |

$09: 28: 47$
1

09:29:1410
$09: 29: 3015$
have always told us after the dates have
passed that we have to show good cause. So the fact that he's not happy that we wouldn't give him a free pass because we needed the amendment in light of their bad faith conduct doesn't seem to be a real defense.

So we think we've met the four prongs. There certainly is no prejudice here. And to the extent there is any prejudice, if it were to result in the delay, $I$ don't think it would, that's a result of the delay tactic and campaign that these defendants employed in the first place, so they can't be heard to complain now that they're prejudiced by that delay.

Mr. Green also has been involved in this case, so no prejudice there. And we're moving as quickly as we can to make sure that all the discovery gets finished on time.

THE COURT: Anything else, sir?
MR. PISANELLI: NO.

THE COURT: Okay. This is what I'm going to
do. And $I$-- and before $I$ make a decision on this issue, $I$ think it's important just to take a quick cursory review of the Nutton factors. And specifically, number one, we've had an explanation of the untimely conduct in this regard.

Depositions had to be taken to explain
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| 09:29:59 | 1 | specifically what documents stood for, what they meant, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | what their purpose was. |
|  | 3 | And $I$-- and you have to do that because |
|  | 4 | documents don't testify. People testify. |
| 09:30:12 | 5 | I understand the importance of the requested |
|  | 6 | untimely action to add a party, new claims for relief, |
|  | 7 | civil conspiracy, and the like. I get that. |
|  | 8 | The potential prejudice in allowing the |
|  | 9 | untimely conduct, and as you can see I'm going through |
| 09:30:30 | 10 | the factors, and one of the -- one of the issues I'm |
|  | 11 | considering is we have a November 9, 2020 , trial date; |
|  | 12 | right? And so that's, what, eight, ten -- nine, ten |
|  | 13 | months down the road. If this impacts the trial date |
|  | 14 | potentially, I could move it. But right now it doesn't |
| 09:30:51 | 15 | appear it's going to. |
|  | 16 | And last, but not least, No. 4 of the |
|  | 17 | availability of continuance to cure such prejudice, |
|  | 18 | right now I don't have to deal with that. You know, if |
|  | 19 | it was closer to the trial date, yes. But now, no. |
| 09:31:06 | 20 | But if that becomes a factor I have to consider, bring |
|  | 21 | it to my attention. |
|  | 22 | In light of the discussion of the Nutton |
|  | 23 | factors, 1 'm going to go ahead and grant the motion, |
|  | 24 | sir. Prepare an order. And there's been a - you can |
| 09:31:1925 |  | put the factors in the order that l considered to |
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| ---: | ---: |
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$09: 31: 4315$
determine good cause.
MR. PISANELLI: Will do. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Everyone, enjoy your day.

MS. MECERA: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: What about the motion to seal?

Was that --
MS. MECERA: Yes.
THE COURT: I'm sorry. Motion to seal certain exhibits to opposition, any issue there?

MS. MECERA: Yes, Judge. Just briefly. We didn't file an opposition with the only caveat that yesterday we had a meet and confer with counsel. And I believe that the documents that they're seeking to seal have now been de-designated as not confidential. So I don't know if that changes their motion. By other than that we have no opposition to them being under seal.

THE COURT: Sir, anything on that?
MR. BROOKS: Yeah. We had a meet and confer yesterday. And $I$ said $I$ would review certain documents, and if they were -- if they were what they were represented to be, we would withdrew the confidentiality.

MS. MECERA: These were --
(Reporter clarification)
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THE COURT: What I'll do, it's unopposed.
I'll grant it. If you want to de-designate, that's up to you.

MR. BROOKS: Okay.
THE COURT: Just to make that easier.
MS. MECERA: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: All right.
MR. PISANELLI: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: Everyone, enjoy your day.
(Proceedings were concluded.)
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| 4/19 | 11/15 11/15 11/16 | A | 16/7 16/22 17/1 | 14/19 14/21 15/5 |
| MR. PISANELLI: | 19 18/21 | A. | 18/4 18/13 20/ | 15/8 18/5 21/24 |
| [10] $4 / 95 / 28 / 14$ | 16 22/24 | ab | /9 21/16 23/8 | gued [1] 12/6 |
| 8/16 8/19 9/8 21/6 | [3] 1/23 | 16/17 28/11 | 24/15 27/7 28/5 | arguing [1] 20/15 |
| 24/18 26/2 27/8 MR. WILT: [1] | $2100 \text { [1] } 3 / 11$ | able [1] $12 / 5$ <br> about [16] 7/1 | $\begin{array}{\|ll} \text { allege [1] } & 15 / 21 \\ \text { ALLEN [2] } & 3 / 18 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { argument [3] } \\ & 10 / 18 \quad 10 / 25 \quad 17 / 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| MR. WILT: [1] | 2101 [1] 3/12 | about [16] $7 / 1$ $7 / 210 / 1712 / 19$ | $4 / 15$ | as [26] 5/9 5/24 |
| MS. MEC | 212 [1] 2/10 | 13/23 17/4 17/5 | allow [1] 20/ | 6/10 6/25 7/24 9/17 |
| M/1 MECERA, | 214-2100 [1] 3/1 | 18/16 19/10 21/19 | allowed [1] 23/2 | 9/25 13/21 15/9 |
| 26/11 26/24 27/6 | 214-2101 [1] 3/1 | 21/24 22/17 22/24 | allowing [2] 17/11 | 15/9 15/20 17/5 |
| MS. WATKINS: [1] | 2214 [1] 3/22 | 23/1 23/4 26/6 | 25 | 17/16 19/25 20/1 |
| 4/13 | 2215 [1] 3/23 | according [1] | already [7] 6/10 | 20/23 21/17 21/25 |
| THE COURT: [37] | 24 [1] 11/15 | 19/14 | 8/23 13/16 15/17 | 22/3 22/13 22/25 |
| \$ | $\text { 25th [2] } 1$ | ACCURATE [1] | 16/2 20/24 21/10 $\text { Iso [2] } 4 / 2324 /$ | 24/14 24/14 23/17 25/9 26/15 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 107,031.79 \text { [1] } \\ & 14 / 6 \end{aligned}$ |  | Se | ways [1] | aside [1] 22/16 |
|  | 3 | across [1] 6/2 | mend [15] 4/25 | ask [2] 9/5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 2.14 \text { [1] } 14 / 3 \\ & \$ 2.14 \text { million [1] } \end{aligned}$ |  | action [6] 6/9 8/5 | 5/19 5/19 9/6 9/14 | d [2] 11/ |
|  | $300 \text { [2] } 3 / 93 / 1$ | 8/24 9/14 17/10 | 2/1 12/3 12/11 |  |
| 14/3 | $37 \text { [1] } 13 / 22$ | 25/6 | 12/1 12/3 12/11 | sking [4] 8/19 |
| \$49,000 [1] 14/10 | 37GR3 [1] | actions [1] | 16/11 19/5 19/9 | 8/20 15/15 19/24 |
| \$57,590.06 [1] | $3800 \text { [1] } 2 / 19$ | actually [4] 7/8 |  | sume [1] 10/20 |
| 14/7 | 3800 [1] 2/19 | 16/5 18/20 21/9 | amended [3] 1/1 | [21] 7/13 8/7 |
|  | 4 | 10/1 |  |  |
| '12 [1] 14/3 |  | 11/22 12/2 15/14 |  |  |
|  | $\text { 41ST [1] } 2 / 8$ | 23/22 25/6 | 11/12 11/18 12/13 | 15/1 15/9 16/6 16/8 |
|  |  | added [1] 15 | 19/19 18/22 | /22 17/17 17/21 |
|  | 5 | ing [5] 11/12 |  | 22/19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0007 \text { [1] } 2 / 10 \\ & 0469 \text { [1] } 2 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | 5 percent [3] 10/5 | 15/18 18/22 19/6 | amendment [2] 23/20 $24 / 4$ | 28/6 28/8 attached [2] 14/20 |
| 1 | 541 [2] 1/25 28/17 | O1 | $5 / 206 / 107 / 2$ | tempt [1] 12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathbf{1 0 0 1 9} \text { [1] } 2 / 9 \\ & \mathbf{1 0 9 9} \text { [2] } 10 / 8 \\ & 14 / 17 \\ & \mathbf{1 0 9 9 s}[\mathbf{1 ]} 20 / 21 \\ & 11 \text { [2] } 6 / 2318 / 24 \\ & \mathbf{1 2}[2] 1 / 234 / 1 \\ & \mathbf{1 2 0 0}[1] 2 / 20 \\ & 15[3] 11 / 1916 / 11 \\ & 20 / 3 \\ & 15 \text { percent [2] } \\ & 10 / 714 / 15 \\ & 15 \text { TH [1] } 3 / 20 \\ & 16 \text { [7] } 2 / 22 / 22 / 3 \end{aligned}$ | 7 | affidavit [1] 14/25 | amounts [1] 14/2 | attention [1] |
|  |  | afoot [1] 22/14 | analysis [4] 9/19 | 25/21 |
|  | 702 [4] 2/22 2/23 | after [7] 6/9 8/3 | 16/25 18/3 19/22 | attorney [1] 15/1 |
|  |  | 8/10 11/16 18/21 | another [4] 7/19 | audit [4] 22/8 22/9 |
|  | 732-7110 [1] 2/23 | 19/15 24/1 | 7/23 8/8 11/1 | 22/11 22/12 |
|  | $\text { 732-9099 [1] } 2 / 22$ | again [3] 4/20 23/2 | answer [2] 6/12 | availability [2] |
|  | $\left\|\begin{array}{cc} 732-9099[1] & 2 / 22 \\ 757-0007[1] & 2 / 10 \end{array}\right\|$ | 23/19 | 12/2 | 17/13 25/17 |
|  | 757-0469 [1] 2/11 | against [4] 5/8 6/4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { any [4] } 7 / 618 / 9 \\ & 24 / 826 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { aware [2] } 18 / 14 \\ & 18 / 14 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $775 \text { [2] } 3 / 223 / 23$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16 / 12 \quad 23 / 19 \\ & \text { ago [1] } 10 / 17 \end{aligned}$ | 24/8 26/10 anything [4] 6/18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18/14 } \\ & \text { AWILT [1] 3/24 } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 788-2215 [1] 3/23 | agree [2] 16/21 | $\begin{array}{\|c} 8 / 20 \\ \text { anyway [2] } 8 / 17 \\ \text { a } \end{array}$ | B |
|  |  | agreed [6] 11/3 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { back [2] } 17 / 15 \\ & 17 / 19 \end{aligned}$ |
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| B | BR | central [2] 5/3 | concluded [1] | course [4] 5/4 5/7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| backwards [1] |  |  |  | 16/ |
| 22 |  |  |  |  |
|  | brought [1] 21/15 | certainly [4] 6/13 | 17/8 17/12 24/5 | /9 11/19 12/25 |
| bankruptcy [1] 6/2 | business [3] 5/6 | 8/8 11/23 24/7 | 24/24 25/ | 16/9 16/24 18/4 |
| basis [3] 17/3 | 5/10 12/25 | CERTIFICATE [1] | conducting [1] | Court's [2] 16/13 |
| 17/17 23/18 |  |  |  |  |
| Bates [2] 15/3 | 7/10 9/24 13/ | CERTIFIE | confer [2] 26/1 | courts [2] |
| be [20] 8/22 9/5 | 15/15 15/20 1 |  |  | IG [1] |
| 10/9 11/4 12/5 | 6/22 17/13 18/2 | CERTIFY [1] 28/5 | confidential [1] |  |
| 15/15 16/11 16/12 | 20/13 20/21 21/9 | chain [1] 14/10 |  |  |
| 16/14 18/9 18/12 | 21/25 22/7 23/11 | change [7] 8/ | confidentia | 25/17 |
| 20/7 20/22 21/7 | 25/14 25/16 25/19 | //11 12/7 16/23 | 26/23 | rious [1] |
| 21/14 22/4 24/5 | 25/20 | 19/5 19/24 23/2 | confronted | cursory [1] |
| 24/11 24/25 26/22 | C | ] |  | [5] 6 |
| because [18] 5/9 | 2] |  |  |  |
| 6/3 6/22 7/19 8/4 | [12] |  |  | D |
| 9/16 12/17 12/18 | 14/22 16/6 20/17 | $\mathbf{c i}$ | conside | DANIEL [2] |
| $\begin{array}{ll}12 / 21 & 15 / 1315 / 22 \\ 17 / 24 & 19 / 8 \\ 21 / 7\end{array}$ | 20/17 20/18 20/19 | claim [3] 11 | $25 / 11$ | 4/17 |
| 17/24 19/8 21/7 <br> 21/22 23/9 24/4 | 22/10 | 19/17 23/19 | consolid | date [10] |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21 / 22 \text { 23/9 24/4 } \\ & 25 / 3 \end{aligned}$ | CAESARS' [4] $1 / 16$ | claimed [1] | 8/24 | 8/20 11/11 12/12 |
|  | 1/18 4/10 15/2 | claims [3] 19/6 | consp | 5/15 19/24 23/21 |
| been [9] 5/23 6/6 | calculated [1] 14/5 | 19/20 25/6 | 25/7 | 25/11 25/13 25/19 |
| been $14 / 9$ 15/17 21/12 | calendar [1] 17/22 | clarification | consp | DATED [1] 1/23 |
| 21/16 24/13 25/2 | call [3] 7/6 20/11 | 26/25 | 7/6 | dates [1] 24/1 |
| 26/15 | 20/12 | CLARK [3] 1/7 28/3 | CONSTITUTES | DAVID [2] 2/18 |
| beer [1] 14/13 | called [2] 15/ |  | 28/10 |  |
| before [12] $1 / 20$ |  |  |  | day [3] 16/22 26/4 |
| 5/18 6/23 6/23 8/21 | $23$ | clearly [4] 10 | CONTINUED [1] | BROOKS [1] 2/12 |
| 8/22 12/12 12/13 | campaign [1] | $10 / 13 \quad 15 / 5 \quad 16 / 8$ | $3 / 1$ | CARROLL [1] |
| $28 / 6$ | 24/10 | clogged [1] 17/22 | continues [1] | 2/24 |
| BEFORE-ENTIT | can [7] 11/4 12/16 | closed [2] 11/ |  | e[2] 26/15 27 |
| [1] 28/6 | 21/14 23/21 24/15 | 19/20 | control | de-designate [1] |
| begin [1] 8 | 25 | closely [1] 11/2 | conviction [2] 5/4 | 27/2 |
| behalf [5] $2 / 34 / 10$ |  | closer [1] 25/19 |  | -designated |
| 4/12 4/14 12/4 |  |  | pera | //15 |
| being [4] 5/9 10/13 | $\text { CARROLL [3] } 2 / 1$ | co-consp <br> [1] 7/6 | re |  |
| 22/17 26/17 | $2 / 184 / 19$ | orts [1] |  | 19/5 19/23 |
| believe [2] 15/10 | case [36] | [1] $23 / 5$ | 11/23 19/4 | /25 20/2 |
| 26/14 | cases [3] 1 | come [1] 21/ |  | eal [3] $4 / 25$ 14/11 |
| BEST [1] 28/11 between [1] 23/7 | 17/20 21/19 | comes [2] 13/1 | counsel [ | 25/18 |
| between [1] 23/ | catch [2] 8/7 22/10 | 23/8 | 14/22 15/2 16/6 | December [4] |
|  | caught [2] 7/18 | coming [3] 6/3 | /2 22/19 23/1 | 0/11 10/21 18/15 |
|  |  |  |  | 18/15 |
| bottom [2] 15/9 | cause [13] | ent [1] 22/5 | Counsel's [1] | December 7 [1] |
| $18 / 2$ | 9/4 9/19 12/10 | complain [1] 24/12 |  | 10/11 |
| brazenly [1] 7 | 16/15 16/25 19/14 | complained [1] | counte | December 8 [1] |
| $\text { eaks [1] } 14 / 1$ | 19/21 19/22 20/4 |  | 9/14 12/3 19/9 | 0/21 |
| $\text { ef [1] } 20 / 14$ |  | complaining [1] | counterclaims [ | decide [1] 7/13 |
| efly [1] $26 / 11$ | cavalier [1] 16/ |  |  | sion [5] 18/3 |
| bring [2] $8 / 21$ | /12 | complaint [4] 1/17 | COUNTY [3] 1/7 | 18/6 18/9 19/11 |
| 25/20 | CCR [2] 1/25 28/17 CD [3] 10/11 14/21 | 1 |  | 4/ |
| BRITTNIE [2] 3/7 $4 / 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14 / 23 \\ & \text { CDs [1] } 15 / 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { concerned [2] } \\ & 17 / 317 / 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { couple [3] 4/2 } \\ & 7 / 1919 / 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17 / 16 \\ & \text { defend [1] } 6 / 4 \end{aligned}$ |
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| D | Di | 14/10 20/11 | Exhibit 7 [1] 16/8 | figured [1] 23/14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Defendant [1] |  |  |  | file [5] 1/16 1/18 |
| 1/13 | dis | 15/5 18/20 18/24 | Exhibit C [1] 13/22 | 4/22 6/11 26/1 |
| defendants [3] | distributor | 20/8 20/9 21/2 | exhibits [9] $1 / 17$ | filed [4] 10/1 |
| 21/16 23/21 24/10 |  | 23/6 | 4/24 14/24 14/25 | 17 11/17 11/ |
| defends [1] 5/7 | DISTRICT [2] 1/6 | embark [1] 15/ | 15/7 15/10 20/6 | filing [1] 12/12 |
| defense [3] $7 / 15$ |  | employed [1] | 20/9 26/10 | finally [2] 22 |
| 7/18 24/5 |  |  | Exhibits 1 [ |  |
| delay [5] 6/12 |  | ployee | 14 | find [2] |
| 19/13 24/9 24/10 | 7/3 7/4 8/20 15/1 | 20/18 | Exhibits 1B [1] | nds [1] 16/9 |
| 24/12 | 17/2 19/8 24/ | enclosing [1] 15/ | 20/9 | finished [1] 24 |
| delayed [5] 5/25 | 25/3 26/2 27/1 28/4 | end [2] 14/17 | Exhibits 37GR3 [1] | firm [2] 14/22 |
| 20/23 21/7 21/21 | docket [2] 1/2 | 16/22 | 15/ | first [10] 1/16 |
| 22/21 |  | engaged [1] | expect [1] 7/3 | 4/22 4/25 6/21 7 |
| delays [1] 22/2 | document [6] 7/21 | enjoy [2] 26/4 27/9 | expiration [1] 8/3 | 13/16 21/9 23/25 |
| denied [2] 7/9 | 7/25 8/8 11/3 18/16 | enough [1] 8/24 | explain [2] 6/6 | 24/11 |
|  | 18/18 |  |  | FLOOR [2] 2/8 |
| denying [2] 7/6 | documents | ENTERPRISES [2] | explaining [2] | 3/20 |
| 12/9 | 6/7 6/15 6/17 6/ | 2/2 2/2 | 6/21 13/4 | FOREGOING |
|  | $7 / 57 / 208 / 18 / 18 / 2$ | Entertainme | explanation [2] | 28/10 |
| 6/20 7/10 13/22 | 10/10 10/13 10/19 | 5/10 | 17/8 24/23 | form [2] 8/5 |
| 15/9 21/23 22/13 | 12/24 13/5 15/8 | entities [8] 4/10 | Express [2] 10/21 | former [1] 14 |
| depositions [13] | 22/3 23/5 23/6 2 | 4/12 4/14 4/18 10/6 | 14/24 | forth [2] 5/25 17 |
| 8/10 11/4 11/14 | 25/ | 20/16 21/1 21/1 | extend [1] | forthright [1] |
| 11/17 12/17 12/22 | does [1] 9/15 | ENTITLED [1] 28/6 | extent [1] 24/7 | 22/17 |
| 13/14 19/15 20/8 | doesn't [7] |  | F | found [1] 10/19 |
| 22/16 22/25 23/5 | 22/9 22/10 | ESQ [5] 2/6 2 |  | ] |
| 24/25 | 24/5 25/14 | 3/5 3/7 3/18 | face | 15/7 17/5 18/5 20/9 |
| DEPT [1] $1 / 3$ | do | establishments [1] | 19/4 | 24/6 |
| DERIVATIVELY [1] | don't [12] 6/22 | 20/20 | fact [7] 5/20 9/2 | fraud [3] 5/8 6/ |
| DERIVAT | 11/9 13/9 20/4 | even [14] 6/11 | 12/15 17/20 19/23 | 8/21 |
|  | 20/13 21/6 21/2 | [1 | 21/10 24/2 | raudulent [1] |
|  | 23/7 24/9 25/4 | 8/8 10/23 11/1 | factor [1] 25/20 | 5/13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { designated [1] } \\ & 26 / 15 \end{aligned}$ | 25/18 26/16 | 11/8 11/23 19/14 | factors [6] 17/5 | ree [1] 24/3 |
|  | done [2] 6/22 | 21/7 22/16 | 18/5 24/22 25/10 | eely [1] 16/12 |
|  |  | everybody [1] | 25/23 25/25 | rivolous [1] 7/ |
| [6] 6/19 7/2 7/3 | door [1] 22/19 | 18/10 | facts [4] 5/22 | front [2] 9/12 22/ |
| [6 | down [4] 14/1 | everyone [3] 4/7 | 12/12 12/17 18/1 | FULL [1] 28/10 |
| didn't [12] 6/17 | 22/21 25/13 28/ | 26/4 27/9 | faith [2] 9/3 24/5 | further [2] 5/13 |
| 7/25 8/9 10/23 | drafted [2] 16/6 | everything [ | I[1] 17/19 | 16/9 |
| $11 / 1311 / 1311$ | 23/7 | 15/11 23/8 | 1 | futile [1] 7/17 |
| 12/5 19/1 19/8 |  |  | Fax [4] 2/11 2/23 | G |
| 20/14 26/12 |  | exactly [2] |  |  |
| different [2] 8/23 |  | ept |  |  |
| 22/20 | during [1] 21/23 | excuse [3] 8/6 9/1 | FEBRUARY [4] | 15/6 15/19 22/23 |
| 28/9 | E | 15/4 | 1/23 4/1 10/12 | 25/7 |
| discomfort [1] 6/3 |  | Ex |  | ts |
| discovery [11] | eac | 10/8 11/20 13/2 | February 4 [2] | getting [1] |
| 5/12 5/24 6/13 7/4 | earlier [1] | 13/22 14/12 14/25 | 10/12 18/21 | give [5] 14/ |
| 8/13 9/2 11/3 13/13 | early [1] 18/15 | 15/2 15/4 16/8 | federal [4] 6/1 | 14/17 16/1 16/2 |
| 15/16 21/11 24/15 | easier [1] 27/5 | 19/19 22/3 | 10/21 11/6 14/24 | 24/3 |
| discusses [2] | $\text { eight [2] } 6 / 11$ | Exhibit 1A [1] 15 | felony [2] 5/4 6/18 | giving [1] 22/21 |
| 14/11 14/11 | 25/12 | Exhibit 1B [1] 15/ | FENNEMORE [1] | GLOBAL [1] $2 / 3$ |
| $0$ | electronically [1] | Exhibit 1E [1] 10/8 | 3/17 | go [3] $4 / 74 / 24$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { dispositive [1] } \\ & 20 / 7 \end{aligned}$ | 18/17 <br> else [1] 24/17 <br> email [3] 10/8 | Exhibit 6 [4] 10/2 13/21 19/19 22/3 | FERG [2] $2 / 2$ 2/2 fiduciaries [1] 20/16 | $\begin{aligned} & 25 / 23 \\ & \text { goes [1] } 14 / 10 \\ & \text { going [13] } 9 / 17 \end{aligned}$ |
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| G | he's [1] 24/3 | /2 | ] | /24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| going... [12] 14/14 | hear [1] 23/3 | illegal [2] 20/13 | job [1] 7/ |  |
| 14/15 14/17 15/16 | heard [3] 10/18 | 22/10 | joint [1] 5/16 | letter [1] 15/2 |
| 18/8 18/12 21/7 | 10/25 24/11 | impact [1] 5/4 | JUDGE [3] 1/20 | licensee [2] 5/6 |
| 22/4 24/19 25/9 | [14] 7/22 8/4 | impacts [1] 25/13 | 1 26/11 | 6/5 |
| 25/15 25/23 | 8/11 9/17 9/25 | importance [2] | July [1] 10/24 | light [5] 5/20 23/5 |
| good [24] 4/6 4/9 | 10/16 11/6 15/12 | 17/9 25/5 | June [1] 10/24 | 23/13 24/4 25/22 |
| 4/11 4/13 4/20 5/2 | 15/14 20/7 22/14 | important [2] | jury [3] 7/13 8/2 | like [8] 11/9 13/9 |
| 5/19 9/3 9/4 9/10 | 22/19 23/21 24/7 | 13/13 24/21 | 22/6 | 21/17 22/3 23/6 |
| 9/11 9/19 12/10 | HEREBY [1] 28/5 |  | just [16] 5/9 5/ | 23/16 23/25 25/7 |
| 16/14 16/25 19/13 | HEREUNTO [1] | included [1] 15/2 | 10/18 10/25 13/20 | line [1] 18/2 |
| 19/14 19/21 19/22 | 28/13 | including [1] 7/4 | 13/22 18/10 18/19 | litigation [1] 16/19 |
| 20/3 20/4 21/10 | Hey [1] | INDICATED [1] | 19/10 20/15 20/19 | LLC [5] 1/12 2/2 |
| 24/2 26/1 | ghly [1] 11/2 | 28/7 | 22/7 23/18 24/21 | 2/2 2/2 3/2 |
| GORDON [3] 3/15 |  | individ |  |  |
| 4/15 15/23 | 22/23 24/3 | 9/23 | K | LLTQ [3] 2/2 2/2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { got [4] } 8 / 2310 / 20 \\ & 20 / 2123 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | 22/18 | indulging [1] 11/1 | kickback [6] 7/11 | logic [1] 19/12 |
| Government [1] | his [16] 5/5 5/8 | information [1] | 7/16 10/4 21/22 | look [8] 9/22 10/2 |
| $5 / 8$ | 5/14 6/3 6/4 6/12 | 18/18 | 22/9 23/10 | 10/7 13/20 14/12 |
| grant [2] 25/23 | 6/12 6/13 6/18 6/18 | inside [1] 7/24 | kickbacks [2] 5/15 | 16/8 18/5 22/7 |
| 27/2 | 6/24 7/9 20/16 | insiders [3] 23/ | 20/12 | looked [1] 13/17 |
| granted [1] 15/24 | 21/23 22/19 22 | 23/10 23/11 | knew [10 | looking [3] 17/15 |
| Green [4] 21/15 | hold [1] 9/3 | instead [1] 8/2 | 1/24 11/24 12/3 | 17/17 17/21 |
| 21/21 22/16 24/13 | Honor [29] | interchangeably | $112 / 12$ 15/1 | loosely [1] 5/17 |
| grievance [1] | HONORABLE [1] | 1] $11 / 5$ | 9/2 19/10 19/15 | lot [2] 9/3 15/16 |
| 23/16 |  | teresting | know [8] 7/25 | ] $23 / 4$ |
| gun [5] 6/16 8/9 | hope | 22/2 | 12/17 18/24 21/25 | love [2] 17/18 |
| 22/4 22/6 22/11 | hopes [1] | into [3] 11/9 23/2 | /25 23/9 25/18 | 17/ |
| guns [1] 10/2 | te |  | knowing [2] 7/1 | M |
| H | 18/25 23/22 | 24/13 | 7/9 | made [4] 14/23 |
|  | HOWARD [1] 2/19 | involving [2] 11/6 | knowledge [1] 7/6 | 16/23 17/16 17/19 |
| had [16] 6/10 6/20 <br> 8/6 11/25 16/1 | HUGHES [1] 2/19 | 15/23 | knows [1] 21/18 | MAGALI [2] 3/6 |
| 19/16 20/8 20/18 | hu |  | L |  |
| 21/12 22/18 24/23 | I | $\mathbf{I S}$ | LaFrieda [5] 13/25 | 23/11 24/15 24 |
| 24/25 26/13 26/19 |  | issue [13] 5/3 5/18 | 14/3 14/6 20/25 | 27/5 |
| 28/6 28/12 | I'll [6] 7/6 18/19 | issue ${ }^{\text {a }}$ (13] 5/3 5/18 $9 / 22$ 9/24 | 22/9 | making [1] 18/ |
| hands [2] 21/13 | 20/15 21/3 27/1 | 13/13 17/3 17/3 | laid [1] 12/9 | manager [1] 21/ |
|  | 27/2 | 17/17 17/17 20/14 | lapsed [1] 6/10 | many [2] 6/11 |
| happened [1] | I'm [21] 6/24 9/17 | 24/21 26/10 | LAS [4] 2/21 3/10 | 17/20 |
| happy [1] 24/3 | 12/12 12/19 12/20 | issued [1] 10/9 | 4/1 11/6 | MARIA [1] 3/6 |
| harbor [1] 18/9 | 16/24 17/3 17/4 | issues [4] 6/1 7/4 | last [4] 9/12 17/13 | marked [2] 13/21 |
| has [9] 5/20 5/23 | 17/15 17/17 17/20 | 11/7 25/10 | 17/19 25/16 | 15/9 |
| 5/25 6/6 16/10 | 17/21 18/2 18/13 | it [52] | [3] 7/7 7/14 | marketing [1] |
| 21/16 21/18 22/21 | 21/11 22/4 24/19 | it's [26] 4/21 8/6 |  | 7/12 |
| 24/13 | 25/9 25/10 25/23 | 9/21 9/22 10/3 11/1 | law [1] 16/5 | matter [3] 5/22 |
| have [50] | 26/9 | 11/2 11/5 11/6 | LAW.COM [1] 2/2 | 9/15 28/6 |
| having [1] 8/23 | I've [2] 20/6 20 | 11/19 13/23 14/13 | lawsuits [2] 8/23 | matters [3] 4/ |
| haystack [2] 7/20 | idea [1] 21/14 | 16/7 18/5 18/12 | 8/24 | 17/24 17/25 |
|  | if [26] $8 / 810 / 2$ | 20/7 20/13 21/9 | lawyers [1] 22/20 | May [3] 10/23 |
| he [17] 5/7 5/14 | 10/7 10/14 10/23 | 21/17 22/6 22/8 | learn [1] 7/7 | 18/24 22/24 |
| 5/16 5/25 6/6 6/11 | 11/8 13/16 13/20 | 22/8 22/15 24/21 | least [2] 17/13 | May 11 [1] 18/24 |
| 7/7 7/9 7/18 15/2 | 14/12 15/24 16/8 | 25/15 27/1 | 25/16 | maybe [1] 15/14 |
| 21/18 21/19 21/22 | 18/4 18/19 18/20 | its [1] 16/18 | 8 | me [2] 12/16 |
| 21/25 21/25 21/25$22 / 3$ | 20/23 24/8 25/13 |  | $16 / 1123 / 15$ | $12 / 2123 / 5$ |
|  | 25/18 25/20 26/16 | JAMES [2] 3/5 4/10 | Ienient [1] 16/10 | meaning [1] 13/10 |
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| M |  |  |  | $28$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| meant [3] 15/23 | $28 / 1128 / 1428 / 14$ | $\text { NY [1] } 2 /$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { people [2] 11/10 } \\ & 25 / 4 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | 8/20 10/6 11/5 |  |
| meat [1] 20/25 | N | 0 | 14/13 16/3 20/25 | per [1] 14/6 |
| Mecera [1] 4/11 <br> meet [2] 26/13 | name [2] 15/25 | oath [1] | 20/25 21/10 26/1 | 10/7 13/24 14/4 |
| $26 / 19$ | 28/14 | obligated | our [27] 4/7 5/25 | 14/11 14/15 |
| MERCE | named [1] 15/20 | 23/20 | 7/3 7/21 8/4 9/3 9/6 | person [2] 4/18 |
| $3 / 6$ | nation [1] | obligations | 9/13 10/7 11/20 | 20/10 |
| merits [1] 20 |  |  | 12/3 12/9 12/1 | hone [1] |
| met [2] 9/4 24/6 |  |  |  | PWL |
| million [1] $14 / 3$ | necessa | 25 | 16/8 17/21 18/4 | PHWLV [2] 1/12 |
| minute [1] $21 / 7$ |  | obtain [1] | 19/9 19/9 19/19 | 3/2 |
| miss [1] 20/2 | needed [1] 24/4 | October [2] 11/ | 20/6 21/3 21/1 | ISANELLI |
| missed [2] 19/23 | needle [2] 7/20 | 1/19 | 22/10 23/17 | /5 4/10 5/1 13/22 |
| 19/25 |  | Octobe | out [8] 7/3 | PISANELLIBIC |
| model [1] 5/23 |  |  | 18/6 | M [1] 3/13 |
| modified [1] $16 / 14$ | 28/2 28/ |  | 22/20 23/7 23/14 | lace [5] 4/7 8/10 |
| months [5] 6/11 | never [2] 10 |  | over [2] 5/12 6/ | 23/25 24/11 28/7 |
| 6/11 7/21 8/10 |  |  | overlapping [1] | laintiff [1] 1/10 |
| 25/13 | w [7] 2/9 10/12 | OFFICE [1] | 8/14 | planted [2] 7/19 |
| more [8] 15/13 | 21/14 21/15 21/18 | Okay [4] 16/2 | owed [3] 14/5 14/8 | 7/24 |
| 15/19 15/20 16/1 | 23/19 25/6 | 17/6 24/19 |  | ys [1] 5/5 |
| 17/7 17/25 21/19 | nine [1] 25/12 |  | P |  |
| 23/22 | no [15] 1/1 6/20 | once [3] 4/20 | page [4] 11 | 0/12 11/12 11/22 |
| morning [8] 4/6 | 7/16 8/6 12/19 | 23/11 | 14/16 15/3 15/9 | 12/1 12/13 13/19 |
| 4/9 4/11 4/13 4/21 | 19/13 19/14 19/20 | one [16] 5/14 | page 1 [1] $11 / 20$ | 23/18 |
| 5/2 9/10 9/11 | 20/9 22/6 24/7 | 10/4 10/5 10/5 12/4 | paid [4] 10/14 14/6 | plenty [1] 8/ |
| MOTI [2] 2/2 2/3 motion [21] $1 / 16$ | 24/14 24/18 25/19 | 12/6 13/16 15/19 | 14/8 14/9 | PLLC [2] $2 / 53 / 4$ |
|  | 26/17 | 15/20 16/1 21/7 | papers [3] 5/25 | plus [1] 8/1 |
|  | No. [1] 25/16 | 22/25 24/23 25/10 | 20/6 21/3 | PNL [1] 16/1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 4 / 2 b / / 159 / \\ & 10 / 210 / 16 \end{aligned}$ | No. 4 [1] 25/16 | 25/10 | Paris [1] 14/1 | PNLs [1] 16/2 |
| 12/9 13/21 14/ | nonexclusive [1] | only [7] 7 | PARKWAY [1] 2/19 | point [5] 6/7 20/22 |
|  | 18/5 | /19 18/20 |  | 20/22 23/3 23/3 |
| 26/6 26/9 26/16 | nonsense [1] | 18/24 26/12 | RTE [1] | pointed [1] |
| move [2] 13/18 |  | open [1] 23 | rticipating [1] | potential [2] 17/11 |
|  |  | O |  | 25/8 |
| moved [1] | note [1] 22 | 151 | particular [1] 23/6 | otentia |
| moving [1] 24/14 | NOTES [1] 28/8 | oppose [1] 19/9 | parties [14] 10/12 | 25/14 |
| Mr. [17] 5/1 5/4 | nothing [1] 21/19 | opposed [1] | 11/711/1 | prejudice [7] |
| 5/14 5/23 6/24 7/10 | notice [4] 10/15 | opposite [1] 21/12 | 11/22 12/2 12/4 | 17/11 17/14 24/7 |
| 5/14 5/23 6/24 7/10 | 10/16 10/23 18/25 | opposition [10] | 15/18 16/7 18/22 | 24/8 24/14 25/8 |
|  | noticed [2] 18/20 | 1/18 11/20 14/20 | 19/7 19/20 21/11 | 25/17 |
|  | 18/24 | 14/25 15/8 16/8 | 21/15 | prejudiced [1] |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21/21 22/16 22/18 } \\ & 22 / 2124 / 13 \end{aligned}$ | November [3] 12/9 | 19/19 26/10 26/12 | partner [1] 5/17 | 24/12 |
|  |  | 26/17 | partners [3] 2/ | prematurely [1] |
| $1521 / 21 \quad 22$ | November 9 [1] | or [14] 7/17 10/12 | 2/3 20/17 | 11/10 |
| $24 / 13$ | 25/11 | 10/23 10/24 10/25 | party [6] 15/14 | Prepare [1] |
|  | now [12] 5/18 6/15 | 11/12 11/22 12/ | /18 15/20 20/ | presumably [1] |
| $5 / 1 \quad 13 / 22$ | 8/17 10/1 10/16 | 16/3 18/22 19/2 | 21/14 25/6 | 6/3 |
| Mr. Seibel [8] | 11/1 12/6 24/12 | 19/11 19/20 23/8 | ss [1] 24/4 | retext [1] 5/9 |
| 5/23 6/24 7/10 | 25/14 25/18 25/19 | oral [2] 10/18 | passed [2] 5/21 | petty [1] 19/4 |
| 20/16 21/20 22/ | 26/15 |  | 24/2 | ous [1] |
| 22/21 | number [3] 15/9 | order [13] | Pat [4] 13/25 14/3 | imary [1] 23/ |
|  | 22/19 24/23 | 4/23 11/18 11/ | 20/24 22/8 | inted [1] 14/ |
| $5 / 48 / 2110 / 6$ | Nutton [6] 9/21 | 16/5 16/10 16/13 | paying [2] 10/5 | rior [3] 7/21 17/4 |
| must [1] 16/12 | $\begin{aligned} & 16 / 2517 / 520 / 1 \\ & 24 / 2225 / 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16 / 1716 / 2419 / 18 \\ & 20 / 125 / 2425 / 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} 10 / 7 \\ \text { PEGGY [3] } & 1 / \end{array}$ | 19/11 |
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| P | 23/8 | ro | $26$ | simply [2] 5/ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| proceeded [1] | regard [1] 24/24 | ROWEN [7] 1/9 2/2 |  |  |
| 14/22 | regard [1] 24/24 | 14/4 14/5 14/6 14/8 | 6/8 7/24 13/20 | sin [1] $21 /$ |
| Proceedings [3] | related [1] 11/2 | 14/9 | Secondly [1] 21/1 | sir [6] 5/1 9/7 21/4 |
| 27/11 28/6 28/12 | relationship | RRSC [1] 2/ | secret [1] 20/21 | 24/17 25/24 26/18 |
| proceeds [1] 13/24 | 20/18 | RRSC-LAW.COM | see [3] 7/15 23/1 | sitting [2] 21/16 |
| ocess [1] 5/24 | relief [1] 25/6 | RS [1] | 25/9 | 22/21 |
| produced [3] 6/9 | Relying [1] 12/24 | RS [1] 14/4 | king [1] 26/ | $x[2] ~ 6 / 1116 / 3$ |
| 8/4 10/10 | r | Rule [6] 6/ | seem [1] 24/5 | smoking [6] 6/16 |
| program [1] 20/12 | 17/18 | 12/10 16/11 16/13 | seems [2] 21/2 | 8/9 10/1 22/4 22/6 |
| prongs [1] 24/6 | RENO [1] | 20/2 20/3 | 22/18 | 22/11 |
| proper [1] 8/5 |  | Rule 11 [1] | EIBEL [15] | so [33] |
| prosecuting [1] | reply [1] 10/17 | Rule 15 [2] 16/1 | 2/2 4/17 4/18 5/1 | so-called |
|  | REPORTED [1] | 20/3 | 5/23 6/24 7/10 14/4 | some [6] 5/15 8 |
|  | 1/25 | Rule 16 [2] 12/10 | 14/6 14/7 20/16 | 11/5 13/25 21/2 |
| [] | Reporter [2] 26/25 | 20/2 | 21/20 22/18 22/21 | 23/13 |
| [1] 6 | 28/4 | ruled | Seibel's [3] 5/4 | somehow [1] |
| [1] [1] 25/2 | REPORTER'S [2] | rules [1] | 8/21 10/6 | 16/23 |
| purposes [2] 13/7 | 1/ | run [2] 6 | send [1] | something [1] |
| 14/18 | represented | running [2] 6/2 | sent [3] 14/21 | 5/23 |
| put [3] 5/24 22/16 |  |  | 14/23 15/2 | sooner [ |
| 25/25 |  | S | September [4] | 8/7 |
| Q | 25/5 | sa | 19/16 | 12/20 26/9 |
| question | required [1] 16/24 | said [17] 6/10 7/24 | September 24 [1] | sought [1] |
| 22/12 | requirement [1] | 13/16 15/11 | 11/15 | sounds [1] 23 |
| questions [1] 21/3 | 16/12 | 16/9 18/4 18/19 | September 3 [1] | SOUTH [1] 3/8 |
| $\text { quick [1] } 24 / 21$ | respectfully [2] | 18/23 20/5 20/23 | 14/7 | peaks [1] 19/ |
| quickly [1] 24/14 | 8/ | 21/25 | September 6 [ | specifically [ |
|  | responses | 26/ | 16 | /7 24/23 25/1 |
|  |  |  | [1] | speed [1] 21/18 |
| R-SQ | rest [2] 20/ | same [9] $4 / 19$ 9/14 | served [1] 20/2 | spell [1] 23/7 |
| 2/3 | restaurant [4] | 9/16 9/25 11/7 11/7 | serving [1] 15/17 | spend [1] 17/25 |
| raise [1] 23/12 | 15/20 15/21 15/25 | 14/14 15/8 19/12 | set [2] $7 / 317 / 5$ | SQUARED [1] 2/3 |
| RAMSEY [3] 3/15 | 16/2 | sat [1] 21/13 | setting [1] 12/2 | standard [3] 9/ |
| 4/16 15/23 | restaurants [3] | satisfy [1] 6/2 | seven [1] 16/3 | 12/10 16/10 |
| random [1] 11/5 | 5/16 14/1 16/3 | saw [1] 19/2 | SEVENTH [1] 3/8 | started [3] 6/8 |
| ranges [1] 15/3 | restricted [1] | say [9] 9/25 10/ | shall [2] 16/11 | 21/10 22/13 |
| rationale [1] 9/16 | 15/22 | 11/8 11/13 11/25 | 16/13 | STATE [2] 28/2 |
| read [1] 20/9 | result [2] 24/8 | 15/13 19/15 20/15 | shed [1] 23/ | 28/14 |
| al [1] 24/5 | 24 | 22/9 | ined [1] 23/13 | stated [1] 10/3 |
| realize [1] $8 / 9$ | retrospectively [1] | saying [3] 5/7 | short [1] 5/23 | states [4] 5/8 10 |
| really [6] 9/3 | 17/16 | 18/13 22/6 | shortening [2] | 10/8 11/21 |
| 11/13 17/3 17/15 | REUTHER [1] 2/17 | says [7] 7/18 14/3 | 1/17 4/23 | steak [1] 13/25 |
| 20/22 22/14 | review [2] 24/22 | 14/14 14/16 20/1 | SHORTHAND [1] | stems [1] 19/22 |
| ason [1] 1 | 26/20 | 22/8 22/11 | 28/4 | STENOTYPE [2] |
| reasonable [1] | revolving | SCAROLA [1] 2/5 | should [7] 7/18 9/ | 28/5 28/8 |
| 20/10 | 22/19 | SCHAFFZIN [1] | 13/17 13/18 14/9 | stipulated [1] |
| rebate [6] 10/4 | reward [1] 16/19 | 2/ | 15/21 20/7 | 19/18 |
| 10/5 10/7 10/13 | RICE [1] 2/17 | schedu | show [3] 10/13 | stipulation [2] |
| 15/6 20/12 | right [17] 4/6 4/20 | 11/18 11/21 16/10 | 15/5 24/2 | 11/18 23/25 |
| rebates [1] 14/1 | 9/20 9/24 12/23 | 16/13 16/17 16/23 | showed [1] 6/1 | stood [1] 25/1 |
| record [3] 4/8 | 13/1 13/3 13/11 | 19/18 | showing [1] 16/14 | stored [1] 18/18 |
| 16/21 28/11 | 17/1 17/23 18/5 | scheme [10] 5/15 | shows [2] 13/23 | strange [1] $7 / 5$ |
| refer [1] 19/11 | 18/7 18/11 25/12 | 7/8 7/12 7/12 7/16 | 14/2 | STREET [2] 3/8 |
| referred [2] 22/3 | 25/14 25/18 27/7 | 21/22 22/1 22/11 | signed [1] 16/5 | 3/19 |
| 22/13 | RMR [2] 1/25 | 23/10 23/ | similar [1] 6/1 | strongly [1] $15 / 1$ |
| referring [2] 20/11 | 28/17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { seal [6] } 1 / 174 / 2^{2} \\ & 26 / 626 / 9 \quad 26 / 14 \end{aligned}$ | simple [1] 5/22 | submit [1] 19/3 |
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| S | 27/ | 22 | try [1] 6/4 | use [2] 5/17 10/3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | think [18] 6/22 7/2 | trying [4] | used [3] 5/9 11/4 |
| 15/17 20/24 21/11 | that's [21] 7/11 | 9/4 10/14 12/2 | 15/19 17/21 22/23 | 20/8 |
| SUBSCRIBED [1] | 7/13 10/14 10/2 | 13/12 14/13 16/2 | two [8] 7/21 8/2 | uses |
| 28/13 | 12/14 13/12 13/13 | 19/10 20/6 20/7 | 11/4 13/15 14/19 | 6 |
| subtract [1] 14/8 | 14/4 18/4 18/8 | 20/13 20/25 21/6 | 17/9 20/ | V |
| successfully [1] | 22/8 22/12 23/13 | $24 / 2$ | TYPEWRITING [1] | valid [1] 1 |
| 12/6 | 23/14 23/22 24/9 | $\text { third [5] } 8 / 215 / 17$ | 28/8 | $[1]$ |
| such [2] 17/14 | 25/12 27/2 | 19/18 20/24 21/11 | typically [1] 23/6 | VEGAS [4] $2 / 21$ |
| suitability [2] | their [14] 10/2 | this [53] |  | 3/10 4/1 11/6 |
| 6/19 | 1 | those [12] |  | vendor [4] 10/5 |
| SUITE [2] 2/20 3/9 | 11/24 13/7 13/21 | 6/19 7/19 7/25 8/2 | ul | /6 14/13 20/ |
| SULLIVAN [1] 2/17 | 14/12 19/4 19/14 | 10/10 11/17 14/19 | 16/22 18/8 | [ |
| SUPERVISION [1] | 23/12 24/4 25/2 | 15/8 18/20 21/17 | Um [2] 13/6 | 15/6 20/19 |
| 28/9 | 26/16 | 23/11 | Um-hum [2] 13/6 | venture [2] 5/1 |
| supported [1] 16/4 | them [12] 7 | though [1] 12/16 | 13/8 | 5/22 |
| Supreme [1] 18/4 | 8/16 9/1 10/20 | thought [3] 11/25 | uncooperative | ery [3] 10/3 15/5 |
| sure [5] 6/24 19/3 | $10$ |  |  |  |
| 21/11 22/4 24/15 | 26/17 | thousands [1] | covered [3] | volumes [1] |
| surely [1] 6/19 | themselves [2] | $12 / 21$ | 5/13 6/8 23/19 | oluntarily [1] |
| suspect [1] 23/24 | 6/15 8/2 | thread [2] 6/7 | uncovering [1 | 11/17 |
| $13 / 17$ | then [8] |  |  | W |
| swear [1] 23 |  | Tr | $112 / 10 \quad 13 /$ | waited [1] |
| sworn [1] 22/22 | $23 / 12$ | $14 / 10 \quad 25 / 9$ | $16 / 11 \quad 16 / 25 \quad 18 / 3$ | want [10] 5/ |
| SZSLAW.COM [1] | there [9] 5/19 7/16 | time [10] $1 / 1$ | 20/2 26/17 28/9 | 11/8 12/5 12/7 |
| 2/12 | 14/19 14/20 19/20 | 4/23 8/3 9/12 11/21 | undermine [1] | 15/16 18/3 18/10 |
| T | 24/6 24/8 24/14 | 12/1 17/25 19/19 | 16/17 | 19/8 19/11 27/2 |
|  | 26/10 | 24/16 28/7 | understand [4] | wanted [3] 12/3 |
| tactic [1] 24/10 | there's [5] | TIMOTHY [1] 1/20 | 8/18 11/14 20/10 | 19/9 23/17 |
| tactics [1] 6/12 | 19/13 19/14 22/10 |  | 25/5 | was [33] |
|  | 25/24 | today [3] 7/ | understanding [2] | wasn't [2] 18/1 |
| $24 / 21$ | THEREAFTER [1] | 17/20 18/9 | 4/21 23/4 | 20/21 |
|  | 28/7 | told [5] 7/10 10/24 | United [ | WATKINS [2] 3/7 |
|  | therefore [1] | 18/23 20/6 24/1 | universe [1] 20/3 | 4/ |
|  | 23/20 | too [2] 6/24 17/20 | unlawful [1] 10/14 | we [66] |
| $k[1] \quad 23 / 11$ | these [19] 5/22 | took [5] 6/11 8/10 | unless [1] 21/2 | we'll [1] |
| talking [2] 7/1 | 7/5 10/1 10/19 12/4 | 11/14 12/21 28/5 | unopposed [1] | e're [11] $8 / 1$ |
| 13/23 | 13/24 15/6 18/14 | total [4] 14/5 14/6 | 27/1 | 198 |
| tat [1] 9/ | 18/24 20/8 20/19 | 14/7 14/9 | until [6] 6/9 8/3 | 14/15 14/16 20/14 |
| tax [1] 14/17 | 21/16 21/19 21/24 | TPOV [2] 2/3 2/3 | 8/9 10/23 11/14 | $2 / 5$ 23/1 23/20 |
| telephone [1] 9/ | 22/3 22/17 22/24 | TPOV00018823 | 13/2 | 24/14 |
| tell [8] 10/19 10/20 | 24/10 26/24 | [1] 14/16 | untimely [6] 17/8 | Ve [7] |
| 12/16 18/10 19/1 | they [93] | TRANSCRIBED [1] | 17/9 17/12 24/24 | 5/24 8/23 9/4 21/10 |
| 21/24 22/23 23/12 | they're [14] 8/14 | 28/8 | 25/6 25/9 | 24/6 24/23 |
| ten [3] 8/1 25/12 | 13/23 15/14 15/14 | TRANSCRIPT [2] | up [3] 21/18 23/ | eaker [1] 9/ |
| 25/12 | 15/16 15/18 18/16 | 1/15 28/10 |  | EDNESDAY [2] |
| ten-plus [1] 8/1 | 19/4 19/24 22/4 | transitioned [1] | upon | 1/23 4/1 |
| testify [2] 25/4 | 23/7 23/8 24/12 |  | 16 |  |
| 25/4 | 26/14 | trial [7] 8/20 15/15 | us [19] 5/18 6 | [ [1] 9 |
| testimony [3] 6/ | they've [2] 15/17 | 16/24 19/24 25/11 | 7/3 7/10 7/18 11/18 | ght [1] 9/3 |
| 13/2 22/22 | 20/24 | 25/13 25/19 | 12/1 12/5 13/18 | [6] 5/12 7 |
|  | thin | tried [1] 19/5 | 14/22 15/21 16/1 | /18 11/9 11/13 |
| $26 /$ | thing [2] 13/20 | TRUE [1] 28/10 | 9/5 19/18 | 23/19 |
| Thank [8] 9/7 9/8 21/4 21/5 26/2 26/5 | $\begin{aligned} & 14 / 14 \\ & \text { things [3] } 11 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | truth [1] 23/12 <br> truthful [1] 21/23 | $\begin{aligned} & 21 / 2422 / 1022 / 2 \\ & 24 / 1 \\ & \text { usable [1] } 8 / 3 \end{aligned}$ | were [36] <br> weren't [3] 9/2 <br> 12/25 19/3 |
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| W | yes [3] 25/19 26/8 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| what [40] | yesterday [2] |  |  |  |
| when [12] $9 / 2$ | 26/13 26/20 |  |  |  |
| 10/19 10/21 13/13 | yet [4] 11/16 15/15 |  |  |  |
| 16/23 18/2 21/23 | 19/17 23/2 |  |  |  |
| 21/24 22/5 22/12 | ORK [1] 2/9 |  |  |  |
| 23/13 23/14 | you [63] |  |  |  |
| where [3] 7/25 | $17$ |  |  |  |
| 16/9 23/8 | $\begin{array}{r} 20 / 2 \text { 20/2 } \\ \text { your [35] } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| WHEREOF [1] | your [35] |  |  |  |
| 28/13 | Z |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { whether [2] 5/18 } \\ & 19 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | ZUBATOV [1] 2/5 |  |  |  |
| which [10] 5/16 |  |  |  |  |
| 8/10 11/18 15/21 |  |  |  |  |
| 16/5 16/11 19/10 |  |  |  |  |
| 20/6 22/21 23/1 |  |  |  |  |
| who [3] 15/1 21/15 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| why [5] 6/6 9/15 |  |  |  |  |
| 11/25 13/14 17/21 |  |  |  |  |
| will [4] 10/9 20/5 |  |  |  |  |
| 20/22 26/2 |  |  |  |  |
| WILLIAMS [1] |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| WILT [2] 3/18 4/15 |  |  |  |  |
| withdrew [1] |  |  |  |  |
| 26/22 |  |  |  |  |
| without [1] 12/17 |  |  |  |  |
| WITNESS [1] |  |  |  |  |
| 28/13 |  |  |  |  |
| wondering [1] |  |  |  |  |
| 17/21 |  |  |  |  |
| word [2] 10/3 10/4 |  |  |  |  |
| works [1] 23/23 |  |  |  |  |
| worthy [1] 22/15 |  |  |  |  |
| would [20] 6/22 |  |  |  |  |
| 6/25 7/3 7/7 9/25 |  |  |  |  |
| 10/24 13/20 15/13 |  |  |  |  |
| 15/23 15/24 15/24 |  |  |  |  |
| 16/1 16/17 17/18 |  |  |  |  |
| 18/23 18/23 21/12 |  |  |  |  |
| 24/9 26/20 26/22 |  |  |  |  |
| wouldn't [4] 6/22 |  |  |  |  |
| 20/10 23/24 24/3 |  |  |  |  |
| wrongdoers [1] |  |  |  |  |
| 23/21 |  |  |  |  |
| wrote [1] 12/8 |  |  |  |  |
| X |  |  |  |  |
| XVI [1] 1/3 |  |  |  |  |
| Y |  |  |  |  |
| Yeah [3] 8/14 8/15 |  |  |  |  |
| 26/19 |  |  |  |  |
| year [2] 14/17 |  |  |  |  |
| 17/19 |  |  |  |  |


APPEARANCES:
(PURSUANT TO ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER 20-10, ALL MATTERS IN
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BAILEY KENNEDY

BY: JOSHUA GILMORE, ESQ.

BY: PAUL WILIIAMS, ESQ.

8984 SPANISH RIDGE AVENUE

LAS VEGAS, NV 89148
(702) 562-8820
(702) 562-8821

JBAILEY@BAILEYKENNEDY.COM

FOR THE PHWLV:
PISANELLI BICE PLLC

BY: MARIA MAGALI MERCERA, ESQ.
BY: BRITTNIE WATKINS, ESQ.
BY: JAMES PISANELLIE, ESQ.
400 SOUTH SEVENTH STREET
SUITE 300
LAS VEGAS, NV 89101
(702) 214-2100
(702) 214-2101 Fax

MMM@PISANELLIBICE.COM
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FENNEMORE CRAIG, P.C.
BY: JOHN TENNERT, ESQ.

300 SOUTH FOURTH STREET

SUITE 1400

LAS VEGAS, NV 89101
(702) 692-8000
(702) 692-8086 Fax

JTENNERT@FCLAW.COM

FOR ELLIS HOSPITALITY:

MARQUIS AURBACH COFFING P.C.
BY: MICHAEL MAUPIN, ESQ.
10001 PARK RUN DRIVE

LAS VEGAS, NV 89145
(702) 382-0711
(702) 382-5816

MMAUPIN@MACLAW.COM
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*     *         *             *                 *                     *                         * 

THE COURT: Rowen Seibel versus PHWLV. Let's
go ahead and place our appearances on the record.
We'll start first with the plaintiff and then move to the defendants.

MS. MERCERA: Good morning, your Honor.
Magali Mercera on behalf of Desert Palace Inc, PHWLV LLC, Paris Las Vegas Operating Company, and Boardwalk Regency Corporation.

THE COURT: Good morning, ma'am.

MS. WATKINS: Good morning, your Honor,
Brittnie Watkins also on behalf of the Caesars entities.

THE COURT: Good morning.
MR. WILIIAMS: Good morning, your Honor, I
apologize. I was muted. This is Paul Williams on behalf of the development entities. And we also represent plaintiff Rowen Seibel and defendant Craig Green. But they are not parties to this motion. Only the development entities are.

THE COURT: Okay.
(702)671-4402-DEPT16REPORTER@GMAIL.COM Pursuant to NRS 239.053 , illegal to copy without payment.

09:21:11 1

MR. WILLIAMS: And Joshua Gilmore is also on the line. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Okay.
MR. TENNERT: Good morning, your Honor. John Tennert on behalf of the Gordon Ramsey.

THE COURT: All right. Does that cover all appearances?

MR. MAUPIN: And, good morning, your Honor. Michael Maupin on behalf of the Ellis Hospitality.

THE COURT: Good morning, sir.
Is there anyone else welve overlooked?
And $I$ would anticipate we want to have this matter reported; is that correct?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And who requested that for the record?

MR. WILLIAMS: This is Paul Williams on behalf of the development entities.

THE COURT: All right. And Ms. Isom, did you get the appearances, ma'am?

THE COURT REPORTER: I did, Judge. Thank you.
THE COURT: We can go ahead and get started.
MR. WILLIAMS: Good morning, again, your
Honor.
This is Paul Williams on behalf of the
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| 09:22:11 | 1 | development entities. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | We are seeking a limited stay pending |
|  | 3 | resolution of the development entities' writ petition |
|  | 4 | which was recently filed with the Nevada Supreme Court. |
| 09:22:23 | 5 | That writ petition concerns this Court's order |
|  | 6 | which struck the development entities' amended |
|  | 7 | counterclaims which they asserted in response to |
|  | 8 | Caesars' first amended complaint. |
|  | 9 | As this Court recognized at oral argument on |
| 09:22:40 | 10 | the motion to strike, the Caesars' motion to strike, |
|  | 11 | neither the Nevada Supreme Court nor the Nevada Court |
|  | 12 | of Appeals have addressed whether and under what |
|  | 13 | circumstances a defendant may assert an amended |
|  | 14 | counterclaims as a matter of right in response to an |
| 09:22:57 | 15 | amended complaint. |
|  | 16 | We think the writ petition is a great |
|  | 17 | opportunity for the Nevada Supreme Court to provide |
|  | 18 | some clarity to this Court and to the parties and to |
|  | 19 | all the litigants in the state on this issue, which it |
| 09:23:09 | 20 | hasn't decided before. And as this Court likely |
|  | 21 | recalls, there are multiple different approaches taken |
|  | 22 | by other courts. So we think that that's a great writ |
|  | 23 | petition for them to take up and decide that issue. |
|  | 24 | Now, we're only seeking to stay the |
| 09:23:26 | 25 | dispositive motion deadline and to stay trial. We're |
|  |  | Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR <br> (702)671-4402-DEPT16REPORTER@GMAIL.COM |
|  |  | Pursuant to NRS 239.053, illegal to copy without payment |


| 09:23:28 | 1 | not seeking to stay discovery, which the parties are |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | still finishing up, they're still engaging in some |
|  | 3 | cleanup discovery. |
|  | 4 | And, in fact, the deadline to file dispositive |
| 09:23:38 | 5 | motions is tomorrow. But there's one caveat to that, |
|  | 6 | and that is that the parties have stipulated to |
|  | 7 | continue the deadline for dispositive motions as it |
|  | 8 | concerns Caesars coercive claims for relief. Because |
|  | 9 | there are at least two depositions that have -- the |
| 09:23:56 | 10 | parties have been unable to complete concerning those |
|  | 11 | claims. And we've submitted a stipulation and order to |
|  | 12 | the court on that point just for the record. |
|  | 13 | Now, there are four factors the Court looks at |
|  | 14 | in evaluating whether or not to grant a stay pending a |
| 09:24:12 | 15 | writ petition. |
|  | 16 | The first factor is whether the object of the |
|  | 17 | writ petition will be defeated if the stay is not |
|  | 18 | entered. |
|  | 19 | Now, here the object of the writ petition is |
| 09:24:23 | 20 | to enable the development entities to assert the |
|  | 21 | amended counterclaims that they asserted in response to |
|  | 22 | Caesars' first amended complaint and to bring those |
|  | 23 | counterclaims to trial. |
|  | 24 | If the stay is not entered and trial proceeds |
| 09:24:37 | 25 | without a decision from the Nevada Supreme Court, and |
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| 09:24:39 | 1 | the dispositive motions are briefed and argued and |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | decided, the object of the writ petition will be |
|  | 3 | defeated. |
|  | 4 | And as the Nevada Supreme Court recognized in |
| 09:24:49 | 5 | the McCowan Gaming Corporation case where the object of |
|  | 6 | the writ petition is -- will be defeated, a stay is |
|  | 7 | generally warranted. So under the first factor, that |
|  | 8 | would support a stay being entered in this case. |
|  | 9 | The second and third factors concern the |
| 09:25:05 | 10 | respective harm to the parties if the stay is or is not |
|  | 11 | entered. In its opposition, Caesars focuses a lot on, |
|  | 12 | you know, this idea of irreparable harm. But that's |
|  | 13 | not the only relevant consideration. The factor |
|  | 14 | expressly is irreparable or serious harm. So it |
| 09:25:23 | 15 | doesn't have to be irreparable harm. It could also |
|  | 16 | include serious harm. |
|  | 17 | And here the development entities face serious |
|  | 18 | harm if the stay is not entered because they will be |
|  | 19 | precluded from being able to bring the amended |
| 09:25:37 | 20 | counterclaims to trial irrespective of the Nevada |
|  | 21 | Supreme Court's ruling on the writ petition. So that, |
|  | 22 | that is the harm they face. |
|  | 23 | Now, on the other hand, which is the third |
|  | 24 | factor, there virtually will be no harm to Caesars if |
| 09:25:52 | 25 | this matter is stayed. And the only real harm that |
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| 09:25:55 1 |  | Caesars points to in their opposition is delay. And |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | the Nevada Supreme Court -- and, again, this is from |
|  | 3 | the McCowan case -- has already ruled that a mere delay |
|  | 4 | is not sufficient to -- is not sufficient grounds to |
| 09:26:09 | 5 | avoid a stay. |
|  | 6 | And one thing $I$ want to address, your Honor, |
|  | 7 | is Caesars argues that the development entities - - the |
|  | 8 | development entities have sought to delay this |
|  | 9 | litigation, but that's not the reality of the |
| 09:26:21 | 10 | situation. |
|  | 11 | The reality is Caesars continues to operate |
|  | 12 | the restaurant venture - restaurants that the |
|  | 13 | development entities, for lack of a better term, |
|  | 14 | actually developed. And Caesars continues to keep the |
| 09:26:35 | 15 | money that the development entities believe they're |
|  | 16 | entitled to. I say this because, believe me, my |
|  | 17 | clients would like to get a resolution on their claims |
|  | 18 | on the merits as soon as possible. |
|  | 19 | They want -- you know, they believe that |
| 09:26:48 | 20 | Caesars is withholding money that they're entitled to. |
|  | 21 | But the issue here that warrants the stay is |
|  | 22 | that the development entities believe that they were |
|  | 23 | entitled to assert their amended counterclaims as a |
|  | 24 | matter of right and don't want to have to go through |
| 09:27:02 | 25 | the process of a retrial after an appeal. We don't |
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| 09.28.15 1 | 1 | that was going to eventually make its way up to the |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | Nevada Supreme Court on a writ petition. |
|  | 3 | Now, I'd like to point out two things on |
|  | 4 | the - on that - on the merits - on the merits of the |
| 09:28:32 | 5 | writ petition. |
|  | 6 | First, $I$ want to point out on pages 20 through |
|  | 7 | 21 of the writ petition, which is attached as Exhibit 8 |
|  | 8 | to the motion to stay, that's where we address the |
|  | 9 | Nevada Supreme Court decision in Lund. |
| 09:28:46 | 10 | That case involved a matter where the Nevada |
|  | 11 | Supreme Court took up a writ petition where a district |
|  | 12 | court had struck counterclaims based on its |
|  | 13 | interpretation of the Rule $13(\mathrm{~h})$. It was an issue that |
|  | 14 | the Nevada Supreme Court had never addressed before. |
| 09:29:00 | 15 | So they took up the writ to provide some guidance on |
|  | 16 | it. |
|  | 17 | And the Nevada Supreme Court held that writ |
|  | 18 | relief was appropriate there because the district |
|  | 19 | court's dismissal of those counterclaims -- and I'm |
| 09:29:13 | 20 | trying to -- I'm summarizing here from the language of |
|  | 21 | the opinion was something that strike -- the |
|  | 22 | striking -- I'm sorry, the dismissal of the |
|  | 23 | counterclaims potentially affected the future course of |
|  | 24 | the proceedings and the confusion. There was confusion |
| 09:29:29 | 25 | as to the scope and application of Rule 13 (h) which the |
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| 09:29:32 | 1 | Court found to be of statewide significance. So that |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | the Court took up that writ petition and basically |
|  | 3 | provided some clarity to that rule. |
|  | 4 | And here we have a very remarkable fact |
| 09:29:45 | 5 | pattern that's very similar to Lund. There's no |
|  | 6 | controlling authority. There's a potential range of |
|  | 7 | approaches from federal courts. And based on that, we |
|  | 8 | think it's likely the Nevada Supreme Court is going to |
|  | 9 | take up this writ petition and provide some guidance on |
| 09:29:59 | 10 | that issue. |
|  | 11 | I think this Court recognized it was put in a |
|  | 12 | position where there's no controlling authority and it |
|  | 13 | had to decide on what approach it believed the Nevada |
|  | 14 | Supreme Court was going to take up. |
| $09: 30: 09$ | 15 | And we are -- you know, we disagree with the |
|  | 16 | approach utilized in the ultimate decision, but we |
|  | 17 | understand that this court didn't have the controlling |
|  | 18 | authority to go off of. And we think the Nevada |
|  | 19 | Supreme Court has a good opportunity here to provide |
| 09:30:23 | 20 | some guidance to everybody. |
|  | 21 | Now as to the actual merits of the writ |
|  | 22 | petition the -- you know, what approach should be |
|  | 23 | utilized, that's been extensively briefed by the |
|  | 24 | parties. But there's two things I want to point out |
| 09:30:38 | 25 | for the record. |
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| 09:30:38 | 1 | First, as explained on page 15 of the motion |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | to stay, numerous courts have rejected that Rule 16 and |
|  | 3 | scheduling orders have any application in a Court's |
|  | 4 | evaluation of whether amended counterclaims pled in |
| 09:30:58 | 5 | response to amended complaints are appropriate. |
|  | 6 | And the reason $I$ want to point that the out |
|  | 7 | is - - |
|  | 8 | THE COURT: And explain to me why. The reason |
|  | 9 | why I bring that up, I think it's really important to |
| 09:31:11 | 10 | focus on what the issues are and the basis for my |
|  | 11 | decision. Because to me what is primarily overlooked |
|  | 12 | in this entire discussion is essentially this: And |
|  | 13 | it's important to go back to the Nutton case. |
|  | 14 | And understand, the Nutton case was a first |
| 09:31:29 | 15 | case of first impression as it pertains to the tension |
|  | 16 | between Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure 15(a) that |
|  | 17 | deals specifically with motions to amend pleadings |
|  | 18 | versus the scheduling order under Rule 16(b). I'm not |
|  | 19 | talking about Rule 16.1., but Rule 16 (b). And, in |
| 09:31:49 | 20 | fact, that -- I think that is probably the first |
|  | 21 | Rule $16(b)$ case ever published in the state of Nevada. |
|  | 22 | And it was published by our Court of Appeals. And I |
|  | 23 | think it was Judge $T$ ao who authored that opinion. And |
|  | 24 | I think it's really a fascinating opinion because, |
| 09:32:07 | 25 | No. 1, it's 25 pages long. Typically when the opinion |

$09: 32: 0725$
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| 09:32:11 | 1 | is discussed, we focus on the tension between those two |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | rules. |
|  | 3 | But if you really go back and read it again, |
|  | 4 | Judge Tao discusses many, many different issues |
| 09:32:24 | 5 | pertaining to granting a summary judgment, Rule 56, |
|  | 6 | pleadings, Rule 8, and there is many more issues he |
|  | 7 | discusses in that case. |
|  | 8 | But this is what I think is the most important |
|  | 9 | aspect of that case is concerned. And the reason why I |
| 09:32:39 | 10 | am bringing this up is this: He did two things in that |
|  | 11 | case. First, remember Rule 16 (b) was not an issue |
|  | 12 | raised below. It was raised the first time by the |
|  | 13 | Court of Appeals on appeal. And to me, that - I look |
|  | 14 | at that as a guidepost because of the instructions and |
| 09:32:58 | 15 | the comments given by our Court of Appeals as far as |
|  | 16 | the application of Rule 16 (b) . |
|  | 17 | And he talked about the tension between the |
|  | 18 | two rules. But he said, Look, trial courts, you have |
|  | 19 | to read these rules in harmony. |
| 09:33:11 | 20 | But this is my point as far as the analysis is |
|  | 21 | concerned. Because as a condition precedent to be |
|  | 22 | conducting a Rule 15 analysis, he says the first thing |
|  | 23 | the trial court must do and has to do is to address |
|  | 24 | 16 (b). And 16 (b) is the scheduling order. And, you |
| $09: 33: 2925$ |  | know what, if things are filed before the expiration of |
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| $09: 35: 01$ |  | And 1 don't mind telling you that's kind of |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | how I see it. And I think if you go back and look at |
|  | 3 | the Nutton case, that's the approach that was |
|  | 4 | recommended, $I$ mean, from Judge Tao in this regard. |
| 09:35:18 | 5 | Because the trial court, he said it, they didn't |
|  | 6 | consider $16(\mathrm{~b})$. That's error. Right there at the end |
|  | 7 | Of the case and the conclusion. |
|  | 8 | So tell me why it was an error for me not to |
|  | 9 | consider Rule 16 (b) in light of Nutton. |
| 09:35:42 | 10 | MR. WILIIAMS: Understood, your Honor. And I |
|  | 11 | agree. Nutton is, you know, it is a very, very good |
|  | 12 | opinion. And Judge Tao did an excellent job analyzing |
|  | 13 | sort of the federal landscape of the similar cases that |
|  | 14 | they took on and did an excellent job of that. |
| 09:35:56 | 15 | Your Honor, here is why Nutton doesn't apply |
|  | 16 | and why Nutton doesn't apply to the amended |
|  | 17 | counterclaims at issue here. |
|  | 18 | When -- the case law on these approaches, the |
|  | 19 | narrow approach, the moderate approach, and the |
| 09:36:12 | 20 | permissive approach takes the -- takes the approach |
|  | 21 | that when a party is allowed to assert an amended -- an |
|  | 22 | amended complaint, so here it was Caesars, when that |
|  | 23 | party is allowed to assert an amended complaint, that |
|  | 24 | gives the defending party who has to answer that |
| 09:36:3225 |  | complaint the matter of -- to file amended |
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| 09:36:35 | 1 | counterclaims as a matter of right without -- they |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | don't have to seek leave under Rule 15(a). They don't |
|  | 3 | have to comply with -- Rule 16 and Rule 15, essentially |
|  | 4 | the requirement that a party normally obtain leave to |
| 09:36:49 | 5 | assert an amended -- to assert amended claims does not |
|  | 6 | apply because they are pleading in response to the |
|  | 7 | amended complaint that the court allowed by the other |
|  | 8 | party. |
|  | 9 | So here -- |
| 09:37:01 |  | THE COURT: But here's my question - - |
|  | 11 | MR. WILIIAMS: -- the Court allowed -- |
|  | 12 | THE COURT: -- though, in this case, and it's |
|  | 13 | my recollection -- m might be wrong. I have a lot of |
|  | 14 | cases. But there was a motion to assert counterclaims |
| 09:37:11 | 15 | earlier, the same counterclaims; is that correct? |
|  | 16 | MR. WILLIAMS: That is correct, your Honor. |
|  | 17 | It's a -- |
|  | 18 | THE COURT: Right? |
|  | 19 | MR. WILLIAMS: There are similar -- there |
| 09:37:17 | 20 | are -- as it relates to one of the restaurants; that is |
|  | 21 | correct. |
|  | 22 | THE COURT: Okay. And the basis for my |
|  | 23 | determination was essentially this. And this is -- |
|  | 24 | do agree with you. This is a really fascinating issue. |
| $09: 37: 3025$ |  | But at the time, it's my recollection, I made a |
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| 09:37:32 | 1 | determination it was -- it was too late. It wasn't |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | good cause. Something to that effect; right? |
|  | 3 | MR. WILLIAMS: Correct. |
|  | 4 | THE COURT: Okay. Now, here's my question, |
| 09:37:42 | 5 | and I think this is a really important question because |
|  | 6 | I thought about this. In the rules as it -- is there a |
|  | 7 | counterclaim exception to Rule 16(b)? |
|  | 8 | MR. WILLIAMS: There -- I don't have |
|  | 9 | Rule 16 (a) in front of me, your Honor. But I am fairly |
| 09:38:00 | 10 | certain there is not a specific counterclaim exception. |
|  | 11 | THE COURT: Yeah. And $16(\mathrm{~b})$, that's the rule. |
|  | 12 | MR. WILLIAMS: Correct. |
|  | 13 | THE COURT: That's kind of my point. There |
|  | 14 | isn't, you know. And here's the thing. And I don't |
| 09:38:12 | 15 | mind saying this. We look to the federal rules, we do, |
|  | 16 | in many different scenarios. But, and sometimes this |
|  | 17 | is very much overlooked. The district courts are |
|  | 18 | courts of general jurisdiction. Our jurisdiction is |
|  | 19 | very much different than a federal court. As far as |
| 09:38:33 | 20 | their cases are concerned, they're actually very |
|  | 21 | limited, either diversity or federal question. That's |
|  | 22 | it; right? |
|  | 23 | In contrast, we see a myriad of different |
|  | 24 | cases they never see. In fact, our case load is much |
| 09:38:462 | 25 | different. And 1 look at the Nutton case in one simple |
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| 09:38:49 | 1 | respect. It's like a mandate from our Court of Appeals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | in this respect. |
|  | 3 | They're saying, Look, Judge, your Rule -- your |
|  | 4 | Rule $16(\mathrm{~b})$ scheduling orders have to have meaning. |
| 09:39:07 | 5 | They have to have force and effect. If there's a |
|  | 6 | motion filed, for whatever reason, subsequent to the |
|  | 7 | time set forth in the scheduling order, you're required |
|  | 8 | to, No. 1, before you consider that to make a good |
|  | 9 | cause determination. And if I don't, it's error. |
| 09:39:27 | 10 | Whether it's harmless or not or reversible or whatever, |
|  | 11 | I guess, it depends on the circumstances, but it's |
|  | 12 | error. |
|  | 13 | And so when I was confronted with this issue, |
|  | 14 | and $I$ read it, and $I$ remember reading the points and |
| 09:39:42 | 15 | authorities, and one of the -- it just jumped off the |
|  | 16 | page to me based upon my recollection of Nutton, that |
|  | 17 | no one has addressed 16 (b). And l (hink as a trial |
|  | 18 | judge, based upon the Nutton decision, I'm required to |
|  | 19 | do that. Especially when it's a contested issue. If |
| 09:40:01 | 20 | it's not and the parties stipulate and agree, in a |
|  | 21 | general sense because we're much different than the |
|  | 22 | federal courts, $I$ let you decide your own destiny. $I$ |
|  | 23 | do. |
|  | 24 | But if it's a contested, I think -- I think |
| 09:40:1125 |  | that triggers that 16 (b) analysis. And that's - and, |


| 09:40:14 | 1 | you know what, and I respect everyone's position. I |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | think it's -- but one thing I try to do is explain why |
|  | 3 | $I$ do what $I$ do and why $I$ make the decision. |
|  | 4 | And it will be up to the Court of Appeals |
| 09:40:26 | 5 | and/or Nevada Supreme Court to make a decision as to |
|  | 6 | whether I'm right or wrong. |
|  | 7 | But, sir, $I$ didn't want to cut you off. |
|  | 8 | Continue on. |
|  | 9 | MR. WILLIAMS: NO, your Honor. And I, |
| 09:40:35 | 10 | frankly, I agree that this is a very -- this is a very |
|  | 11 | intriguing issue. And from an academic perspective |
|  | 12 | there are a lot of different approaches. And I think |
|  | 13 | this is something I think the Nevada Supreme Court is |
|  | 14 | going to have to provide some clarity on. |
| 09:40:48 | 15 | But just as it relates to Nutton, one thing 1 |
|  | 16 | want to point out on Nutton is that Nutton was also - - |
|  | 17 | you know, it relied a lot, if I recall correctly, on |
|  | 18 | federal authorities as well. Because Rule 16, not |
|  | 19 | 16.1, but Rule 16 is similarly modeled off of federal |
| 09:41:07 | 20 | Rule 16. |
|  | 21 | And the federal courts in applying the narrow |
|  | 22 | approach or the moderate appropriate or the permissive |
|  | 23 | approach are -- have those same limitations |
|  | 24 | theoretically as the Rule 16 schedule order - - |
| 09:41:1925 |  | scheduling orders they enter. |
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| 09:41:21 | 1 2 | And the only reason why $I$ bring that up, your <br> Honor, is just so the record -- this is not something |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | that was really briefed before the court decided the |
|  | 4 | motion to strike because, as you noted, neither caesars |
| 09:41:30 | 5 | nor our side addressed Rule 16 (b). But in the motion |
|  | 6 | to stay we have, 1 think, three -- two or three cases |
|  | 7 | that address that argument saying that -- where the |
|  | 8 | party said, Hey, you need to conduct a good cause |
|  | 9 | analysis under Rule $16(\mathrm{~b})$ because your amended |
| 09:41:49 | 10 | counterclaim was filed after the deadline had passed. |
|  | 11 | And the court there said -- the courts there |
|  | 12 | said, No, it doesn't apply because the defendant when |
|  | 13 | it's responding to an amended complaint has the right |
|  | 14 | to assert the amended counterclaims so long as they |
| 09:42:07 | 15 | comply with whatever approach is being applied. That |
|  | 16 | they have the right to do that. |
|  | 17 | So neither the limitations that would be |
|  | 18 | normally under $16(\mathrm{~b})$ or under $15(\mathrm{a})$ apply in those |
|  | 19 | circumstances. |
| 09:42:19 | 20 | And the reasoning behind all these cases is, |
|  | 21 | you know, if an -- if the court is going to allow one |
|  | 22 | side to amend, which here was -- this Court allowed |
|  | 23 | Caesars to file its first amended complaint. Conducted |
|  | 24 | the Nutton analysis. Determined that it was - there |
| 09:42:3425 |  | was good cause to allow Caesars to file their first |

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR
(702)671-4402-DEPT16REPORTER@GMAIL.COM Pursuant to NRS 239.053 , illegal to copy without payment.

| 09:42:37 | 1 | amended complaint. Then the corresponding -- the |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | corresponding right that comes from that is that the |
|  | 3 | defendant has the right to respond with amended |
|  | 4 | counterclaims. |
| 09:42:49 | 5 | And those cases, again, which are -- is on |
|  | 6 | page 15 of the motion to stay address that issue. This |
|  | 7 | particular issue of Rule 16 and the scheduling order |
|  | 8 | and also Rule 15 as well. |
|  | 9 | But I appreciate your Honor's position. I |
| 09:43:06 | 10 | completely understand, you know, you have something |
|  | 11 | where you have controlling authority where you can look |
|  | 12 | to and say What is -- what is -- how does this work? |
|  | 13 | How do these all interplay? |
|  | 14 | And 1 , you know, I think all the parties |
| 09:43:19 | 15 | appreciate that you really put the time into this. |
|  | 16 | And, you know, evaluate and decide what you think the |
|  | 17 | Nevada Supreme Court is going to do. But we believe |
|  | 18 | that this is a case where the Nevada Supreme Court |
|  | 19 | needs to provide some guidance overall for all |
| 09:43:32 | 20 | litigants including on this case. |
|  | 21 | So with that, I just want to -- there's one |
|  | 22 | other -- just one other point on the merits I want to |
|  | 23 | have on the record is that I just want to explain the |
|  | 24 | differences between the narrow approach and the |
| 09:43:46 | 25 | moderate approach. |
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| 09:43:48 | 1 | Because Caesars continues to argue that under |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | the -- even if this court were to apply the moderate |
|  | 3 | approach that it shouldn't allow it. The amended |
|  | 4 | counterclaims should not be allowed because the amended |
| 09:44:02 | 5 | counterclaims, the changes in there did not relate to |
|  | 6 | the subject matter of the changes in the first amended |
|  | 7 | complaint. |
|  | 8 | But that is the narrow approach. The narrow |
|  | 9 | approach says, if you -- Yeah, defendant, you may |
| 09:44:19 | 10 | assert amended counterclaims in response to an amended |
|  | 11 | complaint as a matter of right, but you must - you are |
|  | 12 | limited to the subject matter of those -- of the |
|  | 13 | changes in the first amended complaint. |
|  | 14 | So here, if you recall Caesars' first amended |
| 09:44:35 | 15 | complaint, the changes in there dealt with what they |
|  | 16 | refer to as a kickback scheme. |
|  | 17 | And essentially, Caesars' argument, which this |
|  | 18 | Court adopted in its order, was that under the moderate |
|  | 19 | approach that would not be appropriate because it did |
| 09:44:51 | 20 | not pertain to that - those changes in the first |
|  | 21 | amended complaint. But that's the narrow approach. |
|  | 22 | The moderate approach allows a defendant to |
|  | 23 | assert amended counterclaims as a matter of right in |
|  | 24 | response to a first -- in response to an amended |
| 09:45:06 | 25 | complaint so long as the changes in the amended |
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| 09:45:11 |  | counterclaim are proportional to the changes in the |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | amended complaint. |
|  | 3 | Proportional is not -- means it's not limited |
|  | 4 | by subject matter. It just happens it can't, you know, |
| 09:45:22 | 5 | phase -- the amended complaint brings, you know, five |
|  | 6 | new claims. That doesn't mean that the amended |
|  | 7 | counterclaims can suddenly bring 20 new claims and five |
|  | 8 | new parties and go way overboard. It has to be |
|  | 9 | proportional. But it doesn't necessarily have to |
| 09:45:38 | 10 | relate to the same subject matter. |
|  | 11 | And $I$ just want clarity on that on the record |
|  | 12 | because that's an argument that Caesars has continued |
|  | 13 | to make. And, again, this Court adopted it in its |
|  | 14 | order. But it's something we want to point out that |
| 09:45:48 | 15 | the difference between the narrow approach and the |
|  | 16 | moderate approach, which, as this Court will recall, it |
|  | 17 | correctly found that the narrow approach is not tenable |
|  | 18 | anymore because Rule 15 (f) was -- I'm sorry. |
|  | 19 | Rule 12 - 13 (f) was the lead advice from Nevada |
| 09:46:06 | 20 | Supreme Court. And that's what - that's what the |
|  | 21 | narrow approach is based upon. |
|  | 22 | You know, so to summarize this issue, your |
|  | 23 | Honor, $I$ just think that here a stay is warranted |
|  | 24 | because the writ petition is likely to be taken up by |
| 09:46:1925 |  | the Nevada Supreme Court. |
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| 09:47:35 | 1 | couple of comments. Understand this. I never have a |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | position. I always tell you what I'm thinking or what |
|  | 3 | my thoughts are. Because I'm not an advocate in the |
|  | 4 | case, so I don't take positions. |
| 09:47:47 | 5 | Secondly, and this is just more of a general |
|  | 6 | observation. And $I$ don't always say this, but it would |
|  | 7 | have been really nice to have a motion for |
|  | 8 | reconsideration to thoroughly vet that issue as it |
|  | 9 | pertains to Rule 16 and counterclaims as a matter of |
| 09:48:08 | 10 | right, so 1 could have taken a bite at that one too. |
|  | 11 | However, I don't have that opportunity. And |
|  | 12 | so anyway, sir, anything else you want to add for the |
|  | 13 | record? I just want to make sure you're done before we |
|  | 14 | go to Caesars. |
| 09:48:20 | 15 | MR. WILLIAMS: No, your Honor. Thank you. |
|  | 16 | THE COURT: You're more than welcome, sir. |
|  | 17 | Oh, one last comment. Yes, you are correct as far as |
|  | 18 | Rule 16 is concerned, 16 (b). The Nevada Supreme |
|  | 19 | Court -- the Court of Appeals did rely upon federal |
| 09:48:33 | 20 | authorities in their interpretation of that. |
|  | 21 | Okay. Sir. Thank you. |
|  | 22 | MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. |
|  | 23 | THE COURT: And we'll hear from -- we'll hear |
|  | 24 | from Caesars. |
| 09:48:43 | 25 | MS. MERCERA: Thank you, your Honor. And for |
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| 09:49:48 | 1 | Nearly four years after this litigation was |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | commenced, the Seibel parties' strategy really is the |
|  | 3 | same, and it's to delay this resolution of this matter |
|  | 4 | at all costs. |
| 09:49:58 | 5 | Your Honor may recall that the seibel parties |
|  | 6 | first attempted to remove this action to federal court. |
|  | 7 | Then they sought to stay it. Then they sought to |
|  | 8 | dismiss it. |
|  | 9 | When they were unsuccessful in each of those |
| 09:50:10 | 10 | attempts, they moved on to their next strategy which |
|  | 11 | was to simply not respond to Caesars complaint. |
|  | 12 | Caesars was, ultimately, forced to file notices of |
|  | 13 | intent to take default to get any answers in this case |
|  | 14 | over ten months after filing its original motion. |
| 09:50:26 | 15 | Now, even after that, Seibel parties continued |
|  | 16 | with delay tactic after delay tactic. They refused to |
|  | 17 | produce meaningful 16.1 disclosures. They refused to |
|  | 18 | participate in good faith discovery. And they even |
|  | 19 | replaced their counsel multiple times. |
| 09:50:43 | 20 | Even the subject matter of their writ to the |
|  | 21 | Supreme Court goes back to delay on their part. And |
|  | 22 | because, as your Honor correctly pointed out, it was |
|  | 23 | over a year ago now in October of 2019 that some of the |
|  | 24 | Seibel parties, specifically the LLTQ and the FERG |
| 09:51:0125 |  | defendants, tried to assert new claims that they should |
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| 09:53:34 | 1 | extensive motion practice, this Court issued a thorough |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | decision explaining in detail why the Seibel parties' |
|  | 3 | amended counterclaims are inappropriate and striking |
|  | 4 | them. |
| 09:53:44 | 5 | Respectfully, your Honor, we don't believe |
|  | 6 | that the Supreme Court will reverse this Court's |
|  | 7 | decision. In fact, we presently don't have any |
|  | 8 | indication that the Supreme Court is going to consider |
|  | 9 | the writ. They haven't even directed Caesars to file a |
| 09:53:56 | 10 | response. |
|  | 11 | So with that background, your Honor, turning |
|  | 12 | to the factors that this Court must consider to issue a |
|  | 13 | stay in this case, respectfully, they do not weigh in |
|  | 14 | favor of issuing such relief. |
| 09:54:09 | 15 | With respect to the first -- the first point |
|  | 16 | that they have to prove is whether the object of the |
|  | 17 | writ will be defeated if the stay is denied. Your |
|  | 18 | Honor, they admit in their motion that if the Supreme |
|  | 19 | Court grants them the relief that they seek, they will |
| 09:54:24 | 20 | be able to file -- refile motions for summary judgment. |
|  | 21 | That is not -- that does not show that the |
|  | 22 | object of their writ will be defeated. While they cite |
|  | 23 | to the Mikohn Gaming case, respectfully, your Honor, |
|  | 24 | that case related to an arbitration clause. And the |
| 09:54:4125 |  | reason the object of the writ would have been defeated |

Peggy Isom, CCR 541, RMR
(702)671-4402-DEPT16REPORTER@GMAIL.COM Pursuant to NRS 239.053 , illegal to copy without payment.

| 09:54:46 | 1 | was because the district court would have ruled on the claims when there was an arbitration clause in effect. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | This is not the same situation here. |
|  | 4 | While the parties must admit motions for |
| 09:54:57 | 5 | summary judgment tomorrow in accordance with this |
|  | 6 | Court's October scheduling order, there was no - there |
|  | 7 | was nothing prohibiting the parties from filing motions |
|  | 8 | for summary judgment early. And at no point before |
|  | 9 | then has the seibel parties made the argument that the |
| 09:55:12 | 10 | case should be stayed so that this issue could be |
|  | 11 | briefed before the Supreme Court. That factor weighs |
|  | 12 | in favor of denying their stay request. |
|  | 13 | Now, your Honor, in terms of the second and |
|  | 14 | third factors, it is -- there is no irreparable harm, |
| 09:55:27 | 15 | and there is no substantial injury here for the seibel |
|  | 16 | parties. They simply have, if any, damages -- and |
|  | 17 | we're not conceding in any way that they would even |
|  | 18 | have these -- would be monetary damages. |
|  | 19 | The Supreme Court has made clear that that |
| 09:55:41 | 20 | does not constitute irreparable harm and would be |
|  | 21 | sufficient enough to warrant a stay. |
|  | 22 | Now, your Honor, we're not making the argument |
|  | 23 | that Caesars would be irreparably harmed. That is not |
|  | 24 | the point. But they would -- we would be substantially |
| 09:55:57 | 25 | prejudiced. |
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| 09:55:57 | 1 | And the judiciary looks to the tenet that |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | justice delayed is justice denied. And here, your |
|  | 3 | Honor, we're going on over, almost over four years when |
|  | 4 | this case was initially filed. At some point this case |
| 09:56:12 | 5 | has to go to trial. It was first filed 2017. We're |
|  | 6 | now in 2011. Respectfully, the Seibel parties have |
|  | 7 | delayed resolution of this matter long enough. |
|  | 8 | Notably, there is also a sister action in |
|  | 9 | federal court, your Honor. Some of the seibel parties |
| 09:56:28 | 10 | are involved in that one, TPOV and TPOV 16. And they |
|  | 11 | have not asked for a stay of that matter. They simply |
|  | 12 | don't want this Court ruling on Caesars claims. Just |
|  | 13 | as has been their strategy for the entirety of the |
|  | 14 | litigation. |
| 09:56:45 | 15 | Now, moving to the last factor that the court |
|  | 16 | must consider, respectfully, again. We think this |
|  | 17 | weighs heavily in favor of denying their request for a |
|  | 18 | stay. This Court did a thorough and appropriate |
|  | 19 | analysis under Rule 16 and the Nutton case as directed |
| 09:57:02 | 20 | by the rules of civil procedure. |
|  | 21 | Again, their request to render such rules |
|  | 22 | moot, it can consistently be disregarded at any point. |
|  | 23 | And even if, your Honor, the Supreme Court were to |
|  | 24 | agree with the seibel parties that Nevada should adopt |
| 09:57:17 | 25 | one of the federal court approaches, and the one they |
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| 09:57:20 | 1 | advocate for is the moderate approach, this court |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | specifically addressed that moderate approach in its |
|  | 3 | decision. |
|  | 4 | And the case law even -- the moderate approach |
| 09:57:29 | 5 | is predominant in the case law. The requirement that |
|  | 6 | an amended response reflect the change in theory or |
|  | 7 | scope of the amended complaint is also consistent with |
|  | 8 | Rule 15's requirement that an amended pleading must |
|  | 9 | plead in response to the amended pleading. |
| 09:57:46 | 10 | As this Court will recall, the Seibel parties' |
|  | 11 | amended counterclaims didn't relate in any way to the |
|  | 12 | new claims brought by Caesars. The claims we brought, |
|  | 13 | your Honor, were related solely to the kickback scheme. |
|  | 14 | We didn't make any changes to claims regarding |
| 09:58:03 | 15 | determination of the agreement. Yet all of the changes |
|  | 16 | that the seibel parties attempted to make over three |
|  | 17 | years after the litigation had started, all related |
|  | 18 | back to Caesars' original complaint. |
|  | 19 | Frankly, they shouldn't have sat on their |
| 09:58:17 | 20 | hands. And they should have either sought |
|  | 21 | reconsideration, or appeal, or any action at some point |
|  | 22 | in the four years of this litigation to bring those |
|  | 23 | claims if they truly thought that they were valid. You |
|  | 24 | know, they cannot be awarded for sitting on their hands |
| 09:58:30 | 25 | and refusing to timely prosecute their case. |


| 09:58:33 | 1 | So respectfully, your Honor, we believe that |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | the factors weigh heavily in favor of denial of any |
|  | 3 | stay. This case should go to trial as scheduled. |
|  | 4 | And unless the Court has any further |
| 09:58:43 | 5 | questions, we would submit that their motion should be |
|  | 6 | denied. |
|  | 7 | THE COURT: Ma'am, $I$ don't have any questions |
|  | 8 | at this time. We'll hear from the moving parties. |
|  | 9 | Did you hear me? Or am I mute? |
| 09:59:11 | 10 | MR. WILLIAMS: My apologies, your Honor. I |
|  | 11 | was muted again. |
|  | 12 | Can you hear me? Your Honor, can you hear me? |
|  | 13 | THE COURT: Yes, I can, sir. You may proceed. |
|  | 14 | MR. WILLIAMS: MY apologies. |
| 09:59:22 | 15 | Again, this is Paul Williams on behalf of the |
|  | 16 | development entities. |
|  | 17 | I just want to address one of the last points |
|  | 18 | opposing counsel just made just because, again, it |
|  | 19 | bears repeating. Caesars continues to argue that the |
| 09:59:35 | 20 | moderate approach requires that the changes in the |
|  | 21 | amended counterclaim relate to the changes in the |
|  | 22 | amended complaint, here the alleged kickback scheme. |
|  | 23 | And that's just simply not the case. |
|  | 24 | If you -- there's numerous cases that we cited |
| 09:59:50 | 25 | in the briefing on that. You can look at Virginia |
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| 09:59:52 | 1 | Innovation case which is out of the Eastern District of |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | Virginia, the UDAP Industry case which is out of the |
|  | 3 | District of Montana, there are numerous cases that |
|  | 4 | explain that the moderate approach does not require |
| 10:00:06 | 5 | that the amended changes relate to the changes in the |
|  | 6 | amended complaint. So just so that - so that is |
|  | 7 | clear. |
|  | 8 | The point on Nutton, again, I'll just |
|  | 9 | emphasize, the federal courts, which, again, the Nutton |
| 10:00:23 | 10 | case relied on, the federal courts have looked at that |
|  | 11 | issue of Rule 16 and Rule 15 and have decided that that |
|  | 12 | doesn't apply where a defendant is responding to an |
|  | 13 | amended complaint. |
|  | 14 | So that issue has been addressed by the |
| 10:00:38 | 15 | federal courts. And the -- that issue is -- does not |
|  | 16 | prohibit a defendant from asserting amended |
|  | 17 | complaint - an amended counterclaim as a matter of |
|  | 18 | right in response to an amended complaint. And that's |
|  | 19 | what the case law explains is that where a party is - |
| 10:00:57 | 20 | where a plaintiff is allowed to assert amended claims, |
|  | 21 | then the defendant has the ability, as a matter of |
|  | 22 | right, to assert them in the counterclaim. That's |
|  | 23 | irrespective of Rule 15 (a) or 16 (b). |
|  | 24 | And just a few other things $I$ want to address. |
| 10:01:16 | 25 | The notion of delay here. Again, my clients would like |
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| 10:03:53 | 1 | this is somewhat overlooked. And you're saying, Look, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | Judge, under the federal approach, it would be |
|  | 3 | appropriate to conduct a Rule 16 (b) analysis. Because |
|  | 4 | the counterclaim is being asserted as a matter of |
| 10:04:14 | 5 | right. $I$ mean, I kind of understand that, but my |
|  | 6 | viewpoint is slightly different in this respect. |
|  | 7 | Because, all right, we know what the |
|  | 8 | procedural history of this case is. But if you look at |
|  | 9 | the factors that would be part of the good cause |
| 10:04:30 | 10 | analysis, for example, No. 1, is the explanation for |
|  | 11 | the untimely conduct. Right? That's pretty broad. |
|  | 12 | It appears to me that, for example, it can be |
|  | 13 | argued that, Look, Judge, we're asserting this |
|  | 14 | counterclaim as a matter of right, and that's why it's |
| 10:04:56 | 15 | being done untimely. And my point is this: I don't |
|  | 16 | think they're necessarily mutually exclusive. Because |
|  | 17 | the way I look at Nutton, and I talked about this a |
|  | 18 | little earlier, there's been a mandate by our court of |
|  | 19 | Appeals in this respect, because remember Rule 16 (b) |
| 10:05:13 | 20 | was not raised at any level other than by the court of |
|  | 21 | Appeals. And they said, Look, it was an error not to |
|  | 22 | consider this rule. |
|  | 23 | And that's what Judge Tao and, of course, |
|  | 24 | concurring Judge Gibbons and also, 1 guess, |
| 10:05:2825 |  | Justice Silver now, they all agree. And then you look |
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| 10:05:30 1 |  | at the other factors. The importance of the requested |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10:05:30 | 2 | untimely action. That's factor No. 2 . |
|  | 3 | And so why wouldn't all this come under, once |
|  | 4 | again, the Nutton-type analysis? Because I really do |
| 10:05:44 | 5 | feel very strongly about this: That our supreme court |
|  | 6 | wants the scheduling orders to have full force and |
|  | 7 | effect. And I don't see why, potentially, that type of |
|  | 8 | analysis couldn't be made under the four factors as set |
|  | 9 | forth in Nutton. $\quad$ j just don't see it. And I think you |
| 10:06:08 | 10 | can do it. |
|  | 11 | And so anyway, is there anything else, sir, |
|  | 12 | you wanted to -- because I don't want to - |
|  | 13 | MR. WILLIAMS: No, your Honor, unless -- if |
|  | 14 | you want me to respond to that. I mean, I - - again, I |
| 10:06:20 | 15 | just with respect to Nutton and the case law on the |
|  | 16 | federal case law on this point is that if -- yes, if, |
|  | 17 | suppose that we, the development entities, had moved |
|  | 18 | the Court to amend, you know, maybe a similar argument |
|  | 19 | to what they had previously done, and this Court had |
| 10:06:39 | 20 | rejected, under Nutton then that -- then, yeah, then |
|  | 21 | the Nutton analysis would have been applicable. |
|  | 22 | But that's not where -- that's not the stage |
|  | 23 | Of where the amended counterclaims were asserted. |
|  | 24 | This Court -- this Court allowed Caesars to |
| 10:06:5425 |  | file its first amended complaint. Conducted the Nutton |
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| 10:08:10 | 1 | But $I$ - your Honor, $I$ understand your reasoning. And I think both parties greatly appreciate you taking the |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | time to thoroughly analyze these issues and explain |
|  | 4 | your reasoning behind them. But, again, this is |
| 10:08:21 | 5 | something we feel that, you know, controlling authority |
|  | 6 | from the Nevada Supreme court to rule one way or the |
|  | 7 | other, here's what the rule is and here's how the |
|  | 8 | interplay works, is what is the most efficient way to |
|  | 9 | address this issue and to stay trial and the |
| 10:08:35 | 10 | dispositive motions pending that resolution. |
|  | 11 | THE COURT: $\quad$ I understand, sir. |
|  | 12 | All right. |
|  | 13 | MS. MERCERA: Your Honor, if I -- if I may. |
|  | 14 | THE COURT: Yeah. Go ahead, ma'am. |
| 10:08:44 | 15 | MS. MERCERA: The only thing - - |
|  | 16 | THE COURT: This will be well vetted if it |
|  | 17 | does -- if the writ is accepted. |
|  | 18 | MS. MERCERA: Your Honor, just one final |
|  | 19 | point. If the Supreme Court agrees with the seibel |
| 10:08:57 | 20 | parties' request that this is an issue of vast |
|  | 21 | importance that it will consider, they will enter a |
|  | 22 | stay at the request of the parties. |
|  | 23 | As I mentioned earlier, we have no indication |
|  | 24 | that they're going to consider the writ at this point, |
| 10:09:09 | 25 | and we haven't even been directed to file a response. |
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| 10:09:12 | 1 | So if the Supreme Court agreed with the Seibel parties, they will take action. But they haven't done so yet. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | THE COURT: All right. $\quad$ I guess, we have a |
|  | 4 | well vetted record. |
| 10:09:26 | 5 | Anyway, what I'm going to do is this: |
|  | 6 | Regarding the motion for a limited stay of proceedings |
|  | 7 | pending the petition for extraordinary writ relief, I'm |
|  | 8 | going to deny that. |
|  | 9 | And I've considered the three factors that I'm |
| 10:09:37 | 10 | required to consider regarding whether the object of |
|  | 11 | the writ would be defeated, the irreparable harm |
|  | 12 | analysis, and also whether or not the party filing the |
|  | 13 | writ would likely prevail on the merits of the action. |
|  | 14 | And I can say this. At the end of the day |
| 10:10:06 | 15 | based upon the current status of the counterclaims with |
|  | 16 | little or no relationship to the amended complaint in |
|  | 17 | this case, and based upon the long history of this |
|  | 18 | litigation, we're talking about four years, give or |
|  | 19 | take, and that's an old case. It just is. Ultimately, |
| 10:10:27 | 20 | I have to marshal this case to trial. I do. |
|  | 21 | And we have a jury trial in this matter |
|  | 22 | currently set for July 12, 2021. I'm 50/50 on whether |
|  | 23 | we can do that or not. I don't know. But this is one |
|  | 24 | of my older cases. And at the end of the day, it's |
| 10:10:4925 |  | going to get tried this year. It just is. And whether |
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| 10:11:58 | 1 | THE COURT: Well, I don't know if the |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | convention center courtroom is going to be available |
|  | 3 | after March. That's what I've heard. I can check up |
|  | 4 | on that. But, sir, $I$ don't know the answer. But $I$ |
| $10: 12: 15$ | 5 | remember hearing somewhere talking to another judge |
|  | 6 | after March it won't be available. |
|  | 7 | MR. PISANELLI: Yeah, actually, Judge Johnson |
|  | 8 | says similar. There's some issue about the rent |
|  | 9 | because it hasn't been used very frequently, et cetera. |
| 10:12:27 | 10 | So fair enough. |
|  | 11 | THE COURT: Yeah. But I'll find out for you, |
|  | 12 | sir. I'll -- that's my understanding. And what can |
|  | 13 | you do. |
|  | 14 | I mean, and I was -- I don't know what's going |
| 10:12:40 | 15 | on. I was hoping, $I$ mentioned this before, that |
|  | 16 | business court we get the sixth floor. Because we have |
|  | 17 | some small courtrooms. And realistically, that doesn't |
|  | 18 | make sense to me. I mean, $I$ come from construction |
|  | 19 | defect. And those were massive, massively complex |
| 10:12:54 | 20 | cases. And I think some of you remember. We had the |
|  | 21 | complex civil litigation center over on Fifth or Six |
|  | 22 | Street, or whatever the location was. But we should |
|  | 23 | have facilities like that available for business court |
|  | 24 | too. We just should because of the size of some of the |
| 10:13:1125 |  | cases if they go to trial. They involve multiple |
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| $10: 13: 13$ | 1 | parties, multiple lawyers, and I don't - from a case |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | management perspective, it would be -- 1 can't try this |
|  | 3 | case, I would think, in my courtroom. |
|  | 4 | MR. PISANELLI: With some of the social |
| 10:13:26 | 5 | distancing, it will be a challenge for sure. |
|  | 6 | THE COURT: Absolutely ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ( You know, and how can |
|  | 7 | we pick a jury right now? |
|  | 8 | MR. PISANELLI: Right. |
|  | 9 | THE COURT: And are we going to make -- |
| 10:13:40 | 10 | MR. PISANELLI: Hopefully the -- ${ }^{\text {- }}$ was just |
|  | 11 | going to say hopefully the county will find it in their |
|  | 12 | budget to keep that courtroom on line for this calendar |
|  | 13 | year. |
|  | 14 | THE COURT: Right. Are we going to require |
| 10:13:53 | 15 | vaccine passports for all jurors when they come in? |
|  | 16 | MR. PISANELLI: No. Good point. |
|  | 17 | THE COURT: I mean, I don't know. But these |
|  | 18 | are things $I$ think about. $I$ don't mind sharing that |
|  | 19 | with everyone. Because we have to, you know, I - I |
| 10:14:05 | 20 | can't bring in panel members where some are vaccinated |
|  | 21 | and some aren't. |
|  | 22 | MR. PISANELLI: Yes. |
|  | 23 | THE COURT: What do you do? Okay. Well, |
|  | 24 | everyone enjoy your day. |
| 10:14:18 | 25 | MS. MERCERA: Thank you, your Honor. |
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MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, your Honor.
MR. PISANELLI: Thank you, Judge.
(Proceedings were concluded.) * * * * * * * *
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|  | 15/6 15/9 15/20 | could [6] 8/15 | damages [2] 32/16 | Desert [1] 4/11 |
| clients [3] 9/17 | 21/8 39/3 39/11 | 26/10 27/20 32/10 | 32/18 | destiny [1] 19/2 |
|  | Conducted [2] | 38/6 38/7 | DATED [1] 1/2 | detail [1] 31/2 |
|  |  | couldn't [1] | day [5] 15/11 | determination [ |
| coercive [2] 7/8 | conducting [1] | counsel [6] 28/19 | 43/14 43/24 44/10 | 7/23 18/1 19/9 |
|  | 14/22 | 29/17 30/2 35/18 | 46/24 | 34/15 |
| $11$ | conducts [1] | 37/20 38/4 | deadline [5] 6/2 | determine [2] |
|  | confronted [1] | counterclaim [13] | 7/4 7/7 21/10 29/8 | 15/22 30/18 |
|  | 19/13 | 15/23 18/7 18/10 | deals [1] 13/17 | Determined [1] |
| 27/20 40/3 45/18 <br> 46/15 | confusion [2] | 21/10 24/1 27/22 | dealt [2] 15/4 | 21/24 |
|  | 11/24 11/24 | 30/11 30/20 35/21 | 23/15 | developed [2] |
|  | consider [10] 16/6 | 36/17 36/22 39/4 | decide [8] 6/2 | 37/9 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Comn } \\ 28 / 2 \end{gathered}$ | 16/9 19/8 31/8 | 39/14 | 12/13 15/17 15/18 | development [20] |
| ment [1] | 31/12 33/16 39/22 | counterclaims [41] | 15/24 19/22 22/16 | 4/21 4/24 5/18 6/1 |
| ment [1] | 42/21 42/24 43/10 | 6/7 6/14 7/21 7/23 | 25/2 | 6/3 6/6 7/20 8/17 |
|  | consideration [3] | 8/20 9/23 11/12 | decided [7] 6/2 | 9/7 9/8 9/13 9/15 |
| $14 / 15 \text { 26/1 }$ | 8/13 44/20 44/23 | 11/19 11/23 13/4 | $\begin{aligned} & 8 / 210 / 1410 / 24 \\ & 10 / 2521 / 3 ~ 36 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | 9/22 10/4 25/7 |
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| D | $20 / 3 \text { 20/3 }$ | $3$ | $46$ | fascinating [2] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| development... [5] |  |  |  |  |
| 25/18 35/16 37/7 | 30/17 31/13 37/15 | end [5] 15/11 16/6 | 20/1 | 4] 31/14 |
| 37/14 40/17 | 38/8 40/4 40/10 | 38/24 43/14 43/24 | example [2] 39/10 | 32/12 33/17 35/2 |
| did [11] 5/19 5/21 | 41/19 43/5 43/20 | engaged [1] 29/1 |  | Fax [2] 2/23 3/10 |
| 14/10 15/16 16/12 | 43/23 44/4 44/13 | engaging [1] 7/2 | excellent [2] 16/12 | FCLAW.COM [1] |
| 16/14 23/5 23/19 | 45/13 46/23 46/23 | enjoy [1] 46/24 | 16/14 | 3/11 |
| 26/19 33/18 35/9 | 48/4 |  | exception [2] 18/7 | FEBRUARY [2] |
| didn't [8] 12/17 | do-over [1] 30/1 | 33/7 38/22 45/10 | 18/10 | 4/1 |
| 16/5 20/7 29/11 | DOCKET [1] 1/2 | enter [2] 20/25 | exclusive | deral [22] 12/ |
| 29/12 29/12 34/11 | documents [1] |  | 3/ | 6/13 18/15 |
| 34/14 | 30/21 | entered [8] 7/18 | excuse [1] | 18/21 19/22 20/18 |
| differenc | does [8] 5/6 17/5 | 7/24 8/8 8/11 8/18 | Exhibit [1] | 20/19 20/21 26/19 |
| 24/15 | 22/12 31/21 32/ | 29/3 37/21 38/4 | Exhibit 8 [1] 11/ | 28/6 33/9 33/25 |
| differen | 36/4 36/15 42/17 | entire [1] 13/12 | expect [1] 37/24 | 36/9 36/10 36/15 |
| 22/24 | doesn't [8] 8/15 | entirety [1] 33/13 | experiencing [1] | 39/2 40/16 41/5 |
| differ | 16/15 16/16 21/12 | entities [19] 4/17 | 27/6 | 41/13 41/13 41/25 |
| 14/4 15/25 18/16 | 24/6 24/9 36/12 | 4/21 4/24 5/18 6/1 | expiration [1] | feel [2] 40/5 42/5 |
| 18/19 18/23 18/25 | 45/17 | 7/20 8/17 9/7 9/8 | 14/25 | FENNEMORE [1] |
| 19/21 20/12 39/6 | doing [1] | 9/13 9/15 9/22 10/4 | expired [1] 29/8 | 3/4 |
| directed [3] 31/9 | don't [32] 9/24 | 25/7 25/18 35/16 | explain [5] 13/8 | FERG [1] 28/24 |
| 33/19 42/25 | 9/25 16/1 17/2 17/2 | 37/7 37/14 40/17 | 20/2 22/23 36/4 | few [2] 36/24 |
| directing [1 | 18/8 18/14 19/9 | entities' [2] 6/3 | 42/3 | 37/25 |
| DIRECTION [1] | 25/24 25/25 26/4 | 6/6 | explained [1] 13/1 | Fifth [1] 45/21 |
| -48/9 | 26/6 26/11 30/1 | entitled [6] 9/16 | explaining [1] | file [10] 7/4 16/25 |
| disagree [2] 1 | 31/5 31/7 33/12 | 9/20 9/23 37/7 37/8 | 31/2 | 21/23 21/25 28/12 |
| 44/11 | 35/7 39/15 40/7 | 48/6 | explains [2] 36/19 | 31/9 31/20 38/5 |
| disclosures [1] | 40/9 40/12 41/14 | entry [1] | 41/25 | 40/25 42/25 |
| 28/17 | 41/14 41/15 43/2 | error [7] 15 | explana | filed [9] 6/4 14/ |
| discove | 45/1 45/4 45/14 | 15/13 16/6 16/8 | 39/10 | 19/6 21/10 29/1 |
| 30/22 | 46/1 46/17 46/18 | 19/9 19/12 39/21 | expressly [1] 8/14 | 30/10 33/4 33/5 |
| discovery [4] 7/1 | done [5] 26/13 | Especially [1] | nsive [1] 31/1 | 38/1 |
| 7/3 15/20 28/18 | 38/6 39/15 40/1 |  | ensively [1] | filing [4] 28/14 |
| discussed [1] 14/1 | 43/2 | ESQ [7] 2/6 2/7 | 12/23 | 32/7 38/11 43/12 |
| discusses [2] 14/4 | DOWN [1] 48/5 | 2/16 2/17 2/18 3/5 | extraordina | nal [2] 10/7 42/ |
| 14/7 | DRIVE [1] 3/17 | 3/16 | 43/7 | ally [1] 38/16 |
| discu | d |  |  | ] $25 / 10$ |
|  | E |  | face [3] |  |
| dismiss [1] 28/8 | each [2] 28/9 | 1] | 38/20 | first [28] 4/8 6 |
| dismissal [2] | 30/17 | et cetera [1] 45/9 | facilities [1] 45/23 | 7/16 7/22 8/7 11/6 |
| 11/19 11/22 | earlier [3] 17/1 | evaluate [1] 22/16 | fact [6] 7/4 12/4 | 13/1 13/14 13/15 |
|  | 39/18 42/23 | evaluating [1] | 13/20 18/24 31/7 | 13/20 14/11 14/12 |
| 6/25 7/4 7/7 8/1 | early [1] 32/8 | 14 | 37/2 | 14/22 15/6 15/17 |
| 25/15 38/14 42/10 | Eastern [1] 36/ | evaluation [1] | factor [8] 7/16 8/7 | 21/23 21/25 23/6 |
|  | effect [4] 18/2 | 13/4 | 8/13 8/24 10/8 | 23/13 23/14 23/20 |
|  | 19/5 32/2 40/7 | even [14] 10/18 | 32/11 33/15 40/2 | 23/24 27/7 28/6 |
| $33 / 22$ | effective [1] 10 | 10/18 23/2 27/8 | factors [9] 7/13 | 31/15 31/15 33/5 |
| 33/22 | effectively [1] | 28/15 28/18 28/20 | 8/9 31/12 32/14 | 40/25 |
| $46 / 5$ | 27/10 | 30/4 31/9 32/17 | 35/2 39/9 40/1 40/8 | five [2] 24/5 24/7 |
|  | efficient [3] 25/2 | 33/23 34/4 37/11 | 43/9 | oor [1] 45/16 |
|  | 25/13 42/8 | 42/25 | facts [3] 29/6 | focus [2] 13/10 |
| 1/21 11/11 11/18 | either [4] 18/ | eventually [1] | 29/24 29/24 | 14/1 |
| 18/17 32/1 36/1 | 25/12 34/20 44/2 |  | failure [1] 15/ | focuses [2] 8/11 |
|  | elapsed [1] 37/23 | ever [1] 13/ | air [1] $45 / 10$ | 27/13 |
| diversity [1] 18/21 do [29] 14/23 | ELLIS [2] 3/13 5/9 | everybody [1] | fairly [1] 18/9 | following [2] |
| $14 / 2317 / 2418 / 15$ | else [3] 5/11 26/12 | 12/20 | faith [1] 28/18 | 29/10 30/25 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 14 / 2317 / 2418 / 15 \\ & 19 / 1919 / 2320 / 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 40/11 } \\ \text { emphasize [1] } \end{array}$ | everyone [2] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { far [5] } 14 / 15 \quad 14 / 20 \\ & 18 / 1926 / 1744 / 9 \end{aligned}$ | force [2] 19/5 40/6 |
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| F | 22/17 25/10 31/8 | 33/5 33/13 35/4 | I'll [3] 36/8 45/11 | irreparable [6] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| forced [1] 28/12 |  | 38/20 38/23 41/9 |  |  |
| REGOING [1] | 43/8 43/25 44/4 | 38/20 38/23 41/9 | I'm [14 | 32/20 43/11 |
|  | 5/2 45/14 | $\begin{array}{\|l} 44 / 20 \\ \text { hasn't [3] } 6 / 20 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} 11 / 20 & 11 / 22 & 13 / 18 \\ 19 / 18 & 20 / 6 & 24 / 18 \end{array}$ | irreparably [1] $32 / 23$ |
| giveness [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { od [24] } 4 / 10 / 10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { hasn't [3] } \\ 37 / 2145 / 9 \end{array}$ | /2 26/3 43/5 43/7 | irrespe |
|  | 4/14 4/15 4/18 |  | 43/9 43/22 44/19 | 8/20 36/23 38/10 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { form [1] } & 15 / 24 \\ \text { forth [3] } & 15 / 11 \end{array}$ | 5/45/85/10 5/23 | haven't [3] | I've [2] 43/9 45/3 | 38/ |
|  | 12/19 15/2 15/21 | 42/25 43/2 | idea [1] |  |
| und [4] 12/1 | 15/22 16/11 18/2 | he [8] 14/6 14/10 | if [51] | isn't [1] |
| /17 29/4 41/1 |  | 14/17 14/18 14/22 | ignore [1] 30/15 | ISOM [4] 1/25 |
| ur [6] 7/13 28/1 | 退 18 30/18 30/19 | 15/9 15/11 16/5 | importance [2] | 48/4 48/17 |
| 33/3 34/22 40/8 | 41/1 46/16 | hear [6] 26/23 | 40/1 42 | issue [30] 6/19 |
|  | [2] 3/3 | /8 35/9 | impo | 6/23 9/21 10/14 |
| urth |  | 35/12 35/12 |  | 10/21 11/13 12/ |
|  |  | heard [2] 2/2 45/3 | 18/5 | 14/11 15/14 16/ |
| frankly [5] 20/10 | granted [1] 15/12 | hearing [5] $1 / 16$ | impres | 17/24 19/13 19/1 |
| 29/20 30/4 34/19 | granting [1] 14/5 | 1/18 10/16 27/3 | 13/15 | 20/11 22/6 22/7 |
| 37/22 | grants [1] 31/19 | 45/5 | in [127 | 24/22 26/8 27/1 |
| frequently [1] | great [2] 6/16 6/2 | heavily [2] 33/17 | inappropri | 27/23 31/12 32/10 |
|  | greatly [1] 42/2 | 35/2 | 31/3 | 36/11 36/14 36/15 |
|  | Green [2] 4/23 | held | In | 37/12 38/21 42/9 |
| 648 |  | here [24] 7/1 | include [2] | 42/20 45/8 |
| [1] $37 / 8$ | grounds [1] 9/4 | 7 9/21 10/9 | 29/7 | sued [1] 31 |
| er [3] | guess [3] 19/11 | 11/20 12/4 12/19 | includin | issues [5] 13/10 |
| /11 38/23 | 39/24 43/3 | 15/14 16/15 16/17 | 22/20 | 14/4 14/6 42/3 |
| future [1] 11/23 | nce [4] | 16/22 17/9 21/22 | increas |  |
|  |  | 23/14 24/23 27/2 | [ | suing [1] 31/14 |
| G |  | 3 32/1 |  | it |
| Gaming [2] $8 / 5$$31 / 23$gave [1] $30 / 21$general [3] $18 / 18$19/21 26/5generally [1] $8 / 7$generated [1] $37 / 9$get [11] $5 / 205 / 22$9/17 $25 / 1528 / 13$$30 / 137 / 137 / 13$$43 / 2544 / 145 / 16$Gibbons [1] $39 / 24$GILMORE [2] $2 / 6$5/1give [1] $43 / 18$given [6] $10 / 22$$14 / 1537 / 2241 / 6$$44 / 2044 / 23$gives [1] $16 / 24$go [13] $4 / 75 / 22$9/24 $12 / 1813 / 13$$14 / 316 / 224 / 8$$26 / 1433 / 535 / 3$$42 / 1445 / 25$goes [2] $28 / 21$$37 / 12$going [22] $10 / 13$$10 / 2311 / 112 / 8$12/14 20/14 $21 / 21$ |  | 36/22 | INDICATED [1] | S |
|  | H |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { had [12] } 11 / 12 \\ & 11 / 1412 / 1321 / 10 \\ & 34 / 1738 / 540 / 17 \\ & 40 / 1940 / 1945 / 20 \\ & 48 / 648 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | 425 | 42/23 | 17/25 19/1 19/9 |
|  |  | 25/4 38/25 42 | Industry [1] | 19/10 19/11 19/19 |
|  |  | 42/7 | in | 19/20 19/24 20/2 |
|  |  | HEREB | /17 | 21/13 24/3 24/14 |
|  |  | H | ] | 27/8 27/12 |
|  | hand [1] $8 / 23$ <br> handle [1] 25/13 | 48/13 | initially [1] 33/4 | 30/6 37/24 37/25 |
|  |  | Hey [1] 21/8 | initiate [1] 29/12 | 39/14 43/24 44 |
|  | hands [3] 29/14$34 / 2034 / 24$ | history [2] 39 | initiating [1] 30/ | its [12] 8/11 11/1 |
|  |  | 43/17 | injury [1] 32/15 | 11/12 21/23 23/18 |
|  | happens [1] 24/4 | holding [1] 44/23 | Innovation [1] | 24/13 28/14 30 |
|  | harm [17] $8 / 10$ 8/12 8/14 8/15 8/16 | Honor [51] | 36/1 | 30/20 34/2 40/25 |
|  |  | Honor's [1] | instea | 41/2 |
|  | 8/18 8/22 8/24 8/25 |  |  | J |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 10 / 310 / 410 / 5 \\ & 32 / 1432 / 2038 / 18 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  | 38/19 43/11 harmed [2] 32/23 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { hopefully [2 } \\ 46 / 10 \\ 46 \end{array}$ | intent [1] 28/13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JAMES [3] } 2 / 1.1 \\ & 27 / 244 / 16 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | 46/10 46/11 <br> hoping [1] 45/15 | intent [1] 28/13 interplay [4] 22/13 | JBAILEY [1] 2/1 |
|  | 38/3 <br> harmless [2] 15/11 | HOSPITALITY [2] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { interplay [4] } 22 / 13 \\ & 25 / 527 / 1442 / 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { job [2] } 16 / 12 \quad 16 / 14$ |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { HOSPITA } \\ 3 / 135 / 9 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 16 / 1216 / 12 \\ & \hline 3 / 55 / 4 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { narmies } \\ & \text { 19/10 } \end{aligned}$ | how [6] 16/2 22/12 | interpreta | Johnson [1] 45/7 |
|  | harmony [1] 14/19 harms [1] 38/16 | 22/13 37/12 42/7 | into [2] 22/15 48/8 | JOSHUA [2] $2 / 6$ |
|  |  | 46/6 | intriguing [1] |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { has [24] } 9 / 312 / 19 \\ & 14 / 2316 / 2419 / 17 \\ & 21 / 1322 / 324 / 8 \\ & 24 / 1225 / 2229 / 16 \\ & 30 / 1732 / 932 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | However [2] 15/3 | 20/11 | TENNER |
|  |  | $26$ |  |  |
|  |  | I | ed [2] 1 |  |
|  |  | I'd [1] 11/3 |  |  |
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| J | 12/22 14/25 15/20 | 34/22 41/7 43/18 | 6/14 8/25 9/24 | 32/18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| judge... [9] 19/3 | 16/11 18/14 20/1 | 45/2 | 11/10 16/25 17/1 | money [3] 9/1 |
| 19/18 39/2 39/13 | 20/17 21/21 22/10 | little [3] 37/25 | 23/6 23/11 23/12 | 9/20 37/6 |
| 39/23 39/24 45/5 | 22/14 22/16 24/4 | 39/18 43/16 | 23/23 24/4 24/10 | Montana [1] 36/3 |
| 45/7 47/2 | 24/5 24/22 27/1 | live [1] 30/1 | 26/9 27/11 28/3 | months [1] 28, |
| Judge Gibbons [1] | 29/16 29/22 34/24 | LLC [2] 1/12 4/12 | 28/20 33/7 33/11 | moot [2] 27/18 |
| 39/24 | 37/10 37/11 38/4 | LLTQ [1] 28/24 | 36/17 36/21 39/4 | 33/22 |
| Judge Johnson [1] | 38/7 38/11 38/12 | load [1] 18/24 | 39/14 41/22 41/23 | more [5] 14/6 |
| 45/7 | 38/19 39/7 40/18 | location [1] 45/22 | 43/21 44/2 48/7 | 25/25 26/5 26/16 |
| Judge Tao [5] | 41/11 41/12 42/5 | long [6] 13/25 | MATTERS [1] $2 / 2$ | 37/1 |
| 13/23 14/4 16/4 | 43/23 44/20 45/1 | 21/14 23/25 29/23 | MAUPIN [2] 3/16 | orning [9] 4/10 |
| 16/12 39/23 | $\begin{aligned} & 45 / 445 / 1446 / 6 \\ & 46 / 1746 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | 33/7 43/17 | 5/9 | 4/14 4/15 4/18 4/19 |
| judgment [6] 14/5 |  | $6 / 2 \text { 18/15 }$ | $8 / 535 / 1342 / 13$ | $14 / 825 / 2$ |
| 15/12 31/20 32/5 | L | 18/25 19/3 22/11 | 44/16 | 25/12 30/3 30/5 |
| 32/8 38/6 | lack [3] 9/13 10/17 | 27/25 35/25 39/1 | maybe [1] 40/18 | 37/15 42/8 |
|  | 10/22 | 39/8 39/13 39/17 | McCowan [4] 8/5 | motion [22] $4 / 23$ |
| judiciary [1 | landscape [1] | 39/21 39/25 41/14 | 9/3 10/11 38/21 | 6/10 6/10 6/25 |
| $\text { July [4] } 27 / 12$ | 16/13 | 41/15 41/15 | me [17] 9/16 10/7 | 10/16 11/8 13/1 |
| 43/22 44/1 | language [1] | looked [1] 36/10 | 13/8 13/11 14/13 | 15/19 17/14 19/6 |
| July 12 [1] 43/ | 11/20 | looking [1] 37/10 | 15/15 16/8 16/8 | 21/4 21/5 22/6 26/7 |
| jumped [1] 19/15 | LAS [6] 2/9 2/21 | looks [2] 7/13 33/1 | 18/9 19/16 30/20 | 28/14 29/10 30/17 |
| jurisdiction [2] | 3/8 3/18 3/25 4/12 | lot [5] 8/11 17/13 | 35/9 35/12 35/12 | 31/1 31/18 35/5 |
| 18/18 18/18 | Las Vegas [1] 4/12 | 20/12 20/17 44/9 | 39/12 40/14 45/18 | 38/5 43/6 |
| jurors [1] 46/15 | la | Lund [2] 11/9 12/5 | mean [8] 16/4 24/6 | motions [11] 7/5 |
| jury [3] 43/21 |  | M | 37/22 39/5 40/1 | 8/1 13/17 25/15 |
| 44/24 46/7 | later [1] 27/12 | ma'am [5] 4/14 | ning [1] |  |
| just [35] 7/12 15/7 | law [10] 16/18 | 5/20 35/7 42/14 | meaningful [1] | move [1] $4 / 8$ |
| 19/15 20/15 21/2 | $34 / 434 / 536 / 19$ | $44 / 4$ | meaningful [1] $28 / 17$ | moved [2] 28/10 |
| 22/21 22/22 22/23 | $40 / 1540 / 1641 / 5$ | MACLAW.COM [1] | means [1] 24/3 | $40 / 17$ |
| 24/4 24/11 24/23 | 41/13 41/14 41/25 | 3/21 | members [1] | moves [1] 30/25 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}25 / 25 & 26 / 5 \\ 26 / 13 \\ 27 / 1 & 29 / 20 / 12\end{array}$ | lawyers [1] 46/1 | made [6] 17/25 | 46/20 | moving [2] 33/15 |
| $27 / 129 / 2033 / 12$ $35 / 1735 / 1835 / 18$ | lead [1] 24/19 | 29/22 32/9 32/19 | mentioned [2] | 35/8 |
| 35/18 35/18 | leads [1] 10/7 | 35/18 40/8 | 42/23 45/15 | Ms [1] 5/19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 35 / 2336 / 636 / 8 \\ & 36 / 2438 / 1638 / 17 \end{aligned}$ | least [1] 7/9 | MAGALI [2] 2/16 | MERCERA [2] 2/16 | much [4] 18/17 |
| 40/9 40/15 42/18 | leave[4] 17/2 17/4 | 4/11 | 4/11 | 18/19 18/24 19/21 |
| $43 / 1943 / 25$ | 29/9 41/9 | make [14] 10/9 | mere [2] 9/3 38/21 | multiple [5] 6/21 |
| $44 / 2245 / 24$ | let [3] 19/22 25/13 | 11/1 19/8 20/3 20/5 | merits [7] 9/18 | 10/17 28/19 45/25 |
| justice [3] 3 | 27/1 | 24/13 25/5 26/13 | 11/4 11/4 12/21 | 46/1 |
| 33/2 39/25 | Let's [3] 4/6 44/9 | 27/17 34/14 34/16 | 22/22 37/1 43/13 | must [7] 14/23 |
| 33/2 39/25 | 44/10 | 37/17 45/18 46/9 | MICHAEL [2] 3/16 | 15/6 23/11 31/12 |
| $39 / 25$ | level [1] 39/20 | makes [1] 37/15 | 5/9 | 32/4 33/16 34/8 |
|  | light [2] 15/15 | making [1] 32/22 | might [2] 17/13 | mute [1] 35/9 |
| K | 16 | management [1] | 44/1 | muted [2] 4/20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { keep [2] } 9 / 14 \\ & 46 / 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { like [5] } 9 / 1711 / 3 \\ 19 / 1 ~ 36 / 25 ~ 45 / 23 \end{array}$ | 46/2 | Mikohn [1] 31/23 mind [3] 16/1 | $\begin{aligned} & 35 / 11 \\ & \text { mutually [1] } 39 / 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| keeping [1] 37/6 | likely [4] 6/20 12/8 | 39/18 | 18/15 46/18 | my [29] 9/16 13/10 |
| KENNEDY [1] $2 / 5$ | 24/24 43/13 | many [4] 14/4 14/4 | MMAUPIN [1] 3/21 | 14/20 15/19 15/23 |
| kickback [3] 23/16 | limitations [2] | 14/6 18/16 | MMM [1] 2/24 | 17/10 17/13 17/22 |
| 34/13 35/22 | 20/23 21/17 | March [2] 45/3 | modeled [1] 20/19 | 17/25 18/4 18/13 |
| kind [3] 16/1 | limited [5] 6/2 | 45/6 | moderate [13] | 19/16 26/3 27/2 |
| 39/5 | 18/21 23/12 24/3 | MARIA [1] $2 / 16$ | 16/19 20/22 22/25 | 35/10 35/14 36/25 |
| knew | 43/6 | MARQUIS [1] 3/15 | 23/2 23/18 23/22 | 37/6 38/25 39/5 |
| $30 / 23$ | line [2] 5/2 46/12 | marshal [1] 43/20 | 24/16 34/1 34/2 | 39/15 43/24 44/2 |
| know | litigants [2] 6/19 | massive [1] 45/19 | 34/4 35/20 36/4 | 45/12 46/3 48/9 |
| $9 / 1910 / 210 / 16$ | 22/20 | massively [1] | 41/18 | 48/11 48/14 48/14 |
| 10/21 10/22 12/15 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { litigation [8] 9/9 } \\ 28 / 133 / 1434 / 17 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 45/19 } \\ \text { matter [28] 5/13 } \end{array}$ | monetary [1] | myriad [1] 18/23 |
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| N | 37/1 38/ | 15/18 17/20 18/25 | $14$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | notices [1] 28/12 | 19/15 19/17 20/2 | 21/5 39/18 |  |
| narrow [9] 16/19 | notion [2] 36/2 | 20/15 21/21 22/21 | 40/5 |  |
| 20/21 22/24 23/8 |  | 33/10 33/25 33/2 |  |  |
| 23/8 23/21 24/15 | novel [1] 10/14 | 33/10 33/25 33/25 | 12/24 13/6 20/ | 5/25 35/15 |
| 24/17 24/21 | November [1] 29/4 | 35/17 37/6 37/18 | 24/14 27/19 28/22 | PEGGY [3] 1/25 |
| Nearly [1] | November 25th [1] | 38/2 41/6 42/6 | 36/1 36/2 45/11 | 48/4 48/17 |
| necessarily [3] | 29/4 | 42/18 43/23 | over [9] 25/ | ding [5] |
| 24/9 37/23 39/16 | now [22] 6/24 7/13 | only [13] 4/23 | 28/14 28/23 30/1 | 4 37/16 42 |
| need [3] 10/23 | 7/19 8/23 11/3 | 8/13 8/25 10/5 | 33/3 33/3 34/16 | 43/7 |
| 15/20 21/8 | 12/21 18/4 27/9 | 15/24 21/1 37/ | 37/25 45/21 | rmiss |
| needs [1] 22/19 | 27/23 28/15 28/23 | 37/24 37/25 41/ | overall [1] | 30 |
| neither [3] 6/11 | 29/10 29/18 30/1 | 41/18 42/15 | overboard [1] 24/8 | permissive [2] |
| 21/4 21/17 | 30/12 30/25 32/13 | operate [1] 9/ | overlooked [4] | 16/20 20/22 |
| NEVADA [40] $1 /$ | 32/22 33/6 33/15 | Operating [1] 4/12 | 5/11 13/11 18/17 | pective |
| 4/1 6/4 6/11 6/11 | 39/25 46/7 | opinion | 39 |  |
| 6/17 7/25 8/4 8/20 | numerous [4] 13/2 | 13/23 13/24 13/25 | $\text { own [2] } 19 / 22$ | ertain [1] 23/20 |
| 9/2 10/12 10/20 |  |  |  | $14 / 5$ |
| 10/24 11/2 11/9 | Nutton [28] 13/14 15/15 16/3 | opportunity [3] | $\mathbf{P}$ | pertains [2] 13/15 |
| 11/10 11/14 11/17 <br> 12/8 12/13 12/18 | 16/9 16/11 16/15 | opposing [4] 10/8 | P | 26/9 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}13 / 16 & 13 / 2120 / 5\end{array}$ | 16/16 18/25 19/16 | 35/18 37/20 38/4 | page [3] | petition [ |
| 20/13 22/17 22/18 | 19/18 20/15 20/16 | opposition [2] | 19/16 22/6 | 6/5 6/16 6/23 7/15 |
| 24/19 24/25 25 | 20/16 21/24 27/13 | 8/11 9/1 | page 15 [2] | 7/17 7/19 8/2 8/6 |
| 25/10 25/13 26/18 | 29/5 33/19 36/8 | or [37] 7/14 8/10 | 22/6 | 8/21 10/13 11/2 |
| 33/24 37/16 37/20 | 36/9 39/17 40/4 | 8/14 15/19 15/20 | pages [2] 11/ | 11/5 11/7 11/11 |
| 38/2 | 40/9 40/15 40/20 | 15/25 18/21 19/10 | 13/25 | 12/2 12/9 12/22 |
| 48/15 | 40/21 40/25 41/13 | 19/10 19/10 20/5 | pages 20 [1] 11/6 | 24/24 25/14 37/4 |
| never [4] 10/1 | Nutton-type [1] | 20/6 20/22 20/22 | ace [1] $4 / 11$ | 37/17 38/3 38/9 |
| 11/14 18/24 26/1 | 40 | 21 | [1] |  |
| new [9] 24/6 24/7 | NV [5] 1/25 2/9 | 26/2 27/8 30/20 | Paris [1] 4/12 | phase [1] 24/ |
| 24/8 28/25 29/17 | 2/21 3/8 3/18 | 34/6 34/21 34/21 | RK [1] 3/17 | PHWLV [4] 1/12 |
| 29/19 30/2 34/12 | 0 | 35 | [2] 28/21 39/9 | 2/14 4/6 4/1 |
| 41/3 |  |  |  | ck 1 ] |
| next [1] 28/10 |  |  |  |  |
| nice [1] 26/7 | $31 / 2231 / 25$ |  | ularly [1] | PISANELLIBICE |
| no [21] $1 / 18 / 24$ | 43/10 | oral [1] 6/9 | 44 | OM [1] $2 / 24$ |
| 12/5 12/12 15/18 | observation [1] | $\text { order [18] } 2 / 26 / 5$ | parties [36] 4 | PISANELLIE [1] |
| 19/17 20/9 21/12 | 26/6 | $7 / 11$ $13 / 18$ <br> $14 / 24$  | 6/18 7/1 7/6 7/10 | P/18 |
| 26/15 27/18 32/6 | obtain [1] 17/4 | 15/20 19/7 20/24 | 8/10 12/24 19/20 | place [2] $4 / 7$ 48/7 |
| 32/8 32/14 32/15 <br> 38/17 39/10 40/13 | obviously [1] 25/9 | 22/7 23/18 24/14 | 22/14 24/8 27/7 | plaintiff [5] 1/10 |
| 38/17 39/10 40/13 | occurs [1] 41/6 | 25/19 27/20 29/3 | 27/11 27/20 28/5 | 2/4 4/8 4/22 36/20 |
| $41 / 1442 / 23$ $46 / 16$ | October [2] 28/23 | 32/6 37/21 44/5 | 28/15 28/24 29/6 | plead [1] 34/9 |
|  | 32/6 | 44/8 | 29/11 29/17 29/22 | pleading [3] 17/6 |
|  | off [4] 12/18 19/15 | orders [8] | 30/23 32/4 32/7 | 34/8 34/9 |
|  | 20/7 20/19 | 19/4 20/25 27/18 | 32/9 32/16 33/6 | eadings [ |
|  | OFFICE [1] 48/14 | 40/6 41/15 44/8 | 33/9 33/24 34/16 | 13/17 14/6 15/5 |
|  | Oh [1] 26/17 | 44/12 | 35/8 38/17 41/8 | Please [1] $44 / 5$ |
| $\text { nor [2] } 6 / 1121 / 5$ | Okay [6] 4/25 5/3 | original [2] 28/14 | 42/2 42/22 43/1 | $\text { led [3] } 13 / 425 /$ |
| normally [2] 17/4 | 46/23 |  | ties' |  |
| 21/18 | old [1] 43 | other [11] 6/22 | 31/2 34/10 42/20 | $\text { oint [27] } 7 / 1$ |
| not [62] | older [2] $43 / 24$ | 8/23 17/7 22/22 | party [11] 10/8 | 10/5 11/3 11/6 |
|  | 44/2 | 22/22 25/22 36/2 | 16/21 16/23 16/2 | 12/24 13/6 14/20 |
|  | on [80] | 38/2 39/20 40/1 | 17/4 17/8 21/8 | 18/13 20/16 22/22 |
| NOTES [1] 48/8 | once [4] 15/3 | 42/7 | 36/19 41/3 41/6 | 24/14 27/19 27/20 |
| nothing [3] 32/7 | $\begin{gathered} 15 / 1315 / 2240 / 3 \\ \text { one [25] } 7 / 59 / 6 \end{gathered}$ | our [9] 4/7 13/22 | $\begin{aligned} & 43 / 12 \\ & \text { passed [1] } 21 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | 31/15 32/8 32/24 |
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|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| point... [11] 33/4 |  |  | 30/3 | , |
| 33/22 34/21 36/8 | prove [1] 31/16 | reconsideration | 2 33/17 33/2 | 11 |
|  | provide [7] 6/17 | [3] 26/8 29/11 | 42/22 | 43/3 46/7 |
| 40/16 42/19 42/24 | 10/13 11/15 12/9 |  | requested [3] | 6/8 46/14 |
| 46/16 |  |  |  | 29/ |
| pointed [1] 28/22 points [3] 9/1 |  | 5/16 7/12 12/25 |  | e [1] 30/21 |
|  |  |  |  | RMR [2] 1/25 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 19 / 1435 / 17 \\ & \text { portion [1] } 37 / 8 \\ & \text { position [4] } 12 / 12 \end{aligned}$ |  | 25/25 26/13 27/1 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | put [5] 10/19 12/11\| $22 / 1541 / 1244 / 10$ | r |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20 / 122 / 926 / 2 \\ & \text { positions [1] } 26 / 4 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ed [2] 28 | requires [1] 35/ | Rule 12 [1] |
| possible [1] 9/18 potential [1] $12 / 6$ potentially [3] |  | 28/17 | resolution [7] | Rule 13 [2] 11/ |
|  |  |  | 9/17 28/3 33/7 37/1 | 11/25 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 2325 / 2040 / 7 \\ & \text { practice [1] 31/1 } \\ & \text { precedent [1] } \end{aligned}$ | 7 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | ved [2] 37/13 | 15/5 17/2 17/3 22/8 |
|  |  |  |  | 4/18 30/9 36/ |
| $14 / 21$ | 25/22 25/25 35 |  |  | 36/23 41/16 |
|  | 38 | 25 |  | le 15's [1] |
| ```precluded [1] 8/19 predicate [1]``` | 4 | 1] 4/ | 19/2 20/1 31/ | [28] |
|  | R | ted [2] | 39/6 39/19 40 | /19 13/21 1 |
|  |  |  | respectfully [10] | $615 / 115$ |
| predominant [1] 34/5 |  | relate [5] 23/ |  | 6/9 17/3 |
| prejudiced [1] |  | /10 34/1 | 30/14 31/5 31/ | 19/4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 32 / 25 \\ & \text { prepare [1] } 44 / 5 \\ & \text { present [1] } 27 / 25 \end{aligned}$ | RAMSEY [2] |  | 31/23 33/6 33/ | /18 20/19 20/2 |
|  |  |  | 35 | 21/5 21/9 |
|  |  |  | respec | /7 26/9 26/18 |
| presently [1] 31/7 |  | relates [2] |  | 27/14 30/10 33/19 |
| preserve [1] 29/13 <br> pretty [1] 39/11 <br> prevail [2] 25/21 |  |  | respond [3] 22/3 | /11 39/19 41/ |
|  |  | relation |  | e 16.1 [1] |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 43 / 13 \\ & \text { previously [1] } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\text { [2] } 2$ |  |  |
|  | reality | 36/10 | 21/13 36/12 41/8 | les [10] 13/16 |
| $\left\|\begin{array}{lll} 40 / 19 & & \\ \text { primarily }[1] & 13 / 11 \end{array}\right\|$ | really [13] 10/ | relief [7] 7/8 10/10 | response [14] | 14/2 14/18 14/19 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { primarily [1] 13/11 } \\ \text { prior [1] 30/24 } \\ \text { probably [1] 13/20 } \\ \text { procedural [1] } \end{array}$ | 13/9 13/24 14/3 | $831 / 14$ 31/19 | 6/14 7/21 13/5 17/6 | 6 18/15 25/ |
|  | 15/9 17/24 18/5 |  | 23/10 23/24 23/24 | 7 33/ |
|  |  |  | 30/11 31/10 34/6 | g [2] $8 /$ |
|  |  | remarkable [1 | 1842 |  |
|  | reason [6] |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { procedure [3] } \\ 13 / 1627 / 1733 / 20 \end{array}$ | 4/9 19/6 | remember [5] |  | ns [1] 15/3 |
| proceed [1] 35/13 proceedings [5] |  |  |  |  |
|  | reasoning [3] 21/20 42/1 42, |  |  |  |
| 11/24 43/6 47/7 | recall [5] 20/ | er [1] 33/ |  | $5$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 48/6 48/12 } \\ & \text { proceeds [1] } 7 / 24 \end{aligned}$ | recall | render [1] 33/ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 15 / 1116 / 5 \\ & 21 / 1121 / 12 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $34 / 10$ | ing [1] | reversible [1] | $9 / 1738 / 213$ |
| process [2] 9/25 |  |  |  | \% |
|  | recent [2] 30/3 | placed [1] | review [1 | ame |
| prohibit [2] 36/16 |  | reported [2] 1/25 | RIDGE [1] | /23 24/10 28/3 |
|  |  |  | [1] | 32/3 |
| $38 / 22$ |  | ORTER [1] |  | [ |
| prohibiting [1] |  |  |  | 22 |
|  | recog | R | 18/22 20/6 21/13 | 26 |
| proportional [4] |  | 1/15 47/10 | 21/16 22/2 22/3 | 1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24 / 124 / 324 / 9 \\ & 41 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { recollection [3] } \\ 17 / 1317 / 2519 / 16 \end{array}$ | represent [1] 4/22 | 23/11 23/23 26/10 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { saying [4] } 18 / 15 \\ 19 / 321 / 739 / 1 \end{array}$ |
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| S | showing [1] | 28/7 28/7 | SUBSC | Tao [5] 13/23 14/4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14/22 23/9 | side [2] 21/5 21/22 | 34/20 | 48/13 | 16/4 16/12 39/23 |
| $41 / 541 / 1445 / 8$ | significance [ | SOUTH [2] 2/19 | subsequent [1] | $\text { tat [1] } 30 / 15$ |
| scenarios [1] | significant [3] | 3/6 <br> SPANISH [1] 2/8 | substantial [1] | TELEPHONIC [3] <br> 1/18 2/2 48/6 |
| $18 / 16$ | $10 / 437 / 437 / 1$ | speak [1] 10/20 | $32 / 15$ | $\text { tell [2] } 16 / 8 \text { 26/ }$ |
| schedule [1] 20/24 <br> scheduled [1] 35/3 | Silver [1] 39/25 | specific [1] 18/1 | substantially | telling [1] 16/1 |
| cheduling [12] | similar [5] 12/ | specifically [5] | 32/24 | ten [1] 28/14 |
| 13/3 13/18 14/24 | 16/13 17/19 40/18 | 13/17 15/4 28/2 | such [2] 31/ | tenable [1] 2 |
| 19/4 19/7 20/25 | 45 |  |  | tenet [1] 33/1 |
| 22/7 27/18 27/20 | s |  | en | NERT [ |
| 32/6 40/6 41/15 | s |  | ] |  |
| scheme [3] 23/16 | simply [11] 15/9 $27 / 2127 / 2528 / 11$ | started [2] 5/22 |  | 14/1 14/17 |
| 34/13 35/22 | $\begin{array}{lll} 27 / 21 & 27 / 25 & 28 / 11 \\ 7 & 20 / 12 \end{array}$ | started [2] 5/22 $34 / 17$ | SUITE [2] 2/20 3/7 summarize [1] | $\begin{array}{\|l} 14 / 114 / 17 \\ \text { term [1] } 9 / 13 \end{array}$ |
| scope [4] 11/25 | $30 / 1032 / 1633 / 11$ | state | $24 / 22$ | terms [1] 32/ |
| $34 / 741 / 741 / 20$ second [3] $8 / 9$ | $35 / 23$ | 13/21 48/2 48/1 | summarizing | than [5] 18/19 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { second [3] 8/ } \\ 27 / 832 / 13 \end{gathered}$ | sir [12] 5/10 20/7 | statewide [1] 12/1 | 11/20 | 19/21 26/16 37 |
| Secondly [1] 26/5 | 25/24 26/12 26/16 | status [1] 43/15 | summar | 39/20 |
| see [5] 16/2 18/23 | 26/21 35/13 40/ | stay [36] $6 / 26 / 2$ | - | thank |
| 18/24 40/7 40/9 | 42/11 44/18 45/4 | 6/25 7/1 7/14 7/17 | 32/8 38/5 38/12 | 5/21 26/15 26/21 |
| seek [3] 17/2 | 45/12 | 7/24 8/6 8/8 8/10 | SUPERVISION [1] | 26/22 26/25 27/4 |
| 29/11 31/19 | sister | 8/18 9/5 9/21 10/9 | 48/9 | 46/25 47/1 47/2 |
| seeking [5] 6/2 | sitting [1] | 11/8 13/2 21/6 22/6 | support [ | that [235] |
| 6/24 7/1 29/9 37/2 | situation [2] 9/10 | 24/23 27/7 27/10 | suppose [1] 40/ | that's [40] 6/22 |
| seems [1] 15/15 | 32/3 | 27/25 28/7 31/13 | Supreme [43] 6/4 | 8/12 9/9 10/1 10 |
| SEIBEL [23] | six [2] 29/18 45 | 31/17 32/12 32/21 | 6/11 6/17 7/25 8/4 | 10/2 10/2 10/10 |
| 4/6 4/22 27/7 | sixth [1] 45/16 | 33/11 33/18 35/3 | 8/21 9/2 10/12 | 11/8 12/5 12/23 |
| 28/5 28/15 28/ | size [1] 45/24 | 37/15 38/3 38/22 | 10/20 10/24 11/2 | 15/16 16/1 16/3 |
| 29/6 29/11 29/16 | slightly [1] 39/6 | 42/9 42/22 43/6 | 11/9 11/11 11/14 | 16/6 18/11 18/13 |
| 29/22 30/23 31/2 | small [1] 45/17 | stayed [2] 8/25 | 11/17 12/8 12/14 | 18/21 19/25 23/2 |
|  | so [49] | 32/ | 12/19 20/5 20/13 | 24/12 24/20 |
| 33/9 33/24 34/10 | social [1] | STENOTYPE [2] | 22/17 22/18 24/20 | 35/23 36/18 36/22 |
|  | solely [1] 34/13 | 48/5 48/8 | 24/25 25/3 25/10 | 37/11 37/23 37/25 |
| sense [3] 19/21 | some [22] 6/18 7/2 | still [2] 7/2 7/2 | 25/14 26/18 27/1 | 39/11 39/14 39/23 |
| $37 / 1545 / 18$ | 10/14 11/15 12/3 | stipulate [1] 19/20 | 28/21 31/6 31/8 | 40/2 40/22 40/22 |
| September | 12/9 12/20 20/14 | stipulated [1] 7/6 | 31/18 32/11 32/19 | 41/25 43/19 44/13 |
| 44/1 | 22/19 28/23 33/4 | stipulation [1] | 33/23 37/16 37/21 | 45/3 45/12 |
| serious [4] 8/1 |  |  | 38/20 40/5 42/6 | their [35] 9/1 9/17 |
| 8/16 8/17 37/12 | 44/20 45/8 45/17 | strategy [4] 28/2 | 42/19 43/1 | 9/23 18/20 21/25 |
| set [5] 15/1 19/7 | 45/20 45/24 46/4 | 28/10 29/19 33/13 | sure [3] 26/13 | 26/20 27/14 27/2 |
| 27/12 40/8 43/22 |  | STREET [3] 2/19 | 37/17 46 | 28 |
| sets [1] |  |  | T | $28 / 21 \text { 29/1 }$ |
| settled [1] 44/3 | 18/2 20/13 21/2 | 6/10 10/17 11/21 | tactic [2] 28/16 | 30/: |
| SEVENTH [1] 2/19 | $22 / 10 \text { 24/14 37/15 }$ | 21/4 30/25 | 28/16 | 30/10 30/21 30/2 |
| sharing [1] 46/18 | $37 / 2342 / 5$ |  | take [8] 6/23 10/13 | $31 / 1831 / 2232 / 12$ |
| SHORTHAND [1] | sometimes [1] | striking [2] $11 / 22$ | 12/9 12/14 26/4 | $33 / 1333 / 1733 / 21$ |
|  | 18/16 | strong [1] | 28/13 43/2 43/19 | 34/19 34/24 34/25 |
| $23 / 4 \text { 28/25 30/13 }$ | somewhat [1] | strongly [1] 40/5 | taken [5] 6/21 | 35/5 38/11 46/11 |
| $32 / 1033 / 2434 / 20$ | 39/1 | struck [2] 6/6 | 24/24 25/15 26/10 | them [7] 6/23 31/4 |
|  | somewhere [1] |  | 38/7 | 31/19 36/22 41/22 |
|  | 45/5 | subject [5] 23/6 | takes [2] 16/20 | 41/23 42/4 |
| shouldn't [2] 23/3 | so | 23/12 24/4 24/10 |  | n [16] 4/8 |
|  | sorry [2] 11/2 |  |  | /24 15/24 22/1 |
|  | 24/18 | submit [3] 35/5 | talked [2] 14/17 | 5/5 28/7 28/7 32/9 |
| $12$ | sort [1] | 44/8 44/1 | 39/17 | 36/21 39/25 40/20 |
| showed [1] 30/19 | sought [5] 9/8 | submitted [1] 7/11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { talking [3] } 13 / 19 \\ & 43 / 1845 / 5 \end{aligned}$ | 40/20 40/20 41/7 |
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| T | third [4] 8/9 8/23 | 44/24 45/25 | $21$ | $\text { 1] } 10 / 19$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| then... [2] 41/21 | 27/9 32/14 | trials [1] 44/22 | upon [7] 15/23 | /16 24/8 |
| then... [2] 41/21 | this [145] | tried [2] 28/25 | 19/16 19/18 24/21 | 5/12 25/13 32/17 |
| theoretically [1] | thorough [2] 31/1 | 43/25 | 26/19 43/15 43/17 | 34/11 39/17 42/6 |
| 20/24 | 33/18 | triggers [1] 19/25 | use [1] 10/1 | 42/8 |
| theory [1] 34/6 | thoroughly | TR | used [1] 45/ | [5] |
| there [37] 5/11 | $26 / 842 / 3$ <br> those [15] 7/10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { truly [1] } 34 / 23 \\ & \text { try [2] } 20 / 246 / 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { utilized [2] } 12 / 1 \\ & 12 / 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { we'll [5] } 4 / 826 / 23 \\ & 26 / 2335 / 844 / 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| 6/21 7/9 7/13 8/24 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{\|c} \text { those [15] } 7 / 10 \\ 7 / 2211 / 1914 / 1 \end{array}\right.$ | try [2] 20/2 46/2 trying [4] 10/19 |  | 26/23 35/8 44/13 <br> we're [13] 6/24 |
| 11/18 11/24 14/6 | 20/23 21/18 22/5 | $11 / 2041 / 1141 / 12$ | V | 6/25 19/21 27/5 |
| $15 / 22 ~ 16 / 6 ~ 17 / 14$ $17 / 1917 / 1918 / 6$ | 23/12 23/20 28/9 | turn [1] 25/23 | vaccinated [1] | 32/17 32/22 33/3 |
| 17/19 17 | 29/15 30/1 34/22 | turnaround [1] | 46/20 | 33/5 37/10 39/13 |
| $20 / 12 \text { 21/11 21/11 }$ | 41/19 45/19 | 44/11 | vaccine [1] 46/15 | 43/18 44/4 44/4 |
| 21/24 23/5 23/15 | though [1] 17/12 | turning [1] 31/11 | vacuum [1] 27/24 | e've [3] 5/11 |
| 25/2 27/18 30/18 | thought [2] 18/6 | two [7] 7/9 11/3 | valid [1] | 7/11 41/6 |
| 30/19 32/2 32/6 | 34/23 | 12/24 14/1 14/10 | [1] | WEDNESDAY [2] |
| 32/6 32/14 32/15 | thoughts [1] 26/3 | 14/18 21/6 | EGAS [6] $2 / 9$ | 1/23 4/1 |
| 33/8 36/3 38/24 | three [6] 15/25 | type [3] 15/17 40/4 | 3/8 3/18 4/1 4/12 | week [1] 37/24 |
| $40 / 1141 / 1$ | 21/6 21/6 34/16 | 40/7 | venture [1] | eks [1] 37/25 |
| there's [15] 7/5 | 43/9 44/10 | TYPEWRITING | versus [2] 4/6 | gh [2] 31/13 |
| 10/3 12/5 12/6 |  |  |  |  |
| 12/12 12/24 19/5 | 44/10 | Typically [1] 13/25 | ve | weighs [2] 32/ |
| 22/21 29/18 35/24 | through [4] 9/24 | U | 12/5 16/11 16/11 | 33/17 |
| 37/4 37/13 38/17 | time [18] 14/ | UDAP | 20/10 20/10 25/12 | ] $20 / 18$ |
| 39/18 $45 / 8$ | time <br> $15 / 15 / 317$ <br> $17 / 25$ | ultimate [1] 12/16 | 25/17 40/5 45/9 | 2/8 27/1 27/2 30/4 |
| THEREAFTER | 19/7 22/15 27/7 | ultimately [3] | vet [1] 26/8 | 30/13 38/19 42/16 |
|  | 27/8 27/9 27/9 35/8 | 10/23 28/12 43/19 | vetted [2] 42/1 | 43/4 45/1 46/23 |
| $1$ | 37/5 37/22 37/24 | unable [1] 7/10 | 43/4 | were [17] 9/22 |
|  | 38/6 42/3 44/9 48/7 | unattainable [1] | VIA [1] 2/2 | 10/19 23/2 25/7 |
| 30/5 32/18 38/9 <br> 42/3 46/17 | timely [2] 29/23 | 10/10 | viewpoint [1] 39/6 | 25/11 28/9 29/6 |
|  | 34/2 | under [17] 6/12 | violation [1] 15/19 | 29/15 30/22 33/23 |
|  | times [2] 10/17 | 8/7 13/18 17/2 21/9 | Virginia [2] 35/25 | 34/13 34/23 40/23 |
|  | 28/19 | 21/18 21/18 23/1 | 36/2 | 41/20 45/19 47/7 |
|  | TIMOTHY [1] 1/20 | 23/18 29/5 30/9 | virtually [1] 8/24 | 48/8 |
| 29/19 37/6 37/7 | tit [1] 30/15 | 33/19 39/2 40/3 | vu [1] 27/6 | what [43] 6/12 |
| 39/16 41/23 42/24 | together [3] 38/10 | 40/8 40/20 48/9 | W | 10/20 10/25 12/13 |
| thing [6] 9/6 14/22 |  |  |  | 12/22 13/10 13/11 |
| 18/14 20/2 20/15 | tomorrow [2] | 22 |  | 20/1 |
| 42/15 | 32/5 | 26/1 39/5 41/11 | want [24] 5/12 9/6 | 0/3 22/12 22/12 |
| things [8] | too [4] 15/7 | 42/1 42/11 | 9/19 9/24 11/6 | 22/16 23/15 24/20 |
| 12/24 14/10 14/2 | 26/10 45/24 | understanding [1] | 12/24 13/6 20/7 | 4/20 25/1 25/2 |
| 25/15 36/24 3 | took [6] 11/11 | 45/12 | 20/16 22/21 22/22 | 5/4 25/4 25/6 26/2 |
|  | 11/15 12/2 16/14 | Understood [1] | 22/23 24/11 $24 / 14$ | 6/2 27/15 27/15 |
|  | 30/6 48/5 | 16/10 | 26/12 26/13 33/12 | 7/16 29/16 30/3 |
| \|th | TPOV [2] 33/10 | unless [4] 25/22 | 35/17 36/24 37/13 | 6/19 38/12 39/7 |
|  | 33/10 | 35/4 38/23 40/13 | 38/16 40/12 40/14 | 39/23 40/19 41/25 |
| $12 / 1112 / 181$ | TRANSCRIBED [1] | Unlike [1] 30/22 | 44/12 | 42/7 42/8 43/5 44/4 |
| $13 / 2013 / 2313 / 24$ | 48/8 | unsuccessful [1] | wanted [3] 27/1 | 44/13 45/3 45/12 |
| 14/8 15/8 16/2 18/5 | TRANSCRIPT [2] | 28/9 |  | 6/23 |
| 19/17 19/24 19/24 | 1/15 48/10 | until [1] 25/18 | wants [1] 40/ | t's [1] 45/14 |
| 20/2 20/12 20/13 | trial [22] 6/25 7/23 | untimely [4] 29/21 | warrant [1] 32/2 | whatever [4] 19/6 |
| 21/6 22/14 22/16 | 7/24 8/20 14/18 | 39/11 39/15 40/2 | warranted [2] 8/7 | 19/10 21/15 45/22 |
| 24/23 33/16 38/25 | 14/23 15/8 15/10 | unusual [1] 38/1 | 24/23 | n [16] 10/18 |
| 39/16 40/9 42/2 | 16/5 19/17 25/16 | up [17] 6/23 7/2 | warrants [1] 9/21 | 13/25 16/18 16/21 |
| 45/20 46/3 46/18 | 25/18 27/11 33/5 | 10/13 11/1 11/11 | was [62] | 16/22 19/13 19/19 |
| thinking [2] 10/20 | 35/3 38/15 42/9 | 11/15 12/2 12/9 | wasn't [1] | 21/12 27/11 28/9 |
| thinking [2] 10/20 26/2 | 43/20 43/21 44/17 | $\begin{array}{lll} 12 / 14 & 13 / 9 & 14 / 10 \\ 15 / 16 & 15 / 18 & 20 / 4 \end{array}$ | WATKINS [2] 2/17 $4 / 16$ | 29/1 32/2 33/3 41/6 |
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