#### IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

W L A B INVESTMENT GROUP, LLC,

Appellant,

v.

TKNR, INC., a California Corporation, and CHI ON WONG aka CHI KUEN WONG, an individual, and KENNY ZHONG LIN, aka KEN ZHONG LIN aka KENNETH ZHONG LIN aka WHONG K. LIN aka CHONG KENNY LIN aka ZHONG LIN, an individual, and LIWE HELEN CHEN aka HELEN CHEN, an individual and YAN QIU ZHANG, an individual and INVESTPRO LLC dba INVESTPRO REALTY, a Nevada Limited Liability Company, and MAN CHAU CHENG, an individual, and JOYCE A. NICKRANDT, an individual, and INVESTPRO **INVESTMENTS LLC**, a Nevada Limited Liability Company, and **INVESTPRO MANAGER LLC, a** Nevada Limited Liability Company and JOYCE A. NICKDRANDT, an individual and does 1 through 15 and roe corporation I-XXX,

Respondents.

### APPEAL

Supreme Court Case No: 82835 Electronically Filed District Court Nov sea 2021 09:33 a.m. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

Page **1** of **2** 

from the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County The Honorable Adriana Escobar, District Judge District Court Case No. A-18-785917-C

## **APPELLANT'S APPENDIX VOLUME VII**

#### CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX

Document Name	Date Filed	Vol.	Page
Amended Order Granting	04/07/2021	VII	1367 - 1409
Defendants' Motion for Summary			
Judgment, or in the Alternative,			
Partial Summary Judgment			
Minute Order Granting Benjamin	04/07/2021	VII	1410-1411
Childs' Motion to Withdraw as			
Attorney for Plaintiff /			
Counterdefendant			
Transcript of March 11, 2021	04/15/2021	VII	1412-1450
Proceedings			

Electronically Filed 04/07/2021 4:21 PM

		Electronically Filed 04/07/2021 4:21 PM
1	MICHAEL B. LEE, ESQ. (NSB 10122) MICHAEL MATTHIS, ESQ. (NSB 14582)	CLERK OF THE COURT
2	MICHAEL B. LEE, P.C. 1820 East Sahara Avenue, Suite 110	
3	Las Vegas, Nevada 89104 Telephone: (702) 477.7030	
4	Facsimile: (702) 477.0096 mike@mblnv.com	
5	Attorney for Defendants	
6	IN THE EIGHTH JUDIC	CIAL DISTRICT COURT
7	CLARK COUN	NTY, NEVADA
8	W L A B INVESTMENT, LLC,	CASE NO.: A-18-785917-C DEPT. NO.: XIV
9	Plaintiff,	DEFT. NO AIV
10	vs.	ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT,
11	TKNR INC., a California Corporation, and CHI ON WONG aka CHI KUEN WONG, an	OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE, PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT
12	individual, and KENNY ZHONG LIN, aka KEN ZHONG LIN aka KENNETH ZHONG	SOWIWART JODGWENT
13	LIN aka WHONG K. LIN aka CHONG	
14	KENNY LIN aka ZHONG LIN, an individual, and LIWE HELEN CHEN aka HELEN CHEN, an individual and YAN QIU	Date of Hearing: March 11, 2021 Time of Hearing: 9:30 a.m.
15	ZHANG, an individual, and INVESTPRO LLC dba INVESTPRO REALTY, a Nevada	Time of Hearing. 9.50 a.m.
16	Limited Liability Company, and MAN	
17	CHAU CHENG, an individual, and JOYCE A. NICKRANDT, an individual, and INVESTPRO INVESTMENTS LLC, a	
18	Nevada Limited Liability Company, and INVESTPRO MANAGER LLC, a Nevada	
19	Limited Liability Company and JOYCE A. NICKRANDT, an individual and Does 1	
20	through 15 and Roe Corporation I - XXX,	
21	Defendants. AND RELATED CLAIMS.	
22	AND RELATED CLAIMS.	
23	This matter being set for hearing before	the Honorable Court on March 11, 2021 at 9:30
24	a.m., on Defendants' TKNR INC., CHI ON WC	ONG aka CHI KUEN WONG, KENNY ZHONG
25	LIN, aka KEN ZHONG LIN aka KENNETH Z	HONG LIN aka WHONG K. LIN aka CHONG
26	KENNY LIN aka ZHONG LIN, LIWE HE	LEN CHEN aka HELEN CHEN, YAN QIU
27	ZHANG, INVESTPRO LLC dba INVESTPRO	REALTY, MAN CHAU CHENG, JOYCE A.
28	NICKRANDT, INVESTPRO INVESTMENTS	S LLC, and INVESTPRO MANAGER LLC,
	Page	l of 41
	Statis	tically closed: USJR - CV - Summar <b>, நெரு</b> ent (USSU

 $T\rm{EL}-(702)\,477.7030;\,FAX-(702)\,477.0096$ MICHAEL B. LEE, P.C. 1820 E. SAHARA AVENUE, SUITE 110 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89104

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

27

28

1 (collectively, the "Defendants"), Motion for Summary Judgment, or in the Alternative, Partial 2 Summary Judgment ("Motion"), by and through their attorney of record, MICHAEL B. LEE, P.C. 3 Plaintiff W L A B INVESTMENT, LLC appeared on and through its counsel of record, DAY & 4 NANCE. Defendants filed the Motion on December 15, 2020. Plaintiff filed an Opposition to the 5 Motion ("Opposition"), Countermotion for Continuance Based on NRCP 56(f) ("56(f) Countermotion"), and Countermotion for Imposition of Monetary Sanctions (collectively, 6 7 "Countermotion") on December 29, 2020. On January 20, 2021, Defendants filed a Reply brief. 8 On January 29, 2021, Defendants filed a Supplement ("Supplement") to Defendants' Motion for 9 Summary Judgment. The Supplement included the deposition of Frank Miao ("Miao"), the 10 designated person most knowledgeable for Plaintiff, from January 12, 2021. Plaintiff did not file 11 a response to the Supplement. Mr. Miao attended the hearing.

After considering the pleadings of counsel, the Court enters the following order **GRANTING** the Motion, **DENYING** the 56(f) Countermotion, and Countermotion, and **GRANTING** attorneys' fees and costs to Defendants pursuant to Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure 11:

#### **Findings of Facts**

#### First Residential Purchase Agreement and Waiver of Inspections, Contractual Broker Limitations

19 1. 2132 Houston Drive, Las Vegas, NV 89104 ("Property") was originally
 20 constructed in 1954. On or about August 11, 2017, Marie Zhu ("Zhu"), the original purchaser,
 21 executed a residential purchase agreement ("RPA") for the Property. At all times relevant, Ms.
 22 Zhu and Mr. Miao, the managing member of Plaintiff, were sophisticated buyers related to
 23 "property management, property acquisition, and property maintenance." The purchase price for
 24 the property was \$200,000.

25 2. Through the RPA, Ms. Zhu waived her due diligence, although she had a right to
26 conduct inspections:

During such Period, Buyer shall have the right to conduct, noninvasive/non-destructive inspections of all structural, roofing, mechanical, electrical, plumbing, heating/air conditioning,



1 water/well/septic, pool/spa, survey, square footage, and any other property or systems, through licensed and bonded contractors or 2 other qualified professionals. 3 3. Ms. Zhu did not cancel the contract related to any issues with the Property. 4 4. Under Paragraph 7(C) of the RPA, Ms. Zhu waived the Due Diligence condition. 5 *Id.* Under Paragraph 7(D) of the RPA, it provided: 6 It is strongly recommended that Buyer retain licensed Nevada professionals to conduct inspections. If any inspection is not 7 completed and requested repairs are not delivered to Seller within the Due Diligence Period, Buyer is deemed to have waived the 8 right to that inspection and Seller's liability for the cost of all repairs that inspection would have reasonably identified had it 9 been conducted, except as otherwise provided by law. 5. 10 Ms. Zhu waived any liability of Defendants for the cost of all repairs that 11 inspection would have reasonably identified had it been conducted. Ms. Zhu also waived the 12 energy audit, pest inspection, roof inspection, septic lid removal inspection, mechanical 13 inspection, soil inspection, and structural inspection. 14 Under Paragraph 7(F), it was Ms. Zhu's responsibility to inspect the Property 6. 15 sufficiently as to satisfy her use. Additionally, Wong, Lin, Chen, Zhang, Cheng, and Nickrandt 16 (collectively, "Brokers" or "Broker Defendants") had "no responsibility to assist in the payment 17 of any repair, correction or deferred maintenance on the Property which may have been revealed 18 by the above inspections, agreed upon by the Buyer and Seller or requested by one party." 19 7. On August 2, 2017, TKNR submitted Seller's Real Property Disclosure Form 20 ("SRPDF" or "Seller's Disclosures") timely indicating all known conditions of the Subject 21 Property. In fact, TKNR disclosed that "3 units has (sic) brand new AC installed within 3 22 months," and further that the "owner never resided in the property and never visited the 23 property." It also disclosed that the minor renovations, such as painting, were conducted by the 24 Seller's "handyman" as disclosed in the Seller's Disclosures. Seller also disclosed that it had done construction, modification, alterations, or repairs without permits. Despite these 25 26 disclosures, Plaintiff chose not to inspect the Subject Property, request additional information 27 and/or conduct any reasonable inquires.

28 ////

rel - (702) 477.7030; Fax - (702) 477.0096

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89104

MICHAEL B. LEE, P.C. 820 E. SAHARA AVENUE, SUITE 110

1 Second Residential Purchase Agreement and Waiver of Inspections, Contractual Broker **Limitations** 2 3 8. On or before September 5, 2017, Ms. Zhu had issues related to the financing for 4 the Property because of an appraisal, so Ms. Zhu executed a new purchase agreement, and would 5 agree to pay the difference in an appraisal with a lower value than the purchase price, and waive inspections: 6 7 Please note that seller agree the rest of terms and request to add the below term on the contract: "Buyer agree to pay the difference in cash if appraisal come in 8 lower than purchase price, not to exceed purchase price of \$200k" 9 I just send you the docs, please review and sign if you are agree. Thank you! (Per buyer's request will waive licensed home inspector to do 10 the home inspection) 11 On the same day, Ms. Zhu and TKNR agreed to Addendum No. 1 to cancel the 12 9. 13 RPA dated August 11, 2017 and entered into a new Residential Purchase Agreement dated September 5, 2017 ("2<sup>nd</sup> RPA"). As before, the overall purchase price for the Property was 14 15 \$200,000, but Ms. Zhu changed the contingency for the loan to \$150,000 with earnest money deposit of \$500 and a balance of \$49,500 owed at the close of escrow ("COE" or "Closing"). 16 17 The COE was set for September 22, 2017. 18 10. Notably, although Ms. Zhu had not initialed the "Failure to Cancel or Resolve

18 10. Notably, although Ms. Zhu had not initialed the "Failure to Cancel or Resolve 19 Objections" provision in the RPA, she initialed the corresponding provision in the 2<sup>nd</sup> RPA. This 20 was consistent with Ms. Zhu's instructions to Ms. Chen. Ex. D. This is the second time that Ms. 21 Zhu waived inspections for the Property despite the language in the 2<sup>nd</sup> RPA that strongly 22 advised to get an inspection done.

11. As noted, Ms. Zhu waived any inspections related to the purchase of the Property
in the 2<sup>nd</sup> RPA. Although Ms. Zhu had actual knowledge of the Seller's Disclosures, and the
Parties agreed to extend the COE to January 5, 2018, Ms. Zhu did not conduct professional
inspections. Instead, she put down an additional \$60,000 as a non-refundable deposit to the
TNKR. Moreover, she also agreed to pay rent in the amount of \$650 per month for one of the
units, and to also pay the property manager \$800 for the tenant placement fee. Through

Addendum 2 to the 2<sup>nd</sup> RPA, Ms. Zhu later changed the purchaser to Plaintiff. 1 2 Deposition of Plaintiff's Person Most Knowledgeable – Mr. Miao 3 12. Since 2008, Mr. Miao, Ms. Zhu, and/or Plaintiff have been involved in the 4 purchase of approximately twenty residential properties. In Clark County alone, Ms. Zhu and 5 Mr. Miao were involved with the purchase of at least eight rental properties starting in 2014. 6 13. Plaintiff understands the importance of reading contracts. 7 14. Mr. Miao specified that he understands that he needs to check public records 8 when conducting his due diligence. 9 15. Plaintiff was a sophisticated buyer who understood the necessity of getting 10 properties inspected. 11 Requirement to Inspect was Known 12 16. The terms of the RPA were clear to Plaintiff. 13 17. As to Paragraph 7(A), Mr. Miao specified that he believed that his inspection and 14 conversations with the tenant constituted the actions necessary to deem the Property as 15 satisfactory for Plaintiff's purchase.  $19 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes \cdot Based on -- we bought this -- we go$ 16 20 to the inspection, then we also talk to the tenant, 17 21 so we thinking this is investment property; right? 22 So financial it's looking at the rent, it's 18 23 reasonable, it's not very high compared with the 24 surrounding area. Then also financially, it's good. 19  $25 \cdots$  Then I take a look at the – everything Page 164 20 ·1 outside. · Good. · So I said, Fine. · That's satisfied.  $\cdot 2$  That's the reason I command my wife to sign the 21  $\cdot$ 3 purchase agreement. 22 18. At all times relevant prior to the purchase of the Property, Plaintiff had access to 23 inspect the entire property and conduct non-invasive, non-destructive inspections:  $\cdot 2 \cdot \cdot \cdot 0 \cdot \cdot So$  at the time when you did your 24 ·3 diligence, you had a right to conduct noninvasive, 25 •4 nondestructive inspection; correct?  $\cdot 5 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes$ , I did. 26  $\cdot 6 \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot And$  you had the opportunity to inspect all  $\cdot$ 7 the structures? 27  $\cdot 8 \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot I$  check the other one -- on the walk. I •9 don't see the new cracking, so the -- some older 28 10 cracking.  $\cdot$  I check the neighbor who also have that

MICHAEL B. LEE, P.C. 1820 E. SAHARA AVENUE, SUITE 110 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89104 fel – (702) 477,7030; FAX – (702) 477.0096

	1	11 one. I think it's okay; right? Then the –
	2	Supplement at 166:2-11.
	3	$8 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot So$ you had the right to inspect the
	4	$\cdot 9$ structure; correct? 10 $\cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes$ , yes, I did that.
	5	$11 \cdots Q \cdots$ You had the right to inspect the roof; is 12 that correct?
	6	$13 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot \cdot Yes.$ $14 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot Okay \cdot Did you do that?$
	7	15 A I forgot I maybe did that because 16 usually I go to the roof. * * *
	8	$22 \cdots Q$ . You had the right to inspect the 23 mechanical system; correct?
	9	$24 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Right \cdot Yes, yes.$ $25 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot You had the right to inspect the$
	10	Page 167 ·1 electrical systems; correct?
	11	$\cdot 2 \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot I$ check the electrical system, yes. $\cdot 3 \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot Y$ ou had a right to inspect the plumbing
Ś	12	$\cdot 4$ systems; correct? $\cdot 5 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes.$
600.77	13	$\cdot 6 \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot Y$ ou had the right to inspect the $\cdot 7$ heating/air conditioning system; correct?
702) 477.7030; FAX – (702) 477.0096	14	$\cdot 8 \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Y \text{es.}$ * * *
0; FAX -	15	$\cdot 3 \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot And$ then you could have inspected any $\cdot 4$ other property or system within the property itself;
177.703	16	$\cdot$ 5 correct? $\cdot 6 \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Y \text{es, yes.}$
- (702)	17	
Tel – (	18	<i>Id.</i> at 167:8-16, 167:22-25-168:1-11, 168:25-169:1-6.
	19	19. Prior to the purchase, Mr. Miao was always aware that the Seller "strongly
	20	recommended that buyer retain licensed Nevada professionals to conduct inspections":
	21	$13 \cdots Q \cdots$ "It is strongly recommended that buyer 14 retain licensed Nevada professionals to conduct
	22	15 inspections." $16 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes.$
	23	$17 \cdot \cdot \cdot \mathbf{Q} \cdot \cdot \mathbf{Y}$ eah. So you were aware of this 18 recommendation at the time
	24	$19 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yeah$ , I know.
	25	<i>Id.</i> at 176:13-19.
	26	20. Plaintiff was also aware of the language in the RPA under Paragraph 7(D) that
	27	limited potential damages that could have been discovered by an inspection:
	28	
		Page 6 of 41

MICHAEL B. LEE, P.C. 1820 E. SAHARA AVENUE, SUITE 110 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89104 - -7707) 477 7030: FAX -7707) 477 0006

1 18. · · Q. · · Okay. · So going back to paragraph 7D -- $19 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yeah.$ 2  $20 \cdots 0$ . · · · · · · · · right, after the language that's in 21 italics, would you admit that because it's in the 3 22 italics, it's conspicuous, you can see this 23 language?  $24 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yeah \cdot Yeah$ . 4  $25 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot O$ kay. Then it goes on to say, "If any 5 Page 179 ·1 inspection is not completed and requested repairs  $\cdot 2$  are not delivered to seller within the due diligence 6  $\cdot$ 3 period, buyer is deemed to have waived the right to 7 •4 that inspection and seller's liability for the cost ·5 of all repairs that inspection would have reasonably 8 ·6 identified had it been conducted."  $\cdot 7 \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot$  Did I read that correctly?  $\cdot 8 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes$ , yes. 9  $\cdot 9 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot O$ kay.  $\cdot$  So we'll eventually get to the 10 10 issues that, you know, Ms. Chen identified that you 11 wanted corrected in the emails or text messages. 11  $12 \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot$  Is that fair to say that those are the 13 only issues that you deemed needed to be resolved to 12 14 go forward with the purchase?  $15 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yeah \cdot \cdot After that time, yes.$ 13 14 Id. at 179:18-25-180:1-15. 15 21. Finally, as to the RPA, Mr. Miao agreed that all the terms in it were conspicuous 16 and understandable, and it was a standard agreement similar to the other agreements he had used 17 in purchasing the other properties in Clark County, Nevada. *Id.* at 198:19-25-199:1-2, 200:3-15. 18 Mr. Miao Does Inspections for Plaintiff Although he is not a Licensed, Bonded Professional Inspector 19 20 22. As to all the properties purchased by Plaintiff, Mr. Miao always does the 21 inspections and does not believe a professional inspection is necessary. Id. at 116:2-9, 119:3-25, 22 140:5-10. Based on his own belief, he does not believe that a professional inspection is 23 necessary for multi-tenant residential properties. Id. at 120:6-9 (his own understanding), 120:16-24 25 (second-hand information he received). 25 23. Notably, he does not have any professional license related to being a general

26 contractor, inspector, appraiser, or project manager. Id. at 123:5-16 (no professional licenses), 27 123:23-24 (no property management license), 169:7-14 (no licensed or bonded inspector), 28 171:23-25 (have not read the 1952 Uninformed Building Code), 172:17-19 (not an electrician),

TEL – (702) 477.7030; FAX – (702) 477.0096 820 E. SAHARA AVENUE, SUITE 110 MICHAEL B. LEE, P.C. LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89104

1	172:23-25-1-16 (no general contractor license or qualified under the intentional building code),
2	174:13-23 (not familiar with the international residential code).
3	24. Mr. Miao has never hired a professional inspector in Clark County, <i>Id.</i> at 140:19-
4	21, so he does not actually know what a professional inspection would encompass here. Id. at
5	143:9-13, 144:8-19.
6	25. The main reason Plaintiff does not use a professional inspector is because of the
7	cost. <i>Id.</i> at 147:2-7.
8	26. On or about August 10, 2017, Mr. Miao did an inspection of the Property. Id. at
9	158:1-25-159:1-12. During that time, he admitted that he noticed some issues with the Property
10	that were not up to code, finishing issues, GFCI outlets, and electrical issues:
11	$16 \cdots A \cdots I$ looked at a lot of things. For example, 17 like, the I point out some drywall is not
12	18 finished; right? And the some of smoke alarm is 19 not is missing and which is law required to
13	20 put in for smoke alarm. Then no carbon monoxide 21 alarm, so I ask them to put in.
14	$22 \cdot \cdots \cdot Then$ in the kitchen, lot of electrical, 23 the outlet is not a GFCI outlet, so I tell them, I
15	24 said, You need to change this GFCI. Right now this 25 outlet is not meet code. You probably have problem.
16	
17	Id.
18	27. Similarly, he also specified that there was an issue with exposed electrical in Unit
19	C. Id. at 175:10-24. He also noted that there could have been a potential asbestos issue as well.
20	<i>Id.</i> at 160:7-12.
21	28. Additionally, Mr. Miao noted that there were cracks in the ceramic floor tiles, <i>Id</i> .
22	at 249:22-25, and he was aware of visible cracks in the concrete foundation, Id. at 269:13-22
23	(aware of slab cracks), which were open and obvious. <i>Id.</i> at 270:14-24.
24	29. Mr. Miao admitted that he could also have seen the dryer vent during his
25	inspection. <i>Id.</i> at 269:23-25.
26	30. As to those issues, Mr. Miao determined that the aforementioned issues were the
27	only issues that TKNR needed to fix after his inspection. Id. at 171:2-9 (was only concerned
28	about the appraisal), <i>Id</i> . at 219:13-25-221:1-2.
	Page 8 of 41
	1374

1	31. Moreover, Mr. Miao received the SRPDF prior to the purchase of the Property.
2	Id. at 201:22-25. As to SRPDF, Plaintiff was aware that TKNR was an investor who had not
3	resided in the Property, and there were issues with the heating systems, cooling systems, and that
4	there was work done without permits. <i>Id.</i> at 201:1-25-202:1-12. Similarly, it was aware that the
5	Property was 63 years old at that time, <i>Id.</i> at 204:4-7, and all the work was done by a handyman
6	other than the HVAC installation. Id. at 205:14-25, Id. at 134:14-25 (understands the difference
7	between a handyman and a licensed contractor), 243:2 ("Yes. They did by the handyman, yes.").
8	32. Despite these disclosures, Mr. Miao never followed up:
9	$23 \cdots Q \cdots O$ kay. So when they disclosed that there 24 was construction and modification, alterations,
10	25 and/or repairs made without State, City, County Page 205
11	•1 building permits, which was also work that was done •2 by owner's handyman, did you ever do any follow-up
12	$\cdot$ 3 inquiries to the seller about this issue?
13	$\cdot 4 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot No$ , I didn't follow up. $\cdot$
14	<i>Id.</i> at 204:23-25-205:1-4.
15	33. However, Mr. Miao also admitted that he could have followed up on the issues
16	identified in the SRPDF that included the HVAC and the permits:
17	$10 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot U$ nder the disclosure form $11 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Y$ eah.
18	$12 \cdot \cdot \cdot \mathbf{Q} \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot$ like, where it specified that there
19	13 were heating system/cooling system issues that 14 they're aware of, that you could have elected to
20	15 have an inspection done at that time; correct? $16 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes.$
21	<i>Id.</i> at 206:10-16.
22	$15 \cdots Q \cdots O$ kay. So as your attorney said, you could
23	16 have obtained a copy of the permits at any time? 17 Yes?
24	$18 \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes.$ $19 \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot Okay. \cdot And$ then it's fair to say that just
25	20 put you on notice of the potential permit issue; 21 correct?
26	$22 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes.$ $23 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot It$ also put you on notice of the issues of
27	24 everything that's basically specified on page 38; 25 correct?
28	Page 209 $1 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes.$
	Page 9 of 41

	1	
	2	<i>Id.</i> at 209:15-25-210:1, 245:22-25 (could have obtained permit information in 2018).
	3	34. Similarly, Mr. Miao was aware that he should have contacted the local building
	4	department as part of his due diligence:
	5	$22 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot O$ kay. $\cdot$ So you understand that for more
	6	23 information during the diligence process, you should 24 contact the local building department? 25AYes
	7	Page 260 * * *
	8	$\cdot 5 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q$ . $\cdot \cdot - \cdot it$ provides you with the address of the $\cdot 6$ building and safety department; is that correct?
	9	$\cdot 7 \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Y$ es. $\cdot 8 \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot A$ nd the office hours; is that correct?
	10	$\cdot 9 \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Y$ es. 10 $\cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot A$ nd it also provides you with a phone
	11	11 number; correct? $12 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes.$
960	12	$13 \cdots Q$ . And this is information or resources that 14 you could have used at any time related to finding
TEL – (702) 477.7030; FAX – (702) 477.0096	13 14	15 information about the permits of the property; 16 correct? $17 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes.$
AX-(70	15	$18 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q$ . And this would have been true prior to the 19 purchase of the building; correct?
7030; F	16	$20 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes.$ $21 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot And$ this would also have been true at the
02) 477.	17	22 time you read the disclosure that specified that 23 some of the improvements or some of the disclosures
TEL – (7	18	24 had been done without a permit; right? $25 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes.$
	19	<i>Id.</i> at 260:22-25, 261:5-25.
	20	35. Plaintiff was also on notice of the potential for mold and the requirement to get a
	21	mold inspection:
	22	•5••• Q.••Okay.• And it says, "It's the buyer's duty •6 to inspect.• Buyer hereby assumes responsibility to
	23	•7 conduct whatever inspections buyer deems necessary •8 to inspect the property for mold contamination.
	24	•9•••••"Companies able to perform such 10 inspections can be found in the yellow pages under
	25	11 environmental and ecological services." $12 \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot I$ read that correctly? Yes?
	26	$13 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot \cdot Yes.$ $14 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot Okay \cdot And then you elected not to get a$
	27	15 mold inspection; correct? $16 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yeah \cdot \cdot$
	28	
		Page 10 of 41

MICHAEL B. LEE, P.C. 1820 E. SAHARA AVENUE, SUITE 110 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89104

1	<i>Id.</i> at 213:5-16.
2	$\cdot 5 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot So$ you relied upon your own determination
3	•6 related to the potential mold exposure of the •7 property; correct?
4	$\cdot 8 \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes.$ $\cdot 9 \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot Okay. \cdot And you elected to proceed with$
5	10 purchasing it without a professional mold 11 inspection; correct? 12···A.··Yes.
6	$12 \cdots A \cdots 1 es.$
7	<i>Id.</i> at 216:5-12.
8	36. Despite actual knowledge of these issues, Plaintiff did not elect to have a
9	professional inspection done. 160:17-20.
10	37. Finally, Plaintiff was also acutely aware of the requirement of Nevada law to
11	protect itself by getting an inspection:
12	$\cdot 2 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q$ . $\cdot \cdot If$ we go to page 40 $\cdot 3 \cdot \cdot \cdot A$ . $\cdot \cdot Mm$ -hmm.
13	$\cdot 4 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q$ there's a bunch of Nevada statutes $\cdot 5$ here.
14	$\cdot 6 \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Mm$ -hmm. $\cdot 7 \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot If$ you look at NRS 113.140
15	$\cdot 8 \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Mm$ -hmm. $\cdot 9 \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot - \cdot do$ you see that at the top of the page?
16	10 "Disclosure of unknown defects not required Form 11 does not constitute warranty duty of buyer and
17	12 prospective buyer to exercise reasonable care." $13 \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot D0$ you see that?
18	$14 \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes$ . $15 \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot Okay \cdot So$ this disclosure form gave Marie
19	16 Zhu, your wife, a copy of the Nevada law that was 17 applicable to the sale of the property; correct?
20	$18 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yeah.$ $19 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot Okay. \cdot And under NRS 113.1403, it$
21	20 specifies, "Either this chapter or Chapter 645 of 21 the NRS relieves a buyer or prospective buyer of the
22	22 duty to exercise reasonable care to protect 23 himself."
23 24	$24 \cdots \rightarrow \text{Did I read that correctly}?$ $25 \cdots A \cdots \text{Yes.}$
24 25	<i>Id.</i> at 209:2-25.
26	38. Plaintiff assumed the risk of failing to exercise reasonable care to protect itself.
27	There Is No Dispute a Professional Inspection Could Have Revealed the Alleged Issues
28	39. The alleged defects identified by both parties' experts could have been discovered
	Page 11 of 41
	1377

 $T\rm{EL}-(702)\,477.7030;\,FAX-(702)\,477.0096$ MICHAEL B. LEE, P.C. 1820 E. SAHARA AVENUE, SUITE 110 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89104

1	at the time of the original purchase. As to the ability to inspect, Mr. Miao admitted that he had
2	access to the entire building. Id. at 250:22-25. He had access to the attic and looked at it. Id. at
3	251:4-14. Mr. Miao admitted that Plaintiff's expert examined the same areas that he did:
4	$\cdot 6 \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot O$ kay. $\cdot$ So you walked through the property
5	$\cdot$ 7 with him at the time he did his inspection; correct? $\cdot$ 8 $\cdot$ $\cdot$ A. $\cdot$ Right.
6	$9 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q$ . $0$ kay. $0$ During that time, did he inspect 10 any areas that that you did not have access to in
7	11 2017? $12 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes \cdot He didn't go to anything I didn't$
8	13 inspect during 2017 too. $14 \cdots Q \cdots So$ he inspected the same areas you
9	15 inspected? $16 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes$ , yes.
10	<i>Id.</i> at 291:6-16.
11	40. Notably, Plaintiff's expert did not do any destructive testing, so the expert's
12	access was exactly the same as Mr. Miao's original inspection. Id. at 291:1-5.
13	41. Mr. Miao admitted that Plaintiff's expert's inspection of the HVAC, <i>Id.</i> at 292:2-
14	5, 293:18-23, and the plumbing system, Id. at 300:19-25-301:1-4, would have been the same as
15	his in 2017.
16	42. Mr. Miao also admitted that the pictures attached to Plaintiff's expert report were
17	areas that he could have inspected in 2017. Id. at 302:6-13.
18	43. Additionally, Mr. Miao accompanied Defendants' expert during his inspection.
19	Id. at 320:31-25. As before, Mr. Miao had the same access to the Property in 2017 for the areas
20	inspected by Defendants' expert. Id. at 321:1-6.
21	44. Mr. Miao agreed with Defendants' expert that the alleged conditions identified by
22	Plaintiff's expert were "open and obvious":
23	$22 \cdots Q$ . And then the second line down, the first 23 sentence begins, "Items complained about in the Sani
24	24 report were open and obvious in the roof area, attic 25 area, and on the exterior/interior of the property."
25	Page 318
26	$\cdot 3 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q$ . $\cdot \cdot Do$ you agree with this statement? $\cdot 4 \cdot \cdot \cdot A$ . $\cdot \cdot Yes$ .
27	<i>Id.</i> at 318:22-25-319:3-4.
28	
	Page 12 of 41

1 45. He also agreed with Defendants' expert's finding that there was no noticeable 2 sagging in the roof. Id. at 333:20-24. 3 46. Incredibly, Mr. Miao also recognized the deficiency in Plaintiff's expert's report that failed to differentiate between conditions prior to when TKNR owned the Property, while it 4 5 owned it, and those afterwards:  $17 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot -$  midway down the first complete sentence 6 18 says, "The Sani report does not recognize prior 7 19 conditions in existence before any work took place 20 by defendants." 8  $21 \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot$  Do you agree with this statement? Page 321 \* \* \* 9  $\cdot 3 \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot Yes$ , yes. 10 ·4 BY MR. LEE:  $\cdot 5 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot Y$  ou agree with that?  $\cdot O$  kay.  $\cdot 6 \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot A$  gree. 11 12 Id. at 321:17-21 - 322:3-6. This would have also included any issues with the dryer vent and 13 ducts, Id. at 325:3-20, as he recognized that most rentals do not include washer / dryer units. Id. 14 at 326:7-25-327:1-9. 15 No Permits Required for Cosmetic Work by TKNR 47. 16 No dispute exists that TKNR did not need permits for the interior work it had 17 done to the Property. Mr. Miao admitted the following: 18  $\cdot 5 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot$ Number 5 says, "Painting, papering, ·6 tiling, carpeting, cabinets, countertops, interior 19 •7 wall, floor or ceiling covering, and similar finish ·8 work." 20  $\cdot 9 \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot Do$  you see that?  $10 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes.$ 21  $11 \cdot \cdot \cdot \mathbf{Q} \cdot \cdot \mathbf{S}$ o you agree that no permits are required 12 for any of these types of work; correct? 22  $13 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes.$ 23 Id. at 262:5-13. 24 ·1 Window Replacements where no structural member -- no ·2 structural member is altered or changed," that does 25  $\cdot$ 3 not need a permit either; right?  $\cdot 4 \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes.$ 26 Id. at 265:1-4. 27  $17 \cdot \cdot \cdot \mathbf{Q} \cdot \cdot \mathbf{O}$ kay. If you turn the page to 82, 28 18 Plumbing Improvements, no permits required to repair Page 13 of 41

	1		19 or replace the sink; correct?
			$20 \cdot \cdot \cdot \dot{A} \cdot \cdot Y es.$
	2		$21 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot To$ repair or replace a toilet? $22 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes$ .
	3		$23 \cdot \cdot \cdot \mathbf{Q} \cdot \cdot \mathbf{To}$ repair or replace a faucet?
	4		24 A Yes. 25 Q Resurfacing or replacing countertops?
	5		Page 264 $\cdot 1 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes.$
			$\cdot 2 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot \text{Resurfacing shower walls?}$
	6		$\cdot 3 \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes.$ $\cdot 4 \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot Repair or replace shower heads?$
	7		$\cdot 5 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes$ . $\cdot 6 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot Repair or replace rain gutters and down$
	8		·7 spouts?
	9		$\cdot 8 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes.$ $\cdot 9 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot Regrouting tile?$
1	10		$10 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes.$ $11 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot And$ a hose bib, whatever that is.
			$12 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot W$ ater freezer. It's, like, for the
	11		13 filtration of the water. 14. $\cdot \cdot Q_{\cdot} \cdot O$ kay. $\cdot$ And then for the mechanical, no
. 1	12		15 permits required for portable heating appliances; 16 correct.
2 1	13		$17 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes.$
	14		$18 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot For$ portable ventilation appliances? $19 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes$ .
2 4 1	15		$20 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot Or$ portable cooling units; correct? $21 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes$ .
1,00			$22 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot And$ for portable evaporative coolers
	16		23 installed in windows; correct? 24 $A$ Yes.
1	17		
] ]	18	<i>Id</i> . at 264:17-	25-265:1-24.
1	19		Plaintiff Does not Disclose the Alleged Issues to Potential Tenants
2	20	48.	Since the date it purchased the Property, Plaintiff has always been trying to lease
2	21	it. <i>Id</i> . at 330:	:19-25-331:1-2. According to Mr. Miao, the landlord must provide safe housing for
2	22	the tenant:	
2	23		$19 \cdots \cdots$ Then also in according to the law, and
2	24		20 they said it very clearly, because this is 21 residential income property, right, rental income
2	25		22 property, multi-family, we need landlord need 23 provide housing and well-being and for the
2	26		24 tenant. The tenant is not going to do all this 25 inspection. They can't. The burden is on the $Page 120$
2	27		Page 120 ·1 landlord to make sure all these building is safe and 2 in used condition
2	28		·2 in good condition.
			D 14 . f 41

	1	<i>Id.</i> at 120:16-25-121:1-2, 140:10-14. However, they have not done any of the repairs listed by
	2	Plaintiff's expert. <i>Id.</i> at 331:3-12. This illustrates the lack of merit of Plaintiff that there are
	3	underlying conditions with the Property.
	4	49. Moreover, Plaintiff does not provide any notice to the tenants about its expert's
	5	report or this litigation:
	6	$\cdot 6 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot All right$ . In terms of tenants renting
	7	<ul> <li>•7 out the units to any tenants, do you ever provide</li> <li>•8 them with a copy of the Sani report?</li> </ul>
	8	$\cdot 9 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot No.$ 10 $\cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot Do$ you ever provide them with any of the
	9	11 pleadings or the first amended complaint, second 12 amended complaint, the complaint itself?
	10	$13 \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot \text{No.}$
	11	$22 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot O$ kay. $\cdot$ So basically, you just tell them, 23 There's this. $\cdot$ You can inspect the unit if you want;
	12	24 is that it? $25 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot \text{Yeah.} \cdot \text{And also we need to tell is a lot}$
	13	Page 337 1 of things report that we don't need to go to the
+ (701)	14	·2 inside the building. It's wall cracking. It's ·3 outside. You can see.
	15	$\cdot 4 \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot O$ kay. So it's open and obvious for them? $\cdot 5 \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Y$ eah. You can see always outside.
<pre></pre>	16	<i>Id.</i> at 337:6-13, 337:22-25-338:1-5.
	17	50. This illustrates the lack of merit of Plaintiff's claims, proven that it has done
	18	nothing to correct the allegedly deficient conditions that are clearly not so dangerous as it does
	19	not tell prospective tenants about them.
	20	Squatters or Tenants Could Have Damaged the Property
	21	51. Mr. Miao admitted that multiple third parties could have potentially damaged the
	22	Property. The Property has a historic problem with squatters during the time that Plaintiff owned
	23	it:
	24	$12 \cdots Q \cdots Do$ you generally have a squatter problem 13 with the property?
	25	$14 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Y \text{es.} \cdot As a matter of fact, today I just 15 saw the one text message that said one some$
	26	16 people go to my apartment.
	27	<i>Id.</i> at 110:12-16. He also admitted that tenants could have damaged the Property while they
	28	The activity for the also admitted that tenants could have dumaged the Property while they
		Page 15 of 41

TEL - (702) 477.7030; FAX - (702) 477.0096MICHAEL B. LEE, P.C. 1820 E. SAHARA AVENUE, SUITE 110 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89104

1 were occupying it: 2  $\cdot 4 \cdot \cdot \cdot \mathbf{O} \cdot \cdot \mathbf{O}$  kav. So the tenant in this context would •5 have damaged the unit at the time that you owned it; 3  $\cdot 6$  is that fair?  $\cdot 7 \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Maybe \cdot Yes.$ 4  $\cdot 8 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot O$ kay.  $\cdot$  So some of the -- so the damage •9 that was to the water heater system, could the 5 10 tenant have damaged that as well?  $11 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes.$  $12 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot And$  then he could have damaged the cooler 6 13 pump and the valve as well; is that correct? 7  $14 \cdot \cdot \cdot \dot{A} \cdot \cdot Yes.$  $15 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot Okay \cdot \cdot Then on 122$ , these are all issues 8 16 that the tenant could have damaged; is that correct?  $17 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes.$ 9  $18 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot And$  then the same through for 145; is that 19 right? 10  $20 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yes.$ 11 Id. at 306:4-20, 330:5-7. This could also account for the cracking on the walls. Id. at 310:8-12. 12 Tenants could have also damaged the Property if they hit it with their cars. Id. at 332:14-16. 13 No Evidence That Defendants Knew of Alleged Conditions 52. 14 Plaintiff's case is based on assertions that Defendants knew about the alleged 15 conditions in the Property; however, Mr. Miao admitted that there is no evidence that shows 16 Defendants knew about them. Id. at 245:1-13 (speculating that InvestPro made changes). 17 53. The entire case is based on Mr. Miao's personal belief and speculation. Id. at 18 253:17-19. 19 54. Mr. Miao admitted that he has no evidence Defendants knew about the alleged 20 moisture conditions. Id. at 293:24-25-294:1-3. Additionally, he also admitted that there is no 21 evidence that Defendants knew about the alleged issues with the plumbing system. Id. at 22 301:21-24. He also admitted that he did not know if Defendants knew about the alleged issues 23 with the duct work when they owned the Property. Id. at 314:5-19. He also recognized the 24 deficiency in Plaintiff's expert's report that failed to differentiate between conditions prior to 25 when TKNR owned the Property, while it owned it, and those afterwards. Id. at 321:17-21 – 26 322:3-6. 27 Mr. Miao recognized that a 63-year-old property could have issues that were not 55.

Page 16 of 41

caused by Defendants. Id. at 324:6-15. This would have also included any issues with the dryer

MICHAEL B. LEE, P.C. 1820 E. Sahara Avenue, suite 110 Las Vegas, Nevada 89104 fel – (702) 477.7030; Fax – (702) 477.0096

6

2

3

4

MICHAEL B. LEF, P.C. 1820 E. SAHARA AVENUE, SUITE 110 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89104 Del - (702) 477.7030; FAX - (702) 477.0096

10 Defendants should have been aware of any of the issues when Mr. Miao, a self-professed expert, did not even know about them following his inspection. 11 12 No Basis for Claims for RICO and/or Related to Flipping Fund 13 58. The Flipping Fund had nothing to do with Plaintiff's decision to purchase the Property. Id. at 223:15-25. 14 15  $20 \cdot \cdot \cdot Q \cdot \cdot Yeah \cdot So$  there's no way that you relied 21 upon any flipping fund since it would have been 16 22 closed at this time; right?  $23 \cdot \cdot \cdot A \cdot \cdot Yeah.$ 17 18 Id. at 274:20-23. He also admitted that he never received any pro forma, private placement 19 information, calculations of profit and loss, capital contribution requirements, member share or 20 units, or any such information about the Flipping Fund. Id. at 277:7-16. 21 Cost of Repairs 59. 22 Mr. Miao contacted contractors to bid the potential cost of repair for the Property 23 and determined that it would have been \$102,873.00. Id. at 307:6-22. However, Plaintiff's 24 expert opined that the cost of repair would have been \$600,000, although he did not provide an 25 itemized cost of repair. *Id.* at 334:17-21. 26 27 Allegations in the Second Amended Complaint 28 60. On November 23, 2020, Plaintiff filed its Second Amended Complaint ("SAC"). Page 17 of 41 1383

1 vent and ducts, *Id.* at 325:3-20, and when the duct became disconnected. *Id.* at 329:1-16.

56. Plaintiff did not identify any discovery illustrating a genuine issue of material fact that Defendants knew of the alleged issues with the Property that they had not already disclosed on Seller's Disclosures.

5 57. Notably, during Mr. Miao's due diligence period, he spoke with the tenants of the 6 Property. *Id.* at 163:12-25-164:1-6. This included a conversation with the long-term tenant of 7 Unit A, who still resides in the Property to this day. *Id.* At that time, the tenant reported being 8 very happy with the Property and had no complaints. *Id.* In fact, the tenant reported still being 9 very happy with the Property. *Id.* at 170:7-9. This illustrates that there is no basis that 10 Defendants should have been aware of any of the issues when Mr. Miao, a self-professed expert, 11 did not even know about them following his inspection

Based on the admissions of Mr. Miao and the waivers related to the RPA and the 2<sup>nd</sup> RPA, these 1 2 allegations illustrate the overall frivolous nature of this action and why Rule 11 sanctions are 3 appropriate: 25. 4 TKNR failed to disclose one or more known condition(s) that materially affect(s) the value or use of the Subject Property in 5 an adverse manner, as required by NRS Chapter 113, in a particular NRS 113.130. \* \* \* 6 27. Factual statements from the August 7, 2017 Seller Real 7 Property Disclosure Form (SRPDF) are set forth in Paragraph 31 and the subsections thereof state whe (sic) the disclosures were 8 either inadequate or false. The SRPDF states that it was prepared, presented and initialed by Kenny Lin. 9 \* \* \* Since the Subject Property is a residential rental apartment, 29. 10 to protect tenants and consumers, the applicable local building code requires all renovation, demolition, and construction work 11 must be done by licensed contractors with permits and inspections to ensure compliance with the Uniform Building Code [UBC]. 12 \* \* \* 31. Defendants Lin, Investpro, as TKNR's agent, TKNR, 13 Wong and INVESTPRO MANAGER LLC, as the true owner of the Subject Property, did not disclose any and all known conditions 14 and aspects of the property which materially affect the value or use of residential property in an adverse manner, as itemized below. 15 a. SRPDF stated that Electrical System had no problems 16 or defects. The fact is that many new electric lines were added and many old electric lines were removed by 17 Investpro Manager LLC . The swamp coolers that were removed were supplied by 110 volt power supply lines. 18 Investpro Manager LLC first added one 220v power supply line for one new 5 ton heat pump package unit on one roof 19 top area for the whole building for Unit A. Unit B and Unit C. Investro (sic) Manager, LLC then removed the one year 20 old 5 ton heat pump packaged unit from the roof top with power supply lines and added two new 220v power supply 21 lines for two new 2 ton heart pump package units, one each for Unit B and Unit C. 22 Inestpro (sic) Manager, LLC then added one new 110 volt power supply line for two window cooling units for Unit A. 23 The electrical system load for Unit A was increased due to the installation of two new cooling units and required 100 24 amp service, but the electrical service was not upgraded to 100 amp service from the existing 50 amp service. Failure 25 to upgrade the electrical service caused the fuses to be blown out multiple times during the cooling seasons of 2018. The tenants in Unit A could not use air conditioning 26 units in cooling seasons of 2018, causing Unit A to be 27 uninhabitable until the Unit A electrical supply panel was upgraded to 100 amp service. 28 All the electrical supply line addition and removal work Page 18 of 41

1384

MICHAEL B. LEE, P.C. 1820 E. SAHARA AVENUE, SUITE 110 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89104 Fel – (702) 477.7030; FAX – (702) 477.0096 were performed without code required electrical load calculation, permits and inspections. To save money, minimize flipping cost, minimize flipping time, maximize flipping fund profits, Investpro Manager LLC used unlicensed and unskilled workers to do the electrical work and used low quality materials used inadequate electrical supply lines.

Further, to save money, minimize flipping cost, minimize flipping time, maximize flipping fund profits, Investpro Manager LLC used unskilled workers who did not know the UBC requirements to do the electrical work This substandard work may lead electrical lines to overheat and cause fires in the attic when tenant electrical load is high.

Further, to save money, minimize flipping cost, minimize flipping time, maximize flipping fund profits, Investpro Manager LLC used unskilled workers who did not know the UBC requirements to do the electrical work. The outlets near the water faucets in kitchens, bathrooms and laundry areas were not GFCI outlets as required by the UBC.

b. SRPDF stated that Plumbing System had no problems or defects

The fact is that that within two years prior to the sale to Plaintiff, Investpro Manager LLC removed and plugged swamp cooler water supply lines without UBC required permits and inspections. To save money, minimize flipping cost, minimize flipping time, and maximize flipping fund profits, Investpro Manager LLC used unlicensed and unskilled workers who just plugged high pressure water supply lines at rooftop instead of at ground level and who did not remove the water supply lines on top of the roof, inside the attic and behind the drywall. In cold winter, the high pressure water line which was left inside the building may freeze and break the copper line and lead flooding in the whole building.

Further, to save money, minimize flipping cost, minimize flipping time, and maximize flipping fund profits, Investpro Manager LLC used unlicensed and unskilled workers to remove and plug natural gas lines for the natural gas wall furnaces without UBC required permits and inspections.

Further, to save money, minimize flipping cost, minimize flipping time, and maximize flipping fund profits, Investpro Manager LLC used unlicensed and unskilled workers with little knowledge of natural gas pipe connection requirements. The unlicensed and unskilled workers used the wrong sealing materials and these sealing materials may degrade and lead to natural gas leaks and accumulation inside the drywall and the attic which may cause an explosion or fire.

Further, to save money, minimize flipping cost, minimize flipping time, and maximize flipping fund profits, Investpro Manager LLC used unlicensed and unskilled workers to completely renovate all three bathrooms in the Subject Property without UBC required permits and inspections. Some faucets and connections behind tile walls and drywall

MICHAEL B. LEE, P.C. 1820 E. SAHARA AVENUE, SUITE 110 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89104 FeL - (702) 477.7030; FAX - (702) 477.0096 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

leak and are causing moisture conditions behind tile walls and drywalls.

c. SRPDF stated that Sewer System and line had no problems or defects.

The subject property was built in 1954. Clay pipes were used at that time for sewer lines. Before the sale, within few days after tenants moved into apartment Unit B, they experienced clogged sewer line which caused the bathrooms to be flooded. The tenants called Investpro to ask them to fix the clogged pipes and address the flooding issues. After this report, Investpro asked tenants to pay to hire plumber to snake the sewer line. After tenants threatened to call the Las Vegas code enforcement office, to save money, minimize flipping cost, minimize flipping time, and maximize flipping fund profits, Investpro used unlicensed and unskilled workers to snake the clay sewer pipes. Licensed contractors must be hired to snake sewer pipes as code required. This approach to clearing the clog may break the clay sewer pipes and cause future tree root grown into sewer lines and clogs in sewer lines.

d. SRPDF stated that Heating System had problems or defects.

No full explanation was provided, as required. Investro (sic) Manager, LLC disabled natural gas heating system without UBC required permits and inspections. To save money, minimize flipping cost, minimize flipping time, and maximize flipping fund profits, Investpro Manager LLC used unlicensed and unskilled workers with little knowledge about natural gas pipe connection requirements. They used the wrong sealing materials and these sealing materials may degrade and lead to a natural gas leak inside the drywall and the attic and may cause an explosion or fire.

Further, Investpro Manager LLC installed two electrical heat pump heating systems without UBC required permits and inspections for Unit B and Unit C. The Unit A does not have an electrical heat pump heating system nor a natural gas wall furnace heating system now. Unit A has to use portable electrical heaters.

e. SRPDF stated that the Cooling System had problems or defects

No full explanation was provided, as required. Investro (sic) Manager, LLC removed old swamp cooler systems without UBC required permits and inspections. To save money, minimize flipping cost, minimize flipping time, and maximize flipping fund profits, Investpro used unlicensed and unskilled workers to disconnect water supply lines, cover swamp cooler ducting holes, and disconnect 110V electrical supply lines.

Further, as early as March of 2016, Investro Manager, LLC hired Air Supply Cooling to install one five ton new heat pump package unit with new rooftop ducting systems on

 $\Gamma EL - (702) 477.7030; FAX - (702) 477.0096$ 1820 E. SAHARA AVENUE, SUITE 110 MICHAEL B. LEE, P.C. LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89104

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

one roof area to supply cooling and heating air to the whole building consisting of Unit A, Unit B and Unit C without UBC required weight load and wind load calculations, permits and inspections. The five ton heat pumps package unit was too big, too heavy and had control problems. To save money, minimize flipping cost, minimize flipping time, and maximize flipping fund profits, Investpro Manager LLC also used unlicensed and unskilled workers to remove the one year old five ton heat pump package unit with ducting system without UBC required permits and inspections. All of this work was done without UBC required structural calculation, permits and inspections.

Further, in early June, 2017, Investro Manager, LLC hired The AIRTEAM to install two new two ton heat pump package units, one each for Unit B and Unit C. Invespro (sic) Manager, LLC also used unlicensed

and unskilled workers to install two window cooling units in Unit A's exterior walls. All of the above work was done without UBC required permits and inspections.

Further, to save money, minimize flipping cost, minimize flipping time, and maximize flipping fund profits, Investro Manager, LLC did not replace the old, uninsulated swamp cooler ducts with new insulated HVAC ducts as the UBC required. This resulted in the heat pump package units being overloaded and damaged during cooling season because cool air was heated by uninsulated attic hot air before delivering the cooled air to the rooms. The old, uninsulated swamp cooler ducts were also rusted and leaked due to high moisture air from the bathroom vent fans and the clothes washer/dryer combination unit exhaust vents. The heat pumps would run all the time but still could not cool the rooms.

f. SRPDF stated that Smoker detector had no problems or defects

During Plaintiff's inspection at August 10, 2017 afternoon, some smoke detectors were missing.

g. SRPDF stated that no Previous or current moisture conditions and or water damage.

To save money, minimize flipping cost, minimize flipping time, and maximize flipping fund profits, Investro Manager, LLC used unlicensed and unskilled workers to vent high moisture bathroom fan exhaust and washer/dryer combination unit exhaust into the ceiling attic area instead of venting outside the building roof without UBC required permits and inspections. The improper ventings caused high moisture conditions in ceiling attic and water damages in ceiling and attic. The high moisture conditions in the ceiling attic destroyed ceiling attic insulations, damaged the roof decking, damaged roof trusses and damaged roof structure supports.

To saving money, minimize flipping cost, minimize flipping time, and maximize flipping fund profits, Investpro Manager LLC used unlicensed and unskilled workers to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

complete renovation to all three bathrooms without UBC required permits and inspections. Some faucets and connections behind tile walls and drywall leaks and caused moisture conditions behind tile walls and drywalls.

h. SRPDF stated that there was no structure defect.

Investpro Manager LLC added one new five ton heat pump package unit with ducting systems on the one roof top area for the whole building in early March, 2016 without UBC required weight load and wind load calculation, permits and inspections. Due to the five ton heat pump package unit being too big, too heavy and having control problems to save money, minimize flipping cost, minimize flipping time, and maximize flipping fund profits, Investro (sic) Manager, LLC used unlicensed and unskilled workers to remove the one year old five ton heat pump package unit with part of the ducting system again without UBC required permits and inspections. Investpro Manager LLC added two new two ton heat pump package units on the two roof top areas for Unit B and Unit C with new ducting systems without UBC required weight load and wind loan calculation, permits and inspections.

Further, to save money, minimize flipping cost, minimize flipping time, and maximize flipping fund profits, Investpro Manager LLC used unlicensed and unskilled workers to open two new window holes on

exterior walls for two window cooling units in Unit A without UBC required structure calculation, permits and inspections. This work damaged the building structure.

Further, the moisture condition behind tile walls and drywall due to faucets leaking damaged the building structure.

Further, Investpro Manager LLC's unlicensed and unskilled workers used the space between two building support columns as a duct to vent high moisture exhaust from the washer/dryer combination unit exhaust vent from Unit A without UBC required permits and inspections and this damaged the building structure.

The recent inspection of the exterior wall found multiple cracks which indicates structural problems caused by the heavy load on the roof.

i. SRPDF marked Yes and NO for construction, modification, alterations or repairs made without required state. city or county building permits.

Defendants Lin, Investpro, as TKNR's agent, TKNR, and Wong did not provide detailed explanations. All renovation, demolition, and construction work was done by Investpro Manager LLC using unlicensed, and unskilled workers without UBC required weight load and wind load calculations, permits and inspections.

j. SRPDF stated that there were not any problems with the roof.

The roof of the Subject Property was damaged by changing

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

roof top HVAC units and ducting systems multiple times from October, 2015to June, 2017. Investpro Manager LLC removed the existing swamp coolers from roof top and covered the swamp coolers ducting holes. Investpro Manager LLC added a five ton heat pump package unit with a new ducting system on one roof top area in March, 2016. Investpro the removed the one year old five ton heat pump package unit with part of the ducting system from the one roof top area in June,2017. Then Investpro Manager LLC added two two ton heat pump package units on the two roof top areas in June, 2017. The work damaged the roof of the Subject Property to such an extent that when it rains the roof leaks. All of this renovation, demolition, and construction work was done without UBC required weight load and wind load calculations, permits and inspections and this damaged the building roof structure.

k. SRPDF stated that no there were not any fungus or mold problems.

To save money, minimize flipping cost, minimize flipping time, and maximize flipping fund profits, Investpro Manager LLC vented the bathroom high moisture fans and the washer/dryer combination unit exhaust vents into the ceiling and attic without venting outside of the roof. All of this renovation, demolition, and construction work was done without UBC required permits and inspections and this damaged the building structure. After the purchase of the Subject Property, Plaintiff discovered black color fungus mold was found inside ceiling and attic.

1. SRPDF stated that there were not any other conditions or aspects of the property which materially affect its value or use in an adverse manner.

i. Problems with flooring.

To save money, minimize flipping cost, minimize flipping time, and maximize flipping fund profits, Investpro Manager LLC used unlicensed and unskilled workers to lay low quality cheap ceramic tiles on the loose sandy ground rather than on a strong, smooth, concrete floor base. Within few months after tenants moving into the Subject Property, mass quantities of floor ceramic tiles cracked and the floor buckled. These cracked ceramic tiles may cut tenants' toes and create a trip and fall hazard. These are code violations had to be repaired before the units could be rented to tenants. The plaintiff has to spend lot money to replace all ceramic tile floor in Unit C with vinyl tile floor. ii. Problems with the land/foundation.

Within few months after tenants moved into the Subject Property in 2017, large quantities of floor tiles cracked and the floor buckled. This indicated that there may have foundation problems likely due to heavy loads by the new HVAC systems and the venting of moisture into the ceiling and attic. Too much weight loads on the walls caused exterior wall

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

23

cracking.

iii. Problems with closet doors. To save money, minimize flipping cost, minimize flipping time, and maximize flipping fund profits, Investpro Manager LLC used unlicensed and unskilled workers to install closet doors with poor quality for Unit C, all closet doors fell down in three months after tenant move into Unit C.

61. As to 31(a), Mr. Miao admitted that the Seller's Disclosures disclosed issues with the heating and cooling systems, the use of a handyman, and the lack of permits. Additionally, he specified that he noted issues with the electrical system and items not up to code at the time that he did his inspection and/or that any issues with the electrical system were "open and obvious" that a reasonable, professional inspection could have discovered in 2017. Despite these issues, Plaintiff chose not to have a professional inspection. Incredibly, Mr. Miao admitted that he was the person who asked for TKNR to install the GFCI outlets, so he was clearly aware of this issue as well. Moreover, Mr. Miao specified that this was a condition that Plaintiff could have inspected at or before the time it had originally purchased the Property. Notably, Mr. Miao admitted that no evidence showed that Defendants were aware of any of these issues.

62. As to 31(b), Mr. Miao admitted that the Seller's Disclosures disclosed issues with the heating and cooling systems, the use of a handyman, the lack of permits, and issues with the sprinklers. Additionally, he specified that he noted issues with the plumbing system were "open and obvious" that a reasonable, professional inspection could have discovered in 2017. Despite 20 these issues, Plaintiff chose not to have a professional inspection. Moreover, Mr. Miao specified that this was a condition that Plaintiff could have inspected at or before the time it had originally purchased the Property. Notably, Mr. Miao admitted that no evidence showed that Defendants 22 were aware of any of these issues.

As to 31(c), Mr. Miao admitted that the Seller's Disclosures disclosed the use of a 24 63. 25 handyman, the lack of permits, and issues with the sprinklers. Additionally, he specified that he 26 noted issues with the sewer system were "open and obvious" that a reasonable, professional 27 inspection could have discovered in 2017. Despite these issues, Plaintiff chose not to have a 28 professional inspection. Moreover, Mr. Miao specified that this was a condition that Plaintiff



16

17

18

19

MICHAEL B. LEE, P.C. 820 E. SAHARA AVENUE, SUITE 110

1

2

3

4

5

6

could have inspected at or before the time it had originally purchased the Property. Notably, Mr. Miao admitted that no evidence showed that Defendants were aware of any of these issues.

64. As to 31(d), Mr. Miao admitted that the Seller's Disclosures disclosed issues with the heating and cooling systems, the use of a handyman, and the lack of permits. Additionally, he specified that he did his inspection and/or that any issues with the heating system were "open and obvious" that a reasonable, professional inspection could have discovered in 2017. Despite these issues, Plaintiff chose not to have a professional inspection. Moreover, Mr. Miao specified that this was a condition that Plaintiff could have inspected at or before the time it had originally purchased the Property. Notably, Mr. Miao admitted that no evidence showed that Defendants were aware of any of these issues.

65. As to 31(e), Mr. Miao admitted that the Seller's Disclosures disclosed issues with the heating and cooling systems, the use of a handyman, and the lack of permits. Additionally, he specified that he noted issues with the heating and cooling system and items not up to code at the time that he did his inspection and/or that any issues with the heating and cooling system were "open and obvious" that a reasonable, professional inspection could have discovered in 2017. Despite these issues, Plaintiff chose not to have a professional inspection. Moreover, Mr. Miao specified that this was a condition that Plaintiff could have inspected at or before the time it had originally purchased the Property. Notably, Mr. Miao admitted that no evidence showed that Defendants were aware of any of these issues.

20 66. As to 31(f), this allegation illustrates that Plaintiff had knowledge before 21 purchasing the Property, and the overall emphasis on the failure to obtain a professional 22 inspection of the Property prior to purchasing it.

23 67. As to 31(g), (k), Mr. Miao admitted Plaintiff executed the mold and moisture 24 waiver, and understood its affirmative duty to have an inspection done prior to the purchase of He also admitted that the Seller's Disclosures disclosed the use of a 25 the Property. 26 handyman, installation of the cabinetry, bathrooms, and the lack of permits. Additionally, he 27 specified that he personally inspected the attic and the dryer vent before Plaintiff purchased the 28 Property. Despite these issues, Plaintiff chose not to have a professional inspection. Moreover,

Mr. Miao specified that this was a condition that Plaintiff could have inspected at or before the time it had originally purchased the Property. Notably, Mr. Miao admitted that no evidence showed that Defendants were aware of any of these issues.

4

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

68. As to 31(h), Mr. Miao admitted that the Seller's Disclosures disclosed issues with the heating and cooling systems, the use of a handyman, and the lack of permits. Mr. Miao admitted that there was visible cracking on the foundation, walls, and the tiles that were open and obvious at the time that Plaintiff purchased the Property in 2017. Moreover, Mr. Miao specified that this was a condition that Plaintiff could have inspected at or before the time it had originally purchased the Property. Notably, Mr. Miao admitted that no evidence showed that Defendants were aware of any of these issues.

69. As to 31(i), this allegation illustrates the prior knowledge that Plaintiff had before purchasing the Property, and the overall emphasis on the failure to obtain a professional inspection of the Property prior to purchasing it. Mr. Miao admitted that he should have followed up related to the permit issue prior to Plaintiff purchasing the Property.

70. As to 31(j), Mr. Miao admitted that the Seller's Disclosures disclosed issues with 16 the heating and cooling systems, the use of a handyman, and the lack of permits. Additionally, 17 he specified that he noted issues were "open and obvious" that a reasonable, professional 18 inspection could have discovered in 2017. Mr. Miao agreed that there was no noticeable sagging 19 Despite these issues, Plaintiff chose not to have a professional inspection. on the roof. 20 Moreover, Mr. Miao specified that this was a condition that Plaintiff could have inspected at or 21 before the time it had originally purchased the Property. Notably, Mr. Miao admitted that no 22 evidence showed that Defendants were aware of any of these issues.

23 71. As to 31(1), Mr. Miao admitted that the Seller's Disclosures disclosed issues with 24 the heating and cooling systems, the use of a handyman, and the lack of permits. Mr. Miao 25 admitted that there was visible cracking on the foundation, walls, and the tiles that were open and 26 obvious at the time that Plaintiff purchased the Property in 2017. Mr. Miao noted that this 27 condition could have been inspected at or prior to the Property's purchase. Mr. Miao 28 acknowledged there was no evidence that Defendants were aware of these issues.

Page 26 of 41

1	<u>Plaintiffs Did Not Reply on Broker Agents</u>
2	72. As to the Broker Defendants, Ms. Zhu agreed that she was not relying upon any
3	representations made by Brokers or Broker's agent. Ms. Zhu agreed to purchase the Property
4	AS-IS, WHERE-IS, without any representations or warranties. Ms. Zhu waived all claims
5	against Brokers or their agents for (a) defects in the Property (h) factors related to Ms. Zhu's
6	failure to conduct walk-throughs or inspections. Ms. Zhu assumed full responsibility and agreed
7	to conduct such tests, walk-throughs, inspections and research, as she deemed necessary. In any
8	event, Broker's liability was limited, under any and all circumstances, to the amount of that
9	Broker's commission/fee received in the transaction.
10	Mr. Miao Agreed with Defendants' Expert
11	73. On November 17, 2020, Defendants' expert, Neil D. Opfer, an Associate
12	Professor of Construction Management at UNLV and overqualified expert, conducted an
13	inspection of the Property. At that time, as noted earlier, Mr. Miao walked the Property with
14	Professor Opfer. Supplement at 320:31-25.
15	74. Mr. Miao agreed with Professor Opfer that the alleged conditions identified by
16	Plaintiff's alleged expert were open and obvious:
17	[n]ote that the Plaintiff could have hired an inspector or contractor to evaluate this real-estate purchase beforehand but did not. Items
18 19	complained about in the Sani Report were open and obvious at the roof area, attic area, and on the exterior and interior areas of the Property.
20	<i>Id.</i> at 318:22-25-319:3-4.
21	75. Mr. Miao agreed with Professor Opfer that Plaintiff's expert did not conduct
22	destructive testing, so the same alleged conditions that the expert noted would have been made
23	by an inspector at the time of the purchase. <i>Id.</i> at 291:1-5.
24	76. Mr. Miao agreed with Professor Opfer that Plaintiff's expert did "not recognize
25	prior conditions in existence before any work took place by the Defendants." Id. at 321:17-21 –
26	322:3-6.
27	Conclusions of Law
28	1. Summary judgment is appropriate when the pleadings, depositions, answers to
	Page 27 of 41
	1393

1 interrogatories, admissions, and affidavits, if any, that are properly before the Court demonstrate 2 that no genuine issue of material fact exist, and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a 3 matter of law. Pegasus v. Reno Newspapers, Inc., 118 Nev. 706, 713, 57 P.3d 82, 87 (2002). 4 Substantive law controls whether factual disputes are material and will preclude summary 5 judgment; other factual disputes are irrelevant. Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 6 106 S. Ct. 2505, 91 L.Ed.2d 202 (1986). A genuine issue of material fact is one where the 7 evidence is such that a reasonable jury could return a verdict for the non-moving party. Valley 8 Bank v. Marble, 105 Nev. 366, 367, 775 P.2d 1278, 1282 (1989).

2. The Nevada Supreme Court has held that the non-moving party may not defeat a motion for summary judgment by relying "on gossamer threads of whimsy, speculation and conjecture." *Wood v. Safeway*, 121 Nev. 724, 732, 121 P.3d 1026, 1031 (2005). The Nevada Supreme Court has also made it abundantly clear when a motion for summary judgment is made and supported as required by Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure 56, the non-moving party must not rest upon general allegations and conclusions, but must by affidavit or otherwise set forth specific facts demonstrating the existence of a genuine factual issue. *Id*.

3. Under Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure 56(a), a party may move for summary judgment, or partial summary judgment. "The court shall grant summary judgment if the movant shows that there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law." The court may rely upon the admissible evidence cited in the moving papers and may also consider other materials in the record as well. *Id.* at 56(c). "If the court does not grant all the relief requested by the motion, it may enter an order stating any material fact — including an item of damages or other relief — that is not genuinely in dispute and treating the fact as established in the case." *Id.* at 56(g).

4. The pleadings and proof offered in a Motion for Summary Judgment are
construed in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. *Hoopes v. Hammargren*, 102
Nev. 425, 429, 725 P.2d 238, 241 (1986). However, the non-moving party still "bears the
burden to 'do more than simply show that there is some metaphysical doubt' as to the operative
facts in order to avoid summary judgment being entered." *Wood*, 121 Nev. at 732, 121 P.3d at

MICHAEL B. LEE, P.C. 1820 E. SAHARA AVENUE, SUITE 110 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89104 IEL – (702) 477.7030; FAX – (702) 477.0096 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1031. "To successfully defend against a summary judgment motion, 'the nonmoving party must
 transcend the pleadings and, by affidavit or other admissible evidence, introduce specific facts
 that show a genuine issue of material fact." *Torrealba v. Kesmetis*, 178 P.3d 716, 720 (Nev.
 2008) (quoting *Cuzze v. Univ. & Cmty. Coll. Sys. of Nev.*, 172 P.3d 131, 134 (Nev. 2007).

5. The non-moving party bears the burden to set forth specific facts demonstrating the existence of a "genuine" issue for trial or have summary judgment entered against him. *Collins v. Union Federal Savings & Loan,* 99 Nev. 284, 294, 662 P.2d 610, 618-619 (1983). When there is no genuine issue of material fact and the non-moving party provides no admissible evidence to the contrary, summary judgment is "mandated." *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett,* 477 US 317, 322 (1986). When a motion for summary judgment is made and supported, an adversary party who does not set forth specific facts showing a genuine issue to be resolved at trial may have a summary judgment entered against him. *Collins v. Union Federal Sav. & Loan Ass 'n,* 99 Nev. 284, 294, 662 P.2d 610, 616 (1983) (citing *Van Cleave v. Kietz-Mill Minit Mart,* 97 Nev. 414, 633 P.2d 1220 (1981); *Bird v. Casa Royale West,* 97 Nev. 67, 624 P.2d 17 (1981)).

6. "Under NRS Chapter 113, residential property sellers are required to disclose any defects to buyers within a specified time before the property is conveyed." *Nelson v. Heer*, 163 P.3d 420, 425 (Nev. 2007) (citing NRS 113.140(1)). "NRS 113.140(1), however, provides that a seller is not required to 'disclose a defect in residential property of which [she] is not aware.' A 'defect' is defined as "a condition that materially affects the value or use of residential property in an adverse manner." *Id.* (citing NRS 113.100(1)). The Nevada Supreme Court clarified that:

[a]scribing to the term "aware" its plain meaning, we determine that the seller of residential real property does not have a duty to disclose a defect or condition that "materially affects the value or use of residential property in an adverse manner," if the seller does not realize, perceive, or have knowledge of that defect or condition. Any other interpretation of the statute would be unworkable, as it is impossible for a seller to disclose conditions in the property of which he or she has no realization, perception, or knowledge. The determination of whether a seller is aware of a defect, however, is a question of fact to be decided by the trier of fact.

*Id.* at 425 (citations omitted). Thus, in the context where the plaintiff cannot demonstrate an
omitted disclosure that caused damage, the seller is entitled to summary judgment as a matter of



1 law. *Id.* at 426.

2 7. Generally, "[n]ondisclosure by the seller of adverse information concerning real 3 property . . . will not provide the basis for an action by the buyer to rescind or for damages when 4 property is sold 'as is.' " Mackintosh v. Jack Matthews & Co., 109 Nev. 628, 633, 855 P.2d 549, 5 552 (1993). Moreover, "[1]iability for nondisclosure is generally not imposed where the buyer 6 either knew of or could have discovered the defects prior to the purchase." Land Baron Invs., 7 Inc. v. Bonnie Springs Family LP, 131 Nev. 686, 696, 356 P.3d 511, 518 (2015). The general 8 rule foreclosing liability for nondisclosure when property is purchased as-is does not apply when 9 the seller knows of facts materially affecting the value or desirability of the property which are 10 known or accessible only to [the seller] and also knows that such facts are not known to, or 11 within the reach of the diligent attention and observation of the buyer. *Mackintosh*, 109 Nev. at 12 633, 855 P.2d at 552 (alteration in original) (internal quotation marks omitted).

13 8. A buyer waives its common law claims of negligent misrepresentation, fraudulent 14 or intentional misrepresentation, and/or unjust enrichment when it expressly agreed that it would 15 carry the duty to inspect the property and ensure that all aspects of it were suitable prior to close 16 of escrow, and the information was reasonably accessible to the buyer. Frederic and Barbara 17 Rosenberg Living Tr. v. MacDonald Highlands Realty, LLC, 427 P.3d 104, 111 (Nev. 2018). 18 Accordingly, the Nevada Supreme Court concluded that an agreement to purchase property as-is 19 foreclosed the buyer's common law claims, justifying the granting of summary judgment on 20 common law claims. Id. (citation omitted).

> The terms and conditions of the purchase agreement do not create a duty to disclose. Rather, these disclosures are required by NRS Chapter 113, which sets forth specific statutory duties imposed by law independent of the purchase agreement's terms and conditions. Additionally, the terms of the purchase agreement do not require [the seller] to do anything other than provide the listed disclosures.

25 Anderson v. Ford Ranch, LLC, 78684-COA, 2020 WL 6955438, at \*5 (Nev. App. Nov. 25, 2020).

9. Nevada Revised Statute § 113.140 clearly provides that the Seller Disclosures
does not constitute a warranty of the Subject Property and that the Buyer still has a duty to

Page 30 of 41

21

22

23

1 exercise reasonable care to protect himself. Nevada Revised Statute § 113.140 also provides that 2 the Seller does not have to disclose any defect that he is unaware of. Similarly, Nevada Revised 3 Statute § 113.130 does not require a seller to disclose a defect in residential property of which 4 the seller is not aware. A completed disclosure form does not constitute an express or implied 5 warranty regarding any condition of residential property. Nevada Revised Statute § 113.140(2). 6 Chapters 113 and "645 of Nevada Revised Statutes do not relieve a buyer or prospective buyer of 7 the duty to exercise reasonable care to protect himself or herself." Id. at \$ 113.140(2).

8 10. Summary Judgment is appropriate as a matter of law on all of Plaintiff's claims. 9 It is undisputed that the alleged deficiencies were either disclosed by Defendants, could have 10 been discovered by an inspection, were open and obvious whereby Plaintiff / Ms. Zhu / Mr. 11 Miao had notice of them at the time Plaintiff purchased the Property, or were unknown to 12 Defendants at the time of the sale.

On August 2, 2017, TKNR submitted its Seller Disclosures timely indicating all 11. known conditions of the Subject Property. TKNR disclosed that "3 units has (sic) brand new AC installed within 3 months," and further that the "owner never resided in the property and never 16 visited the property." Plaintiff was also aware that the minor renovations, such as painting, was conducted by the Seller's "handyman" as disclosed in the Seller's Disclosures. TNKR also disclosed that it was aware of issues with the heating and cooling systems, there was construction, modification, alterations, or repairs done without permits, and lead-based paints.

20 12. On August 11, 2020, through the original RPA, Ms. Zhu waived her due 21 diligence, although she had a right to conduct inspections:

> During such Period, Buyer shall have the right to conduct, noninvasive/non-destructive inspections of all structural, roofing, mechanical, electrical, plumbing, heating/air conditioning, water/well/septic, pool/spa, survey, square footage, and any other property or systems, through licensed and bonded contractors or other qualified professionals.

26 13. Section II(B)(1) lists the disclosures by TKNR. Despite these disclosures, 27 Plaintiff did not inspect the Subject Property, request additional information and/or conduct any 28 reasonable inquires. Ms. Zhu cancelled the original RPA, Ex. E, because of an issue related to

Page 31 of 41

rel - (702) 477.7030; Fax - (702) 477.0096 820 E. SAHARA AVENUE, SUITE 110 MICHAEL B. LEE, P.C. LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89104

13

14

15

17

18

19

22

23

24

1 her financing, unrelated to the Seller's Disclosures. Notably, she included the explicit waiver of 2 the inspections, which included her initialing the provision that she had not done in the original 3 RPA. Ms. Zhu informed her agent to waive all inspections. Although Ms. Zhu had actual 4 knowledge of the Seller's Disclosures from August 11, 2017, and the Parties agreed to extend the 5 COE to January 5, 2018, Ms. Zhu still never did any professional inspections. Instead, she put 6 down an additional \$60,000 as a non-refundable deposit to the TNKR. Moreover, she also 7 agreed to pay rent in the amount of \$650 per month for one of the units, and to also pay the property manager \$800 for the tenant placement fee. Through Addendum 2 to the 2<sup>nd</sup> RPA. Ms. 8 9 Zhu later changed the purchaser to Plaintiff.

14. Ms. Zhu agreed that she was not relying upon any representations made by Brokers or Broker's agent. Ms. Zhu agreed to purchase the Property AS-IS, WHERE-IS, without any representations or warranties. Thus, Ms. Zhu waived all claims against Brokers or their agents for (a) defects in the Property . . . (h) factors related to Ms. Zhu's failure to conduct walk-throughs or inspections. Ms. Zhu assumed full responsibility and agreed to conduct such tests, walk-throughs, inspections and research, as she deemed necessary. In any event, Broker's liability was limited, under any and all circumstances, to the amount of that Broker's commission/fee received in the transaction.

15. As to the waivers, Paragraph 7(D) of the both the RPA and  $2^{nd}$  RPA expressly provided:

It is strongly recommended that Buyer retain licensed Nevada professionals to conduct inspections. If any inspection is not completed and requested repairs are not delivered to Seller within the Due Diligence Period, Buyer is deemed to have waived the right to that inspection and Seller's liability for the cost of all repairs that inspection would have reasonably identified had it been conducted, except as otherwise provided by law.

Nevertheless, Ms. Zhu waived her inspection related to the original RPA and the  $2^{nd}$  RPA, reinforced further by actually initialing next to the waiver in the  $2^{nd}$  RPA. Ms. Zhu also waived the energy audit, pest inspection, roof inspection, septic lid removal inspection, mechanical inspection, soil inspection, and structural inspection. Thereby, Ms. Zhu waived any liability of

MICHAEL B. LEE, P.C. 1820 E. SAHARA AVENUE, SUITE 110 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89104 Del - (702) 477.7030; FAX - (702) 477.0096 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Page 32 of 41

1

4

5

6

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Defendants for the cost of all repairs that inspection would have reasonably identified had it been conducted. The RPA and the 2<sup>nd</sup> RPA clearly indicated that Ms. Zhu was purchasing the 2 3 Property "AS-IS, WHERE-IS without any representations or warranties."

16. Additionally, Ms. Zhu also agreed that the Brokers Defendants had "no responsibility to assist in the payment of any repair, correction or deferred maintenance on the Property which may have been revealed by the above inspections, agreed upon by the Buyer and Seller or requested by one party." Paragraph 7(D) of the RPA.

8 17. Since 2008, Mr. Miao, Ms. Zhu, and/or Plaintiff have been involved in the 9 purchase of approximately twenty residential properties. In Clark County alone, Ms. Zhu and 10 Mr. Miao were involved with the purchase of at least eight rental properties starting in 2014.

18. Mr. Miao understood the importance to check public records when conducting due diligence.

> 19. Plaintiff was a sophisticated buyer aware of the necessity of property inspection.

20. At all times relevant prior to the purchase of the Property, Plaintiff had access to inspect the entire property and conduct non-invasive, non-destructive inspections.

21. Prior to the purchase, Mr. Miao was aware that the Seller "strongly recommended that buyer retain licensed Nevada professionals to conduct inspections".

18 22. Plaintiff was also aware of the language in the RPA under Paragraph 7(D) that 19 limited potential damages that could have been discovered by an inspection.

20 23. As to the RPA, Mr. Miao agreed that all the terms in it were conspicuous and 21 understandable, and it was a standard agreement similar to the other agreements he had used in 22 purchasing the other properties in Clark County, Nevada.

23 24. On or about August 10, 2017, Mr. Miao inspected Property. During that time, Mr. Miao noted issues with the Property that were not up to code, finishing issues, GFCI outlets<sup>1</sup>, 24 25 and electrical issues.

26

25. Mr. Miao acknowledged there was an issue with exposed electrical in Unit C as

<sup>27</sup> 28

The Second Amended Complaint references GFCI at Paragraph 31(a). This illustrates the frivolous nature of the pleading since Mr. Miao requested TKNR to install these for Plaintiff.

1	well as possib	le asbestos.
2	26.	Mr. Miao noted that there were cracks in the ceramic floor tiles and visible cracks
3	in the concrete	e foundation, which were open and obvious.
4	27.	Mr. Miao admitted that he could also have seen the dryer vent during his
5	inspection.	
6	28.	Mr. Miao admitted that he could have followed up on the issues identified in the
7	SRPDF that in	ncluded the HVAC and the permits.
8	29.	Similarly, Mr. Miao should have contacted the local building department as part
9	of his due dilig	gence.
10	30.	Plaintiff was also on notice of the potential for mold and the requirement to get a
11	mold inspectio	on.
12	31.	Despite actual knowledge of these issues, Plaintiff did not elect to have a
13	professional ir	nspection done.
14	32.	Finally, Plaintiff was also acutely aware of the requirement of Nevada law to
15	protect itself b	by getting an inspection.
16	33.	Plaintiff assumed the risk of failing to exercise reasonable care to protect itself.
17	34.	The alleged defects identified by both parties' experts could have been discovered
18	at the time of t	the original purchase as they were "open and obvious".
19	35.	Plaintiff failed to differentiate between conditions prior to when TKNR owned the
20	Property, whil	e it owned it, and those afterwards.
21	36.	No dispute exists that TKNR did not need permits for the interior work it had
22	done to the Pro	operty.
23	37.	Plaintiff has always been trying to lease the Property despite not doing any of the
24	repairs listed	by Plaintiff's expert. This illustrates the lack of merit of Plaintiff that there are
25	underlying con	nditions with the Property.
26	38.	Moreover, Plaintiff does not provide any notice to the tenants about its expert's
27	report or this	litigation. This illustrates the lack of merit of Plaintiff's claims and proves that it
28	has done noth	ing to correct the allegedly deficient conditions that are clearly not so dangerous as

MICHAEL B. LEE, P.C. 1820 E. Sahara Avenue, suite 110 Las Vegas, Nevada 89104 Tel – (702) 477.7030; Fax – (702) 477.0096

1 it does not tell prospective tenants about them.

39. Mr. Miao admitted that multiple third parties could have potentially damaged the Property.

40. Plaintiff did not present any evidence related to Defendants' alleged knowledge other than his personal belief and speculation.

41. Mr. Miao admitted that he has no evidence Defendants knew about the alleged moisture conditions. Additionally, he also admitted that there is no evidence that Defendants knew about the alleged issues with the plumbing system. He also admitted that he did not know if Defendants knew about the alleged issues with the duct work when they owned the Property. He also recognized the deficiency in Plaintiff's expert's report that failed to differentiate between conditions prior to when TKNR owned the Property, while it owned it, and those afterwards.

42. Mr. Miao also recognized that a 63-year-old property could have issues that were not caused by Defendants.

43. The Flipping Fund had nothing to do with Plaintiff's decision to purchase the Property.

44. Plaintiff admittedly amplified its alleged damages by more than 6x, and then trebled the damages, and have run up egregious attorneys' fees for this frivolous action. These are undisputed facts that prove abuse of process as a matter of law given the known issues with the Property and Plaintiff's waivers related to the inspections. Plaintiff waived the inspections and purchased the property "as is". This shows that Plaintiff had no interest in having a professional inspection done. It shows the behavior of the Plaintiff related to the entire case.

22 45. Plaintiff was encouraged to inspect the property, and they did not do it. It was a 23 63-year-old property. There were specific disclosures that were made by the Seller, and Plaintiff 24 was strongly encouraged to conduct the inspection, and they did not want to.

25

26

27

28

46. This is a 2018 case. Plaintiff has not been diligent in conducting discovery.

Rule 56(f) is not a shield that can be raised to block a motion for summary judgment without even the slightest showing by the opposing party that his opposition is meritorious. A party invoking its protections must do so in good faith by affirmatively demonstrating why he cannot respond to a movant's affidavits as

1401

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

19

20

rel - (702) 477.7030; Fax - (702) 477.0096 820 E. SAHARA AVENUE, SUITE 110 MICHAEL B. LEE, P.C. LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89104

1

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

2 to rebut the movant's showing of the absence of a genuine issue of fact. Where, as here, a party fails to carry his burden under Rule 56(f), postponement of a ruling on a motion for summary judgment is unjustified. 4 See Bakerink v. Orthopaedic Associates, Ltd., 581 P.2d 9, 11 (Nev. 1978) (quoting Willmar Poultry Co. v. Morton-Norwich Products, 520 F.2d 289, 297 (8th Cir. 1975), Cert. denied, 424 U.S. 915, 96 S.Ct. 1116, 47 L.Ed.2d 320 (1975). 6

otherwise required by Rule 56(e) and how postponement of a ruling on the motion will enable him, by discovery or other means,

47. Plaintiff failed to articulate the alleged discovery that it would likely have. Additionally, Plaintiff already opposed enlarging discovery by specifying that any extension of discovery would prejudice it, indicating that it had no need for additional discovery and that Plaintiff would largely rest upon the findings of its expert. See Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to Enlarge Discovery. Also, Plaintiff's counsel's declaration in the Opposition illustrated that he had additional discussions with Plaintiff's expert related to the MSJ, but Plaintiff's expert did not proffer any additional opinions to counter the Motion. See *Opp.* at p. 18:7-9.

14 48. As a matter of law, Plaintiff is precluded from seeking damages from Defendants 15 because of her failure to inspect. "Nondisclosure by the seller of adverse information concerning 16 real property . . . will not provide the basis for an action by the buyer to rescind or for damages 17 when property is sold 'as is.' " Mackintosh v. Jack Matthews & Co., 109 Nev. 628, 633, 855 18 P.2d 549, 552 (1993). Moreover, "[1]iability for nondisclosure is generally not imposed where 19 the buyer either knew of or could have discovered the defects prior to the purchase." Land 20 Baron Invs., Inc. v. Bonnie Springs Family LP, 131 Nev. 686, 696, 356 P.3d 511, 518 (2015).

49. 21 Defendants also do not have liability as Ms. Zhu / Plaintiff purchased the Property 22 "as-is" within the reach of the diligent attention and observation of the buyer. *Mackintosh*, 109 23 Nev. at 633, 855 P.2d at 552. NRS § 113.140 clearly provides that the disclosures do not 24 constitute a warranty of the Property and that the purchaser still has a duty to exercise reasonable 25 care to protect himself. A completed disclosure form does not constitute an express or implied 26 warranty regarding any condition of residential property. NRS § 113.140(2). Chapters 113 and 27 "645 of Nevada Revised Statutes do not relieve a buyer or prospective buyer of the duty to 28 exercise reasonable care to protect himself or herself." Id. at § 113.140(2).

Page 36 of 41

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

50. Plaintiff waived its common law claims of negligent misrepresentation, fraudulent or intentional misrepresentation, and/or unjust enrichment when it expressly agreed that it would carry the duty to inspect the property and ensure that all aspects of it were suitable prior to close of escrow, and the information regarding Property was reasonably accessible to the buyer. *Frederic and Barbara Rosenberg Living Tr. v. MacDonald Highlands Realty, LLC*, 427 P.3d 104, 111 (Nev. 2018).

51. Summary judgment is appropriate under NRS § 113.140(1) (seller is not required to disclose a defect in residential property of which she is not aware). Under this statute, "[a]scribing to the term 'aware' its plain meaning, . . . the seller of residential real property does not have a duty to disclose a defect or condition that 'materially affects the value or use of residential property in an adverse manner,' if the seller does not realize, perceive, or have knowledge of that defect or condition." *Nelson v. Heer*, 163 P.3d 420, 425 (Nev. 2007). Thus, as Plaintiff cannot demonstrate an omitted disclosure that caused damage, Defendants are entitled to summary judgment as a matter of law. *Id.* at 426.

15 52. Under NRS § 113.140(1) (seller is not required to disclose a defect in residential 16 property of which she is not aware), Nelson v. Heer, 163 P.3d 420, 425 (Nev. 2007), and NRS § 17 645.259(2), Defendants are entitled to Summary Judgment on Plaintiff's claims for (1) Recovery 18 Under NRS Chapter 113, (2) Constructive Fraud, (3) Common Law Fraud, (4) Fraudulent 19 Inducement, (5) Fraudulent Concealment, (6) Breach Of Fiduciary Duty, (8) Damages Under 20 NRS 645.257(1), (9) Failure To Supervise, Inadequate training and Education, (12) Civil 21 Conspiracy, (13) Breach Of Contract, and (14) Breach Of Implied Covenant of Good Faith and 22 Fair Dealing]. It also eliminates the causes of action for (7) RICO, (10) Fraudulent Conveyance, 23 (11) Fraudulent Conveyance, and (15) Abuse of Process since they have no basis in fact or law.

Eighth Judicial District Court Rule 2.20(e) provides that, "[f]ailure of the
opposing party to serve and file written opposition may be construed as an admission that the
motion and/or joinder is meritorious and a consent to granting the same." Simply filing an
opposition does not relieve a party of its duty to actually oppose the issues raised in the motion.
See Benjamin v. Frias Transportation Mgt. Sys., Inc., 433 P.3d 1257 (Nev. 2019) (unpublished

Page 37 of 41

1 disposition).

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

54. The Opposition failed to address the Motion's arguments related to summary judgment in favor of Defendants on Plaintiff's claims for: (7) RICO; (10) Fraudulent Conveyance; (11) Fraudulent Conveyance; (12) Civil Conspiracy; and (15) Abuse of Process. Additionally, Plaintiff fails to provide any meaningful or competent opposition to the Motion's argument for summary judgment as to Plaintiff's claims against the Broker Defendants. As there 6 is no Opposition provided to those arguments made in the Motion, this court should find that those arguments are meritorious and grant the request as to those unopposed issues.

55. Pursuant to Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure 11(b), by presenting to the court a pleading or other paper, an attorney or unrepresented party certifies: (1) it is not being presented for any improper purpose, such as to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of litigation, (2) the claims and other legal contentions are warranted by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for extending, modifying, or reversing existing law or for establishing new law, (3) the factual contentions have evidentiary support, and (4) the denials of factual contentions are warranted on the evidence or.

56. "If, after notice and a reasonable opportunity to respond, the court determines that Rule 11(b) has been violated, the court may impose an appropriate sanction on any attorney, law firm, or party that violated the rule or is responsible for the violation. Absent exceptional circumstances, a law firm must be held jointly responsible for a violation committed by its partner, associate, or employee." NEV. R. CIV. PRO. 11(c).

21 57. "On its own, the court may order an attorney, law firm, or party to show cause 22 why conduct specifically described in the order has not violated Rule 11(b)." Id. at 11(c)(3). "A 23 sanction imposed under this rule must be limited to what suffices to deter repetition of the 24 conduct or comparable conduct by others similarly situated. The sanction may include 25 nonmonetary directives; an order to pay a penalty into court; or, if imposed on motion and 26 warranted for effective deterrence, an order directing payment to the movant of part or all of the 27 reasonable attorney fees and other expenses directly resulting from the violation." Id. at 28 11(c)(4).

Page 38 of 41

MICHAEL B. LEE, P.C. 1820 E. Sahara Avenue, suite 110 Las Vegas, Nevada 89104 Del – (702) 477.7030; Fax – (702) 477.0096 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

22

23

24

25

26

58. Rule 11 prevents a party from bringing a lawsuit for an improper purpose, which
 includes: (1) harassment, causing unnecessary delay, or needless increasing the cost of litigation;
 or (2) making frivolous claims. NEV. R. CIV. PRO. 11(b)(1)-(2). Rule 11 sanctions should be
 imposed for frivolous actions. *Marshall v. District Court*, 108 Nev. 459, 465, 836 P.2d 47, 52.

59. A frivolous claim is one that is "both baseless and made without a reasonable and competent inquiry." *Bergmann v. Boyce*, 109 Nev. 670, 676, 856 P.2d 560, 564 (1993) (quoting *Townsend v. Holman Consulting Corp.*, 929 F.2d 1358, 1362 (9th Cir.1990); *Golden Eagle Distrib. Corp. v. Burroughs Corp.*, 801 F.2d 1531, 1537 (9th Cir.1986)). A determination of whether a claim is frivolous involves a two-pronged analysis: (1) the court must determine whether the pleading is "well grounded in fact and is warranted by existing law or a good faith argument for the extension, modification or reversal of existing law"; and (2) whether the attorney made a reasonable and competent inquiry. *Bergmann*, 109 Nev. at 676, 856 P.2d at 564. A sanction imposed for violation of Rule 11 shall be limited to what is sufficient to deter repetition of such conduct or comparable conduct by others similarly situated. *Id.* at 11(c)(2).

15 60. Furthermore, a court may award attorneys' fees to a prevailing party when it finds
that the claim was brought or maintained without reasonable ground or to harass the prevailing
party. NEV. REV. STAT. § 18.010(2)(b). In other cases, a court may award attorneys' fees "when
it finds that the opposing party brought or maintained a claim without reasonable grounds." *Rodriguez v. Primadonna Co., LLC*, 216 P.3d 793, 800 (Nev. 2009). "The court shall liberally
construe the provisions of this paragraph in favor of awarding attorney's fees in all appropriate
situations." *Id.* The Nevada Legislature explained that:

[i]t is the intent of the Legislature that the court award attorney's fees pursuant to this paragraph and impose sanctions pursuant to Rule 11 of the Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure in all appropriate situations to punish for and deter frivolous or vexatious claims and defenses because such claims and defenses overburden limited judicial resources, hinder the timely resolution of meritorious claims and increase the costs of engaging in business and providing professional services to the public.

*Id.* "A claim is groundless if 'the allegations in the complaint . . . are not supported by any
credible evidence at trial." *Barozzi v. Benna*, 112 Nev. 635, 639, 918 P.2d 301, 303 (1996)

Page 39 of 41



18

1

2

3

4

(quoting Western United Realty, Inc. v. Isaacs, 679 P.2d 1063, 1069 (Colo.1984)).

77. The overwhelming facts and law illustrate that Plaintiff's claim is frivolous. The findings of fact are incorporated by reference.

78. Plaintiff's claim is clearly frivolous: (1) where the pleading was not "well grounded in fact and is warranted by existing law or a good faith argument for the extension, modification or reversal of existing law", and (2) Plaintiff's attorney continued to make frivolous claims. Bergmann, 109 Nev. at 676, 856 P.2d at 564. Sanctions are warranted against Plaintiff and its counsel, which includes an award attorneys' fees to Defendants.

79. Alternatively, the elements of an abuse of process claim are: "(1) an ulterior purpose by the defendants other than resolving a legal dispute, and (2) a willful act in the use of the legal process not proper in the regular conduct of the proceeding." Posadas v. City of Reno, 109 Nev. 448, 452, 851 P.2d 438, 441-42 (1993). Abuse of process can arise from both civil and criminal proceedings. LaMantia v. Redisi, 118 Nev. 27, 30, 38 P.3d 877, 879 (2002). Malice, want of probable cause, and termination in favor of the person initiating or instituting proceedings are not necessary elements for a prima facie abuse of process claim. Nevada Credit Rating Bur. v. Williams, 88 Nev. 601, 606, 503 P.2d 9, 12 (1972); Restatement (Second) of Torts § 682 cmt. a (1977). The mere filing of a complaint is insufficient to establish the tort of abuse of process. Laxalt v. McClatchy, 622 F. Supp. 737, 751 (1985).

19 80. Under either Rule 11, Plaintiff brought and maintained this action without 20 reasonable ground. NEV. REV. STAT. § 18.010(2)(b). The overwhelming facts and law illustrate 21 that Plaintiff brought or maintained this claim without reasonable grounds, which justifies an 22 award of attorneys' fees. Rodriguez v. Primadonna Co., LLC, 216 P.3d 793, 800 (Nev. 2009).

23 81. The court intends to award to the Defendants the reasonable expenses, including 24 attorneys' fees and costs, incurred for defending this lawsuit under Rule 11. This sanction is 25 limited to what suffices to deter repetition of the conduct or comparable conduct by others 26 similarly situated.

27 Based on the foregoing, the Court GRANTS Defendants Motion, DENIES the 28 Counterclaim, and GRANTS attorneys' fees and costs to Defendants pursuant to Nevada Rule of

Page 40 of 41

Civil Procedure 11.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDICATED, AND DECREED that the Motion is GRANTED.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDICATED, AND DECREED** that the Countermotion, including the 56(f) Countermotion, is **DENIED**. This is a 2018 case. Discovery ended October 30, 2020. This Court will not agree to enlarge discovery.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDICATED, AND DECREED** that Defendants are awarded attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Rule 11. Defendants may file an affidavit in support of requested attorney's fees and costs within 10 days of the entry of Order.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDICATED, AND DECREED** that this is a final order related to the claims and counterclaim. This Court directs entry of a final judgment of all claims.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDICATED, AND DECREED** that any outstanding or pending discovery is quashed as moot.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDICATED, AND DECREED** that any trial dates and/or calendar calls are vacated as moot.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2021

THE HON. ADRIANA ESCOBAR DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

158 436 3E2D 40F2 Adriana Escobar District Court Judge

Page 41 of 41

1	CSERV		
2			
3	DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA		
4			
5			
6	W L A B Investment LLC, Plaintiff(s)	CASE NO: A-18-785917-C	
7	vs.	DEPT. NO. Department 14	
8	TKNR Inc, Defendant(s)		
9			
10	Δυτομάτει	N CEDTIFICATE OF SEDVICE	
11	AUTOMATED CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE		
12	This automated certificate of service was generated by the Eighth Judicial District Court. The foregoing Amended Order was served via the court's electronic eFile system to		
13	all recipients registered for e-Service on the above entitled case as listed below:		
14	Service Date: 4/7/2021		
15	Brinley Richeson	bricheson@daynance.com	
16 17	Steven Day	sday@daynance.com	
17	Michael Matthis	matthis@mblnv.com	
19	BENJAMIN CHILDS	ben@benchilds.com	
20	Nikita Burdick	nburdick@burdicklawnv.com	
21	Michael Lee	mike@mblnv.com	
22	Bradley Marx	brad@marxfirm.com	
23	Frank Miao	frankmiao@yahoo.com	
24			
25		the above mentioned filings were also served by mail	
26	known addresses on 4/8/2021	tage prepaid, to the parties listed below at their last	
27			
28			
		140	

1 2	John Savage	Holley Driggs Attn: John Savage, Esq	
3		400 South Fourth Street, Third Floor Las Vegas, NV, 89101	
4 5	Nikita Pierce	6625 South Valley View Blvd. Suite 232 Las Vegas, NV, 89118	
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11 12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18 19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25 26			
20 27			
28			
		4	10

https://www.clarkcountycourts.us/Anonymous/CaseDetail.aspx?CaseID=11919004&HearingID=205429091&SingleViewMode=Minutes

Skip to Main Content Logout My Account Search Menu New District Civil/Criminal Search Refine Search Close

Location : District Court Civil/Criminal Help

# **REGISTER OF ACTIONS** CASE NO. A-18-785917-C

W L A B Investment LLC, Plaintiff(s) vs. TKNR Inc, Defendant(s) § § § § §

7/19/2021

Case Type:	Other Real Property
Date Filed:	12/11/2018
Location:	Department 14
Cross-Reference Case	A785917
Number:	
Supreme Court No.:	82835
	83051

	ş Ş	
	Party Information	
Defendant	Chen, Liwe Helen <i>Also Known</i> <i>As</i> Chen, Helen	Lead Attorneys Michael B. Lee Retained 702-477-7030(W)
Defendant	Cheng, Man Chau	<b>Michael B. Lee</b> <i>Retained</i> 702-477-7030(W)
Defendant	Investpro Investments I LLC	Nikita R. Pierce Retained 702-481-9207(W)
Defendant	Investpro LLC <i>Doing Business</i> As Investpro Realty	Michael B. Lee Retained 702-477-7030(W)
Defendant	Investpro Manager LLC	<b>Michael B. Lee</b> <i>Retained</i> 702-477-7030(W)
Defendant	Lin, Zhong Kenny <i>Also Known As</i> Lin, Chong Kenny <i>Also Known As</i> Lin, Ken Zhong <i>Also Known As</i> Lin, Kenneth Zhong <i>Also Known As</i> Lin, Kenny Zhong <i>Also Known As</i> Lin, Whong K <i>Also Known As</i> Lin, Zhong	Michael B. Lee Retained 702-477-7030(W)
Defendant	Nickrandt, Joyce A	Michael B. Lee Retained 702-477-7030(W)
Defendant	TKNR Inc	<b>Michael B. Lee</b> <i>Retained</i> 702-477-7030(W)
Defendant	Wong, Chi On <i>Also Known As</i> Wong, Chi Kuen	Michael B. Lee Retained 702-477-7030(W)
Defendant	Zhang, Yan Qiu	Michael B. Lee

Retained

Plaintiff W L A B Investment LLC

Steven L. Day Retained 7023093333(W)

#### **EVENTS & ORDERS OF THE COURT**

Minutes
04/07/2021 3:00 AM
- Plaintiff's Counsel's Motion to Withdraw as Attorney for Plaintiff
(Motion) came on for Chambers Calendar before Department
14 of the Eighth Judicial District Court, the Honorable Adriana
Escobar presiding, on April 7, 2021. Upon thorough review of
the pleadings, this Court enters the following order: Attorney
Benjamin B. Childs seeks to withdraw as counsel of record for
Plaintiff W L A B Investment, LLC. On December 15, 2020,
Defendants filed their Motion for Summary Judgment, or in the
Alternative, Partial Summary Judgment. On March 4, 2021, Mr.
Childs filed a Motion to Withdraw as Counsel for Plaintiff. On
March 10, 2021, Attorney Steven L. Day, Esq. filed a
Substitution of Attorneys, substituting himself as counsel of
record for Plaintiff in place and stead Mr. Childs. On March 11,
the Court heard Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, or
in the Alternative, Partial Summary Judgment. Mr. Day
appeared on behalf of Plaintiff. On March 30, 2021, this Court
issued an Order Granting Defendants' Motion for Summary
Judgment, or in the Alternative, Partial Summary Judgment.
On April 7, 2021, this Court issued an Amended Order
Granting Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, or in the
Alternative, Partial Summary Judgment, disposing of this matter. In this Order, the Court awarded Defendants attorney
fees and costs pursuant to NRCP 11. For good cause showing
pursuant to EDCR 7.40(b)(2), RPC 1.16(b), and SCR 46, this
Court hereby GRANTS the Motion. This Court notes the
following: This matter is closed. However, although this Court
awarded Defendants attorney fees and costs under NRCP 11,
this Court has not made a final determination regarding the
amount of attorney fees and costs Defendants are entitled to.
Given that Mr. Childs brought the instant action on behalf of
Plaintiff, which was the basis of this Court's award of attorney
fees and costs under NRCP 11, Mr. Childs is still within the
jurisdiction of this Court until this matter is fully resolved. Mr.
Childs must be present for remaining motion practice, if any, on
this issue, regardless, of the Court's granting of this Motion.
Counsel for Plaintiff is directed to prepare a proposed order that lists all future deadlines and hearings, and includes
Plaintiff's last known physical and/or mailing address, email,
and phone number. Counsel must submit the proposed order
within 14 days of the entry of this minute order. EDCR 1.90(a)
(4). All parties must submit orders electronically, in both PDF
version and Word version, until further notice. You may do so
by emailing DC14Inbox@clarkcountycourts.us. All orders must
have either original signatures from all parties or an email -
appended as the last page of the proposed order - confirming
that all parties approved use of their electronic signatures. The
subject line of the e-mail should identify the full case number,
filing code and case caption. CLERK'S NOTE: This Minute
Order was electronically served to all registered parties for
Odyssey File & Serve. /mt

Return to Register of Actions

TRAN	Electronically Filed 4/15/2021 1:59 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT
CLARK	TRICT COURT COUNTY, NEVADA
,	
WLAB INVESTMENT LLC,	)
Plaintiff,	) CASE NO. A-18-785917-C
vs.	) DEPT NO. XIV
TKNR INC.,	) ) <b>TRANSCRIPT OF</b>
Defendent	) PROCEEDINGS
Defendant.	) )
AND RELATED PARTIES	)
OPPOSITION TO DEFI COUNTERMOTION FOR COUNTERMOTION FOR DEFENDANTS MOTION	T, MARCH 11, 2021 ENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT CONTINUANCE BASED ON NRCP 56(f) AND IMPOSITION OF MONETARY SANCTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, OR IN THE
ALTERNATIVE, PART	IAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT
SETTLEMENT	
APPEARANCES:	
FOR THE PLAINTIFF:	STEVEN L. DAY, ESQ.
FOR THE DEFENDANTS:	MICHAEL B. LEE, ESQ.
TRANSCRIBED BY: JD REPORTIN	NG, INC.

A-18-785917-C | WLAB v. TKNR | 2021-03-11 LAS VEGAS, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA, MARCH 11, 2021, 9:19 A.M. 1 2 \* \* \* \* 3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Department 14 is now in session. We're at page 1-2, Your Honor. 4 5 THE COURT: Okay. Very good. I'd like your 6 appearances for the record, please. 7 This is Michael Lee on behalf of the MR. LEE: 8 defendants. 9 MR. DAY: This is Steven Day on behalf of the 10 plaintiff. 11 THE COURT: Okay. Good morning, Mr. Day and Mr. Lee. 12 All right. I have before me the motion for summary 13 judgment or in the alternative partial summary judgment by the 14 defendant and the opposition and countermotion for continuance 15 pursuant to NRCP 56(f) and by -- Forgive me. The motion for 16 summary judgment is by the defendants. The plaintiff's opposition and also we have -- so let's get going. 17 18 Why don't you, Mr. Lee, please start. 19 MR. LEE: Thank you, Your Honor. 20 We also filed a supplement to our motion for summary 21 judgment that includes the deposition of plaintiff's person 22 most knowledgeable Frank Miao who is also on the line today. 23 In terms of the supplement, it illustrated several 24 undisputed facts that illustrates why summary judgment is 25 appropriate related to all of plaintiff's claims and our claim JD Reporting, Inc.

1 for abuse of process. In particular, when we start looking at 2 the background of plaintiff, Mr. Miao, admitted that plaintiff 3 is a sophisticated buyer who has purchased at least 20 4 properties, 8 in Las Vegas.

5 He also specified that the underlining terms of the 6 residential purchase agreement were conspicuous and 7 understandable. He specified it was a similar agreement to the 8 other agreements that he had used purchasing other properties 9 in Clark County. The terms were clear related to the duties --10 THE COURT: Mr. Lee.

MR. LEE: Yes?

11

12 THE COURT: I'd like you to speak slower, please.
13 MR. LEE: Oh, I apologize.

14 THE COURT: That's okay. Thank you.

15 MR. LEE: He specified that the terms were clear 16 related to the duty to inspect, and he also specified that 17 plaintiff was acutely aware of the requirement under Nevada law 18 to protect itself by getting an inspection.

As to the underlying issue of the inspection, what Mr. Miao also testified was that prior to the purchase he was aware that the seller had, quote, "He only recommended that I retain licensed Nevada professionals to conduct inspections," end quote.

He also specified that he had access to inspect the entire property and conduct noninvasive, nondestructive

JD Reporting, Inc.

1 inspections, which he did.

During that time, he inspected the structure, the roof, the mechanical systems, the electrical systems, the plumbing, the HVAC and the dryer vent.

5 He noted at that time that there were some issues that were not up to code -- and this was prior to the 6 7 purchase -- that there were finishing issues; that there were 8 issues with the outlets not being GFCI outlets; electrical 9 issues, including exposed electrical; potential asbestos; 10 cracks on the ceramic floor tiles; visible cracks in the 11 concrete foundation. And he specified that all of these were 12 open and obvious prior to his purchase.

He also specified that he received the seller's real property disclosure forms prior to the purchase of the property. As to the disclosure form, prior to the purchase, plaintiff was aware that the seller TKNR was an investor who had never resided in the property; that there were issues with the heating systems, the cooling systems; and that there was work done without permits.

He also knew that the property was 63 years old at the time of the purchase and that most of the work done on the property was done by a handyman other than the HVAC installation.

24 Despite these disclosures, Mr. Miao never followed up 25 with the seller at all. He also specified that he could have

JD Reporting, Inc.

1 followed up with these identified issues that included the HVAC 2 and the permits, and he was aware that he should have contacted 3 the local building department and also obtain the permits as 4 part of his due diligence prior to the purchase.

5 He was also aware of the potential for mold and the 6 requirement to get a mold inspection and understood it was his 7 risk that he elected not to get a professional inspection.

8 When we look at the residential purchase agreement, 9 plaintiff was also aware that there were limited damages in 10 this case and that the damages under paragraph 7D limited the 11 potential damages that could have been discovered by an 12 inspection.

13 Now, Mr. Miao had also indicated that he doesn't 14 believe in professional inspections. He does not have a 15 professional license related to being a general contractor, an inspector, an appraiser or a project manager. He has never 16 17 hired a professional inspector in Clark County, and he doesn't 18 use them because he believes the underlining costs is too 19 expensive, and he just relies upon himself to do the 20 inspections.

If we look at the issue of the professional inspection, what Mr. Miao admitted is that he had access to the entire building. He had access to the attic when he looked at it.

25

He also retained an expert in this case. His expert

JD Reporting, Inc.

didn't do any destructive or invasive testing. It would've
been exactly the same type of inspection that he could have
done in 2017. He admitted that the plaintiff examined -- the
plaintiff's expert examined exactly the same areas that he had
done, that the plaintiff's access was exactly the same as his
original inspection in 2017 and that the inspections --

7 THE COURT: Mr. Lee, will you please -- you may be 8 reading, and it's okay. I just need you to speak slower. I've 9 reviewed everything. This is in your motion. But I would like 10 you to speak slower, please.

11

12

MR. LEE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

13 MR. LEE: And these references that I'm giving you 14 right now are all from our supplement which is Mr. Miao's 15 deposition which includes citation to everything that I'm 16 referencing. So I appreciate that you've had an opportunity to 17 read the briefing and also to review the supplement as well 18 because it's the underlining basis that illustrates that --19 THE COURT: Right. I have Mr. Miao's deposition.

20 I've reviewed it.

21

MR. LEE: Okay. Great.

THE COURT: But I (video interference) make a record,please.

24 MR. LEE: Okay. I'll continue to make a record. 25 THE COURT: Just not so quickly. Just not so fast.

JD Reporting, Inc.

1 MR. LEE: Yeah. I'm sorry, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: That's okay. 3 MR. LEE: Okay. During the -- he also specified that as to plaintiff's expert the report illustrated all the areas 4 5 that he could have inspected in 2017 and that the pictures that 6 were also attached to the expert report were areas that he 7 could have inspected in 2017. 8 He also accompanied the defendants' expert during our 9 inspection of the property. As before, Mr. Miao had the same 10 access to the property in 2017 that our expert did during our 11 inspection. 12 He agreed with our expert that the alleged conditions 13 identified by plaintiff's expert were, quote, unquote, "open 14 and obvious." 15 He also agreed with our expert's finding that there 16 were no sagging issues in the roof. 17 And he also recognized the deficiencies in 18 plaintiff's expert report that failed to differentiate when 19 conditions prior to when TKNR owned the property while it owned 20 it and that it was afterwards. 21 When we also look at the underlining issues related 22 to permits, Mr. Miao agreed that the finishing work done by the 23 seller did not need permits. 24 He also specified that although there are these 25 alleged conditions with the property currently, he does not

JD Reporting, Inc.

1 place any notice to tenants, although they have not done any 2 repairs to the property, which illustrates the lack of merit to 3 this action.

He also specified that there were potential third parties that could have damaged the property, such as (video interference) or tenants.

He also specified that there's no evidence defendants
knew about the alleged conditions, that the Flipping Fund,
which is a party to this case related to the RICO action, had
nothing to do with the sale.

And for the abuse of process claim, he indicated that his initial estimate of the cost of repair would've been \$102,000, but their -- plaintiff's expert inflated the cost of the repair to \$600,000.

We also noted the perjury in his declaration where he originally did try to settle this case for \$10,000, but he denied making that offer in his declaration.

When we turn back and we look at the Second Amended Complaint, the Second Amended Complaint illustrates that based on the undisputed facts from Mr. Miao, there's a lack of merit to this action.

Looking at paragraph 25, it reads,

22

23TKNR failed to disclose one or more24known conditions that materially affects the25value or the use of the subject property in

JD Reporting, Inc.

1 an adverse manner. 2 This is not true based on his undisputed facts. 3 We looked at paragraph 27, seller's disclosure form was either inadequate or false. 4 5 Paragraph 29, construction work must be done by 6 licensed contractors with permits and inspections. 7 Then at paragraph 31 outlines the alleged conditions 8 that they're claiming that were a nondisclosure that they did 9 not know about. 10 Paragraph 31A, the electrical systems, including the 11 GFCI outlets. What's also notable about the GFCI outlets is 12 that Mr. Miao is the one who requested that the sellers install 13 the GFCI outlets at the time when he was purchasing the 14 property. 15 31B relates to the alleged issues with plumbing 16 systems. 17 C, sewer line. 18 D, heating systems. 19 E, cooling systems. 20 F, smoke detectors. 21 G, moisture conditions or water damage venting into 22 the attic. 23 H, structural issues. 24 Notably, Item I admits that plaintiff knew that the 25 construction was done without permits. JD Reporting, Inc.

A-18-785917-C | WLAB v. TKNR | 2021-03-11 1 J, roof and HVAC. 2 K, mold, slash, fungus. 3 And then L. THE COURT: A little bit slower, Mr. Lee, please. 4 5 I'm following you. So a little bit -- just a teeny bit slower, 6 please. 7 MR. LEE: Yes. I'm sorry, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: It happens all -- don't worry. 9 MR. LEE: Yeah. 10 THE COURT: Okay. 11 MR. LEE: Yeah. 12 Flooring, land, slash, foundation. 13 Now, the reason I started my presentation talking 14 about the undisputed facts and then went into the underlining 15 Second Amended Complaint was to illustrate that summary 16 judgment is appropriate as to all these issues because there's 17 no dispute that plaintiff was aware of any of these issues 18 prior to plaintiff's purchase of the property or that they were 19 open and obvious or that a reasonable professional inspection 20 could've uncovered them. 21 In terms of the countermotion for additional 22 discovery, Mr. Miao wrote to me directly specifying that he did 23 not want there to be any additional discovery. So there is no 24 basis for the 56(f) request. He wrote to me directly also 25 copying in his counsel, and I asked him not to contact me

JD Reporting, Inc.

1

directly without his attorney's approval.

In terms of the law in the case, which is cited throughout the motion, Nevada Revised Statute 113.140 provides that a seller does not have a duty to disclose any defects that he is not aware of.

The case law under the *Bonnie Springs* case specifies that liability for nondisclosure is generally not imposed where the buyer either knew or could have discovered the defects prior to the purchase.

NRS 113.140 clearly provides that the seller's disclosure does not constitute a warranty and that the buyer still has a duty to exercise reasonable care to protect themselves.

14 A buyer waives their common-law claims for 15 negligent -- negligent misrepresentation, fraudulent or intentional misrepresentation and/or unjust enrichment when 16 17 they expressly agree that it would carry the duty to inspect 18 the property and ensure that all aspects of it were suitable 19 prior to the close of escrow and that the information was 20 reasonably accessible to the buyer. That's the McDonald 21 Highlands case.

The general rule for foreclosing liability for nondisclosure when a property is purchased as is applies when such facts are within the reach of the diligent attention and observation of the buyer. This is the *Macintosh* (phonetic)

JD Reporting, Inc.

1	case.		
2	Importantly, the Nevada Supreme Court included an		
3	agreement to purchase property as is foreclosed each of the		
4	buyer's common-law claims justifying the granting of summary		
5	judgment on all common-law claims.		
6	Now, when we look at the underlining complaint and we		
7	look at the motion, we are entitled to summary judgment on all		
8	the plaintiff's claims for Cause of Action 1, recovery under		
9	NRS Chapter 113;		
10	For Cause of Action 2, constructive fraud;		
11	3, common-law fraud;		
12	4, fraudulent inducement;		
13	5, fraudulent concealment;		
14	6, breach of fiduciary duty;		
15	8, damages under NRS 645;		
16	9, failure to supervise, inadequate training or		
17	education;		
18	12, civil conspiracy;		
19	13, breach of contract; and		
20	14, breach of the covenant of good faith and fair		
21	dealing.		
22	As to the other causes of action, plaintiff never		
23	filed an opposition to those requests. These were included in		
24	the Causes of Action 7, RICO;		
25	10, fraudulent conveyance;		
	JD Reporting, Inc.		
	12		

1 2 11, fraudulent conveyance; and

15, their claim for abuse of process.

3 There's also no dispute that summary judgment is4 warranted as to all the broker defendants.

5 On our counterclaim for abuse of process, we are 6 entitled to summary judgment on that claim as the undisputed 7 facts illustrate that plaintiff's action was merely an attempt 8 to extort all the defendants with a meritless claim and abuse 9 of process.

10 It's undisputed that the property was a 63-year-old 11 home at the time that plaintiff purchased it in 2018, that the 12 purchase price was \$200,000, that plaintiffs now are claiming 13 \$16.25 million in damages, that there's no basis for the claim 14 for RICO or the fraudulent conveyance or any of those other 15 claims where plaintiff didn't even oppose our request for 16 summary judgment; that the original settlement demand by 17 plaintiff was \$10,000.

Now, the only purpose of filing this claim and the related discovery was retaliatory. In that context, summary judgment is appropriate in favor of us related to abuse of process.

In the event that you find that there is somewhat of an disputed fact or there's a material damage issue of material fact, partial summary judgment is appropriate related to the undisputed facts and the unopposed claims.

JD Reporting, Inc.

1 And then we would also ask for attorneys' fees and 2 costs. 3 Unless the Court has any questions, I'll go ahead and 4 turn it over to Mr. Day. 5 THE COURT: Okay. I have no questions at this time. 6 I have so many documents here. 7 Go on, Counsel. Mr. Day. 8 MR. DAY: Your Honor, this is Steven Day for the 9 plaintiff. 10 THE COURT: Okay. And, Mr. Day, before you start, 11 I'd like you to speak a little bit louder, please. For some 12 reason I can't really hear you as well. So will you bring your 13 microphone closer. 14 MR. DAY: Judge, I certainly will. 15 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 16 MR. DAY: Is that better? 17 THE COURT: Yeah, a little bit. Yes. 18 MR. DAY: Okay. Well, Judge, I made an appearance in 19 the case yesterday. I looked at the motions for summary 20 judgment, the opposition and the reply yesterday. And whenever 21 I have a case where I have an opposing party that files a 22 motion for summary judgment and that motion includes 33 pages 23 of briefs and over a hundred pages of documents, hearsay 24 documents, none of which were supported by testimony or have 25 any foundation whatsoever, I immediately assumed that there are

JD Reporting, Inc.

14

1 factual issues in the case.

11

And Mr. Childs filed an opposition to defendants' motion which also included in excess of 30 pages of brief and well over a hundred pages of supporting documents, which would all further suggest that there are not only factual issues, but many factual issues --

THE COURT: Mr. Day, please speak louder. Mr. Day,
excuse me. You must speak louder, please.

9 MR. DAY: How about this? Is this better? 10 THE COURT: That's better.

MR. DAY: Okay. Sorry about that, Judge.

12 THE COURT: No, it's okay. You know, it happens. I 13 have one person speaking too quickly and the other one I can't 14 hear. What you're doing now is better.

15 MR. DAY: Okay. There are -- there are numerous 16 factual issues in this case. The plaintiff's contention is 17 that -- I mean, defendants. Defendants argue that had an 18 inspection of the property been done, the various issues with this triplex would've been discovered. The plaintiffs (sic) 19 20 are claiming that; however, it's plaintiff's position that when 21 defendants purchased this property, the defendants and their 22 many investors purchased this property, the intent was to 23 immediately flip the property. And when they could not flip 24 the property, they attempted to cover up the numerous problems with the triplex with floor covering, wallcoverings, plaster. 25

JD Reporting, Inc.

And as can be seen in the expert reports, many of the issues
 are within the walls of the building itself and were not
 discovered until after the property was purchased.

For example, the issues with the foundation were discovered when tile started coming up from the floor after purchase. And when floor covering, which was all placed by the defendants, was removed to reveal what the primary issue with the foundation was.

9 This is a structure that, frankly, just should have 10 been condemned. And instead of it being condemned and knocked 11 down, defendants attempted to cover up the many problems with 12 the triplex which precluded the plaintiff from observing these 13 many problems upon his inspection of the premises.

So there are -- the argument that was made by defense, great argument, but that's an argument that should be made to the jury. The jury should be allowed to determine what the plaintiff knew or should have known prior to purchase, what efforts the defendants made to attempt to cover up the many problems with this triplex prior to purchase. And those are all factual issues that should be left to a jury.

21 With respect to the deposition that was included in 22 the reply, you know, that's a little late. The initial motion 23 that was filed included no testimony, no admissible evidence. 24 The defense relied primarily or exclusively upon hearsay 25 documents, documents that had no foundation in plaintiff's --

JD Reporting, Inc.

or defendants' presentation with the motion for summary 1 2 judgment. 3 So plaintiff's contention is that there are numerous factual issues in this case which would preclude summary 4 5 judgment with respect to all causes of action. 6 And with that, unless the Court has questions, we'll 7 stand submitted. 8 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Day. 9 Mr. Lee, please. 10 MR. LEE: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. And please 11 slow me down if I start speaking too quickly. 12 THE COURT: All right. You've got to try to control 13 yourself as well. But, yes, I hate to -- I really dislike 14 having to -- to interrupt people, but so please try to speak 15 slower. 16 MR. LEE: Yes. 17 THE COURT: And we're not in a crazy hurry. I'd 18 rather hear everything thoroughly even though I have very 19 thorough pleadings. 20 Go on. 21 In terms of the very thorough pleadings, MR. LEE: 22 just because we have thoroughly briefed the issue doesn't mean 23 that there's a genuine issue of material fact. It's a somewhat 24 novel argument from Mr. Day that we did our job too good. So 25 there has to be a genuine issue of material fact.

JD Reporting, Inc.

1 It's also somewhat of a novel argument that you 2 should discount the deposition of Mr. Miao that illustrates 3 that there were no genuine issues of material fact so that we 4 can avoid summary judgment.

5 The general argument that Mr. Day, and while I 6 appreciate he is new to the case, about the alleged discovery 7 issues is without merit. Miao admitted that there's no 8 evidence that defendant knew about the alleged conditions. And 9 what we have to keep in mind is that the defendants owned the 10 property for a short period of time prior to buying it, 11 improving it, and then selling it to the plaintiff. Then 12 plaintiff operated it for a long period of time utilizing the 13 defendant realtors as a management property.

What we'll also note here is that Mr. Day conveniently omitted the fact that there's a long-term tenant who lived in the property prior to the defendants purchasing it, during the time of the improvement and currently resides there to this day and that Mr. Miao also specified in his deposition that that person is very unhappy with the property and still with the conditions living there.

21 We also have the undisputed fact that Mr. Miao 22 admitted that plaintiff's expert failed to differentiate 23 between what happened when the defendants owned the property 24 and what happened thereafter.

25

So plaintiff here has not met any burden to show that

JD Reporting, Inc.

the defendants knew about the alleged conditions or what's actually more troubling in terms of the underlining case law is that a reasonable inspection at the time of purchase would have shown any alleged open and obvious conditions that Mr. Miao admitted was on the property.

We also have the issue related to the unopposed causes of action that we sought summary judgment on, but also with the underlining claims that Mr. Miao specified related to the GFCI outlets which was an actual condition caused by the plaintiff related to the property that illustrates that this was only -- this lawsuit was brought for a bad-faith purpose with underlying conditions that Mr. Miao knew about.

13 If we look at the deposition alone, it illustrates 14 the undisputed facts that should grant summary judgment to 15 defendants entirely or at least establish these are the 16 undisputed facts in this case. Even if we have the partial 17 finding that these are the undisputed facts within the case, 18 plaintiff can never present any case as a matter of law because 19 the case law is very clear that there is no basis for this case 20 to continue.

21 Unless you have any questions, I'll go ahead and 22 rest.

23

THE COURT: I have a couple of questions.

24 Mr. Day, when you were speaking, you mentioned that 25 the deposition of Mr. Miao or Miao was late, and I'd like to

JD Reporting, Inc.

19

understand what you mean by that. 1 2 Well, Your Honor, any evidence that the MR. DAY: defendants have in support of their motion for summary judgment 3 should have been included in the original motion. 4 5 The defendants in their reply included frankly the 6 only admissible evidence that's included in any of their briefs 7 in their reply. The reply should be nothing more than a 8 response to plaintiff's opposition. So if they intended to use 9 Mr. Miao's deposition, it actually should have been included in 10 the original motion for summary judgment. 11 The original motion for summary judgment has no 12 admissible evidence. There is no testimony in the original 13 motion for summary judgment. Defendant simply relied upon 14 documents which essentially are hearsay documents --15 THE COURT: But, Mr. Day. -- so there is no foundation for those 16 MR. DAY: 17 documents. 18 THE COURT: Let me interrupt you for a moment. When 19 you're talking about the deposition and it's in the reply, can 20 you cite law to this Court that says that, you know -- because 21 I usually look at everything before. In other words, there's 22 been a motion. There's been an opposition. There are exhibits 23 that came first. Then there was a deposition that came in the 24 reply. 25 Is there legally a basis for not allowing something

JD Reporting, Inc.

20

like that to be reviewed, a legal basis that this Court is
 prohibited from reading something that's included in a reply?

3 MR. DAY: Well, there's nothing preventing the Court4 from reviewing whatever the Court wants to review.

THE COURT: Right.

5

6 MR. DAY: I am not prepared to cite cases for the 7 Court suggesting the proposition that -- I mean, I was not able 8 to provide or Mr. Childs was not able to respond to their reply 9 to the opposition. So, no, I'm not prepared to give you case law or suggesting that the Court cannot consider evidence that 10 11 was not originally brought in plaintiff's -- or defendants' 12 initial motion for summary judgment. I'd have to do some 13 research and submit a supplemental brief on that.

14 I just -- Judge, I just find it interesting that 15 their initial motion for summary judgment, as I'm reading the motion for summary judgment that there's no evidence. You 16 17 know, the defense is arguing that there are no factual issues. 18 They're arguing that there are no factual issues in the case, 19 but they present no admissible evidence, no testimony, no 20 nothing in their original motion for summary judgment other 21 than documents, and they discuss those documents, but they have 22 no testimony in their original motion for summary judgment 23 laying any kind of foundation for any of those documents.

Those documents, their presentation would not be admissible at the time of trial in their original motion for

JD Reporting, Inc.

1432

summary judgment. And yet they're asking the Court to render summary judgment on factual issues that were -- you know, on their motion for summary judgment, they present no fact -- no admissible facts. They presented no admissible factual issues. And that was my -- that was my point is that not until we get a reply do we even see any testimony, you know.

So, you know, we -- the plaintiff did not have an opportunity to respond to the testimony, the actual testimony that was presented by defendants in their motion because it was only included in their reply. Their original motion has no admissible evidence in it.

12

THE COURT: Mr. Lee.

13 MR. LEE: Yeah. While I appreciate that Mr. Day is14 late to the case, none of that is accurate.

Exhibit I to the motion for summary judgment is testimony that he's allegedly saying wasn't in there. It's a declaration from a defendant related to the documents.

Exhibit A is the document that was actually produced by -- well, a large portion of the documents in support of the motion for summary judgment were produced by the plaintiff. So they'd be self-authenticating anyway.

As it pertains to the supplement that we have with the deposition, it was filed as a supplement, not as a reply brief. Our reply brief did allude to Mr. Miao's deposition, which we took after filing the motion for summary judgment.

JD Reporting, Inc.

1 And then we supplemented on January 29th, 2021.

Today is March 11th, 2021. To say that the plaintiff never had an opportunity to respond to the supplemental brief that we provided that included the testimony of Mr. Miao is without merit and has no factual basis. We hadn't filed a motion when we filed a motion for summary judgment based on the deadlines set forth in the case. And on top of that, we were trying to keep this case moving forward.

9 We didn't try to do any ambush litigation tactics 10 here. We didn't do anything that the plaintiff wasn't aware 11 of. While I appreciate that Mr. Day was not the attorney at 12 that time, he inherited the case as it was, and he doesn't get 13 to re-examine the procedural history of the case or try to 14 invent facts that just simply aren't true just because he's new 15 to the case.

The underlining supplement that plaintiff had substantial (video interference) to go ahead and try to respond to this. They had substantial opportunity to allegedly do the discovery that they claimed that they needed to do to oppose the summary judgment motion, which they did not do and that Mr. Miao now indicates that he doesn't want there to be.

So if I'm Mr. Day, I appreciate that he is trying to avoid the deposition that illustrates the undisputed facts and the relevant testimony that is a hundred percent admissible that relates to the underlying documents that authenticate all

JD Reporting, Inc.

the documents that we're discussing here. Even without the documents, we have the undisputed admissible testimony of Mr. Miao, the person most knowledgeable, that illustrates the overwhelming undisputed facts that there is a lack of merit for this underlying action and that summary judgment should be appropriate as a matter of law.

Nevada case law is very clear related to a buyer's diligence that they have to do related to buying a piece of property. Mr. Miao admitted that the plaintiff was aware of those laws and those statutes related to the duty to inspect and that had he done a reasonable inspection at the time, they could have been -- they could've been discovered.

Even when you look at the opposition and the plaintiff's expert providing a declaration, he doesn't dispute any of the findings related to defense expert's findings that they were open and obvious or could have been discovered at the time of the purchase.

18 Under the plain language of the cases that I cited 19 and the statutes, nothing there would relieve this Honorable 20 Court of granting summary judgment as a matter of law based on 21 those undisputed evidence. Well, whereas Mr. Day continually 22 tries to expound upon the alleged defects in the motion, 23 opposition and reply, omitting the supplement and the 24 opportunity that the plaintiff had to respond to the 25 supplement, the undisputed facts arise from the undisputed

JD Reporting, Inc.

testimony of the plaintiff in this case. 1 2 So while he tries to go out there and raise some 3 generalities about what the alleged discovery would be, discovery is now closed. The plaintiff hasn't done any 4 5 discovery on those issues. And even if they did do discovery, 6 it would still be no genuine issue of material fact that 7 summary judgment is appropriate as a matter of law. 8 Thank you. 9 MR. DAY: Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: I'll let you have a moment, but Mr. Lee 11 will have the last word. So if you just want to speak to say 12 something quickly, then I'm going to move on, Mr. Day. Okay. MR. DAY: Judge, just one point. And my 13 14 understanding is that plaintiff attempted to take the 15 deposition of the defendant who failed to appear for a 16 deposition, and that issue still has not been brought before 17 the Court. 18 My understanding as well is there is written 19 discovery that still has not been responded to by the 20 defendant. There was a hearing before the Discovery 21 Commissioner who has ordered defendants to respond to certain 22 outstanding written discovery, which has still not been 23 responded to. 24 So, you know, while we have a discovery cut off, 25 there are -- there's discovery that's been ordered produced.

JD Reporting, Inc.

And frankly, the plaintiff still has -- intends to file a
 motion with the Court to compel defendants' appearance at a
 deposition.

4

THE COURT: Mr. Lee.

5 MR. LEE: While I appreciate Mr. Day is late in the 6 case, again, it's simply not accurate. The prior attorney did 7 not properly notice the underlying deposition allegedly for my 8 client. But for one of my clients -- noticed two depositions, 9 one that he called off because of a translator issue and 10 inability to get that scheduled properly.

As to the second deposition that I wasn't aware of, I agreed to allow plaintiff to go ahead and take the deposition prior to this hearing, but Mr. Miao sent an email saying that no more depositions.

What Mr. Miao -- Day is also omitting is that on Monday I had the deposition set for plaintiff's expert. Plaintiff at that time had acknowledged that the plaintiff would appear for the deposition. He knew of the time, knew of the subpoena. And then I told him that his subpoena was available for pickup. He didn't show, and he did a nonappearance.

As to the alleged discovery dispute, it's simply not accurate again. The plaintiff -- the defendants in this case have disclosed almost 600 documents. What the Discovery Commissioner ordered is that of those 600 documents he would

JD Reporting, Inc.

just like us to put into our responses or this information is
 not available.

As to the underlining issue related to the corporate formalities, the articles of incorporation or those type of documents or business licenses, those will have no impact on this underlining case.

So while I appreciate that Mr. Day is late to the
case, you know, the information that he presented related to
alleged discovery is simply not accurate.

10 THE COURT: All right. I'm ready to give you my 11 decision.

12 All right. So I've reviewed all of the 13 documentation, all of the pleadings. And first, I'd like to 14 start off with respect to while it wasn't the binding purchase 15 agreement, it's the first one. The residential agreement dated September 5th of 2017, clearly shows that the buyer did not 16 17 condition -- it was not conditioned on the buyer's due 18 diligence as defined in Section 7(a). This condition referred 19 to due diligence condition checked in the affirmative.

In other words, the bottom line is in the first residential, and I'm only saying that because one came right after another -- the buyer waived and purchased as is and had no interest apparently in moving forward and having an inspection done. While that residential agreement dated September 5th of '17, is not the binding agreement, it's

JD Reporting, Inc.

important because it shows how the -- the behavior of the
 plaintiff throughout this entire case.

3 Secondly, I have sellers real property disclosure form, August 2nd. It looks like the disclosures are there. 4 5 And still after that the plaintiffs refused. They were 6 actually encouraged to have -- to have someone review and --7 excuse me one moment -- inspect this property, and they did not 8 want to do that. And, you know, this is a 63-year-old 9 property. They're purchasing it as is. I'm not going to go 10 into the details, but there are -- there are specific 11 disclosures that were made by the seller, and the buyer was 12 encouraged, strongly encouraged to make sure that they 13 conducted an inspection, and they did not. They did not want to. Okay. 14

15 So in addition we have Mr. Miao's deposition. But 16 even without the deposition, the deposition obviously 17 references everything in more detail. But this was a waiver. 18 And when it comes -- the discovery here closed October 30th 19 of 2020. Okay. And -- and I -- this is not going -- I'm not 20 going to allow more discovery on this. There's been plenty of 21 time for this because this started, you know, long before COVID. And these cases have to move. You know, they have to 22 23 be done properly. So let's see.

24 So with respect to this case, I am granting -- this 25 Court grants the motion for summary judgment as to all claims

JD Reporting, Inc.

and will also entertain the Rule 11 sanctions.

1

Because, honestly, I don't see in good faith how this can be brought by -- this can be brought by the plaintiffs in good faith when they've waived everything. And in addition, they refused to conduct an inspection knowing that they were purchasing a 63-year-old property. I mean, it's just absurd.

7 Also, I find that in my review that this is not the 8 plaintiff's first purchase of a property. There apparently 9 is -- you know, they've purchased quite a few properties before 10 this one. So they should understand, you know, just like 11 purchasing one home, you understand how important generally an 12 inspection is. And here they are sophisticated in a sense that 13 they should, you know, they knew what the repercussions may be 14 of not holding an inspection.

And now, you know, we have a lot of law that has been cited by counsel for defense, Mr. Lee, that I actually think that -- you know, I'm not going to go into it here, but essentially the defendants, in my view, demonstrated that there's no genuine issue of material fact with respect to plaintiff's claims under Chapter 113. Defendants disclosed all of the known defects.

Plaintiffs have failed to create a genuine issue of material fact by introducing any evidence that the defendants were aware of the nondisclosed defects. And all of the defects were thoroughly explained by defendants' expert. They show

JD Reporting, Inc.

1 that those defects were discoverable with due diligence, which 2 plaintiffs failed to do. So that is the reason why I'm 3 granting it.

I don't take motions for summary judgment lightly at all. But this is one of the clearest cut cases I've seen. There's no evidence from the plaintiff that refutes material facts and introduces material facts. And that's really the key here. And then --

9

10

MR. MIAO: Excuse me.

THE COURT: Just a moment. I'm speaking.

11 Then when you're looking at the residential purchase 12 agreement and signed disclosure, it's clear in my view that 13 this is a baseless lawsuit, and I will grant defendants 14 attorneys' fees under NRCP 11.

This Court denies plaintiff's request for Rule 56(f) continuance for more discovery. It's a 2018 case. Discovery closed on October 30th of 2020, and I'm not going to continue to move forward with this because I don't think there's a basis for it. So that's it. That's my decision. That's this Court's decision.

And I'd like Mr. Lee to prepare a very detailed order that adopts the information that you included in your motion, in the defendants' motion.

24 Make sure that Mr. Day has a chance to take a look at 25 it as to form and content.

JD Reporting, Inc.

1	And I'd like to mention that, not from you or anyone
2	in particular, but in many cases I've been I've been
3	receiving orders, proposed orders really late. And pursuant to
4	EDCR 1.90, they need to be filed with this Court no later than
5	14 days after this decision. Okay. So please make sure that I
6	have that everybody starts
7	And, Mr. Lee, I'm not speaking to you. I have other
8	counsel on the phone. So I'm speaking to everyone. I need my
9	orders sooner. And, frankly, I prefer them within 10 days, but
10	the rule says 14. If you're able to submit them in 10 days,
11	then that's great. And, okay. That's it. That's it for this
12	case.
13	MR. MIAO: Excuse me.
14	THE COURT: Yes? Who's
15	MR. MIAO: Excuse me. I would (indiscernible).
16	THE COURT: No. No. I'm sorry. No, you may not
17	speak. You're represented by your attorney, and we are done.
18	MR. MIAO: But I really just (indiscernible) the
19	attorney just took over the case.
20	THE COURT: Excuse me.
21	MR. MIAO: A few days ago. I'm sorry.
22	THE COURT: Sir. Sir. This is this has been
23	on this is not a surprise case. And this is the decision of
24	this Court. Okay. It's a 2018 case. Discovery was closed in
25	October of I've already indicated it, and I don't know where

JD Reporting, Inc.

I have that note. I believe it was 2020. And --1 2 MR. MIAO: Twenty-second. 3 THE COURT: We're done. We're done here. We're 4 done. Please don't speak anymore. I don't want to be 5 disrespectful with you, but you must respect the Court as well. 6 We're done. 7 Counsel, I hope you're being safe out there and your 8 families are well, and --9 MR. MIAO: But --10 THE COURT: No. I'd like you to please mute the 11 person who is speaking that is not Mr. Day or Mr. Lee. 12 THE MARSHAL: Mr. Frank has been muted, Your Honor, 13 by the Court. 14 THE COURT: Okay. In any case, we're done now. 15 And I'd like you to call the next case, please, 16 Marshal Ragsdale. 17 THE CLERK: Judge, there's a status check for 18 settlement on this case. Do you want to hear --19 THE COURT: Oh, wait. Before we go on, before we go 20 on, if you're still on the line, if not, I'd like an email sent 21 to all parties, Ms. Reid (phonetic), that makes sure you tell 22 them to submit the order in PDF format and in Word format, and make sure both parties are -- all of the parties are in the 23 24 email. 25 And ask them to not submit it twice. Because if they

JD Reporting, Inc.

	A-18-785917-C   WLAB v. TKNR   2021-03-11					
1	send two copies, we don't get either one of anything. So only					
2	one PDF and only one Word document.					
3	(Proceedings concluded at 10:26 a.m.)					
4	-000-					
5	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly					
6	transcribed the audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled					
7	case.					
8	The OliAnia marca					
9	Jana P. Williams					
10	Dana L. Williams Transcriber					
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
	JD Reporting, Inc.					

	<b>31 [1]</b> 9/7	afterwards [1] 7/20	approval [1] 11/1	25/6 28/23 29/3 29/3
MD DAY: 1441 0/0 44/0	<b>31A [1]</b> 9/10	again [2] 26/6 26/23	are [30] 6/14 7/24	29/13 31/4 32/4
MR. DAY: [14] 2/9 14/8	31B [1] 9/15	ago [1] 31/21	11/24 12/7 13/5 13/12	because [15] 5/18 6/18
14/14 14/16 14/18 15/9 15/11 15/15 20/2 20/16	<b>33 [1]</b> 14/22	agree [1] 11/17	14/25 15/5 15/15 15/15	10/16 17/22 19/18
21/3 21/6 25/9 25/13	5	agreed [4] 7/12 7/15	15/20 16/2 16/14 16/19	20/20 22/9 23/14 26/9
MR. LEE: [19] 2/7 2/19		7/22 26/12	17/3 19/15 19/17 20/14	27/21 28/1 28/21 29/2
3/11 3/13 3/15 6/11	<b>56 [4]</b> 1/14 2/15 10/24	agreement [9] 3/6 3/7	20/22 21/17 21/18	30/18 32/25
6/13 6/21 6/24 7/1 7/3	30/15	5/8 12/3 27/15 27/15	25/25 28/4 28/10 28/10	been [23] 5/11 6/2 8/13
10/7 10/9 10/11 17/10	5th [2] 27/16 27/25	27/24 27/25 30/12	29/12 31/17 32/8 32/23	15/18 15/19 16/10 20/4
	6	agreements [1] 3/8 ahead [4] 14/3 19/21	32/23 areas [3] 6/4 7/4 7/6	20/9 20/22 20/22 24/12 24/12 24/16 25/16
MR. MIAO: [7] 30/9	<b>600 [2]</b> 26/24 26/25	23/17 26/12	aren't [1] 23/14	25/19 25/22 25/25
31/13 31/15 31/18	<b>63 [1]</b> 4/20	all [29] 2/12 2/25 4/11	argue [1] 15/17	28/20 29/15 31/2 31/2
31/21 32/2 32/9	63-year-old [3] 13/10	4/25 6/14 7/4 10/8	arguing [2] 21/17	31/22 32/12
THE CLERK: [1] 32/17	28/8 29/6	10/16 11/18 12/5 12/7	21/18	been \$102,000 [1] 8/13
THE COURT: [41] THE MARSHAL: [1]	<b>645 [1]</b> 12/15	13/4 13/8 15/5 16/6	argument [6] 16/14	before [11] 1/11 2/12
32/12	7	16/20 17/5 17/12 23/25	16/15 16/15 17/24 18/1	7/9 14/10 20/21 25/16
UNIDENTIFIED	7 [4] E/10	27/10 27/12 27/12	18/5	25/20 28/21 29/9 32/19
SPEAKER: [1] 2/3	7D [1] 5/10	27/13 28/25 29/20	arise [1] 24/25	32/19
	9	29/24 30/5 32/21 32/23	articles [1] 27/4	behalf [2] 2/7 2/9
\$	9:19 [1] 2/1	alleged [13] 7/12 7/25	as [37]	behavior [1] 28/1
<b>\$10,000 [2]</b> 8/16 13/17		8/8 9/7 9/15 18/6 18/8 19/1 19/4 24/22 25/3	asbestos [1] 4/9 ask [2] 14/1 32/25	being [4] 4/8 5/15 16/10 32/7
<b>\$102,000 [1]</b> 8/13	<u>A</u>	26/22 27/9	asked [1] 10/25	believe [2] 5/14 32/1
<b>\$16.25 [1]</b> 13/13	a.m [2] 2/1 33/3	allegedly [3] 22/16	asking [1] 22/1	believes [1] 5/18
\$16.25 million [1]	able [3] 21/7 21/8	23/18 26/7	aspects [1] 11/18	better [4] 14/16 15/9
13/13 <b>\$200,000 [1]</b> 13/12	31/10	allow [2] 26/12 28/20	assumed [1] 14/25	15/10 15/14
\$600,000 [1] 8/14	about [12] 8/8 9/9 9/11	allowed [1] 16/16	at [35]	between [1] 18/23
-	10/14 15/9 15/11 18/6	allowing [1] 20/25	attached [1] 7/6	binding [2] 27/14
<b></b>	18/8 19/1 19/12 20/19 25/3	allude [1] 22/24	attempt [2] 13/7 16/18	27/25
' <b>17 [1]</b> 27/25	above [1] 33/6	almost [1] 26/24	attempted [3] 15/24	bit [5] 10/4 10/5 10/5
	above-entitled [1] 33/6	alone [1] 19/13	16/11 25/14	14/11 14/17 Bonnio [4] 11/6
	absurd [1] 29/6	already [1] 31/25	attention [1] 11/24	Bonnie [1] 11/6
-oOo [1] 33/4	abuse [6] 3/1 8/11 13/2	also [40] alternative [2] 1/16	ATTEST [1] 33/5 attic [2] 5/23 9/22	both [1] 32/23 bottom [1] 27/20
1	13/5 13/8 13/20	2/13		breach [3] 12/14 12/19
<b>1.90 [1]</b> 31/4	access [5] 3/24 5/22	although [2] 7/24 8/1	31/17 31/19	12/20
<b>10 [3]</b> 12/25 31/9 31/10	5/23 6/5 7/10	am [2] 21/6 28/24	attorney's [1] 11/1	brief [5] 15/3 21/13
10:26 a.m [1] 33/3	accessible [1] 11/20	ambush [1] 23/9	attorneys' [2] 14/1	22/24 22/24 23/4
<b>11 [5]</b> 1/12 2/1 13/1	accompanied [1] 7/8	Amended [3] 8/18 8/19	30/14	briefed [1] 17/22
29/1 30/14	accurate [4] 22/14 26/6 26/23 27/9	10/10	audio [1] 33/6	briefing [1] 6/17
<b>113 [2]</b> 12/9 29/20	acknowledged [1]	another [1] 27/22	audio/video [1] 33/6	briefs [2] 14/23 20/6
113.140 [2] 11/3 11/10	26/17	any [23] 6/1 8/1 8/1	August [1] 28/4	bring [1] 14/12
11th [1] 23/2	action [11] 8/3 8/9 8/21	10/17 10/23 11/4 13/14	authenticate [1] 23/25	broker [1] 13/4
<b>12 [1]</b> 12/18	12/8 12/10 12/22 12/24	14/3 14/25 18/25 19/4 19/18 19/21 20/2 20/6	authenticating [1] 22/21	brought [5] 19/11
<b>13 [1]</b> 12/19	13/7 17/5 19/7 24/5	21/23 21/23 22/6 23/9	available [2] 26/20	21/11 25/16 29/3 29/3 building [3] 5/3 5/23
<b>14 [4]</b> 2/3 12/20 31/5 31/10	actual [2] 19/9 22/8	24/15 25/4 29/23 32/14	27/2	16/2
<b>15 [1]</b> 13/2	actually [5] 19/2 20/9	anymore [1] 32/4	avoid [2] 18/4 23/23	burden [1] 18/25
	22/18 28/6 29/16	anyone [1] 31/1	aware [12] 3/17 3/21	business [1] 27/5
2	acutely [1] 3/17	anything [2] 23/10	4/16 5/2 5/5 5/9 10/17	but [25] 6/9 6/22 8/13
<b>20 [1]</b> 3/3	addition [2] 28/15 29/4 additional [2] 10/21	33/1	11/5 23/10 24/9 26/11	8/16 15/5 16/15 17/13
<b>2017 [6]</b> 6/3 6/6 7/5 7/7	10/23	anyway [1] 22/21	29/24	17/14 19/7 20/15 21/19
7/10 27/16	admissible [10] 16/23	apologize [1] 3/13	В	21/21 25/10 26/8 26/13
<b>2018 [3]</b> 13/11 30/16	20/6 20/12 21/19 21/25	apparently [2] 27/23		28/10 28/15 28/17
31/24	22/4 22/4 22/11 23/24	29/8	back [1] 8/18	29/17 30/5 31/2 31/9
<b>2020 [3]</b> 28/19 30/17	24/2	appear [2] 25/15 26/18 appearance [2] 14/18	background [1] 3/2 bad [1] 19/11	31/18 32/5 32/9 buyer [9] 3/3 11/8
32/1 <b>2021 [4]</b> 1/12 2/1 23/1	admits [1] 9/24	26/2	bad-faith [1] 19/11	11/11 11/14 11/20
2021 [4] 1/12 2/1 23/1	admitted [7] 3/2 5/22	appearances [2] 1/19	based [5] 1/14 8/19 9/2	11/25 27/16 27/22
<b>25 [1]</b> 8/22	6/3 18/7 18/22 19/5	2/6	23/7 24/20	28/11
<b>27 [1]</b> 9/3	24/9	applies [1] 11/23	baseless [1] 30/13	buyer's [3] 12/4 24/7
<b>29 [1]</b> 9/5	adopts [1] 30/22	appraiser [1] 5/16	basis [8] 6/18 10/24	27/17
<b>29th [1]</b> 23/1	ADRIANA [1] 1/11	appreciate [7] 6/16	13/13 19/19 20/25 21/1	buying [2] 18/10 24/8
<b>2nd [1]</b> 28/4	adverse [1] 9/1	18/6 22/13 23/11 23/22	23/5 30/18	
3	affects [1] 8/24 affirmative [1] 27/19	26/5 27/7	be [22] 6/7 9/5 10/23	<u>C</u>
	after [6] 16/3 16/5	appropriate [6] 2/25	16/1 16/15 16/16 16/20	call [1] 32/15
<b>30 [1]</b> 15/3	22/25 27/22 28/5 31/5	10/16 13/20 13/24 24/6	17/25 20/7 21/1 21/24	called [1] 26/9
30th [2] 28/18 30/17		25/7	22/21 23/21 24/5 25/3	came [3] 20/23 20/23
				1445
L				

С	27/17 27/18 27/19	create [1] 29/22	Despite [1] 4/24	24/14
came [1] 27/21	conditioned [1] 27/17	currently [2] 7/25	destructive [1] 6/1	doing [1] 15/14
can [6] 16/1 18/4 19/18	conditions [12] 7/12	18/17	detail [1] 28/17	don't [9] 2/18 10/8 29/2
20/19 29/3 29/3	7/19 7/25 8/8 8/24 9/7	cut [2] 25/24 30/5	detailed [1] 30/21	30/4 30/18 31/25 32/4
can't [2] 14/12 15/13	9/21 18/8 18/20 19/1	<b>D</b>	details [1] 28/10	32/4 33/1
	19/4 19/12	D	detectors [1] 9/20	done [20] 4/19 4/21
cannot [1] 21/10	conduct [3] 3/22 3/25	damage [2] 9/21 13/23	determine [1] 16/16	4/22 6/3 6/5 7/22 8/1
care [1] 11/12 carry [1] 11/17	29/5	damaged [1] 8/5	did [17] 4/1 7/10 7/23	9/5 9/25 15/18 24/11
case [47]	conducted [1] 28/13	damages [5] 5/9 5/10	8/16 9/8 10/22 17/24	25/4 27/24 28/23 31/17
cases [5] 21/6 24/18	consider [1] 21/10	5/11 12/15 13/13	22/7 22/24 23/20 25/5	32/3 32/3 32/4 32/6
28/22 30/5 31/2	conspicuous [1] 3/6	Dana [1] 33/10	26/6 26/20 27/16 28/7	32/14
Cause [2] 12/8 12/10	conspiracy [1] 12/18	dated [2] 27/15 27/24	28/13 28/13	down [2] 16/11 17/11
caused [1] 19/9	constitute [1] 11/11	day [26] 1/20 2/9 2/11	didn't [5] 6/1 13/15	dryer [1] 4/4
causes [4] 12/22 12/24	construction [2] 9/5	14/4 14/7 14/8 14/10	23/9 23/10 26/20	due [4] 5/4 27/17 27/19
17/5 19/7	9/25	15/7 15/7 17/8 17/24	differentiate [2] 7/18	30/1
ceramic [1] 4/10	constructive [1] 12/10	18/5 18/14 18/18 19/24	18/22	during [5] 4/2 7/3 7/8
certain [1] 25/21	contact [1] 10/25	20/15 22/13 23/11	diligence [5] 5/4 24/8	7/10 18/17
certainly [1] 14/14	contacted [1] 5/2	23/22 24/21 25/12 26/5	27/18 27/19 30/1	duties [1] 3/9
certify [1] 33/5	content [1] 30/25	26/15 27/7 30/24 32/11	diligent [1] 11/24	duty [6] 3/16 11/4
chance [1] 30/24	contention [2] 15/16	days [4] 31/5 31/9	directly [3] 10/22 10/24	
Chapter [2] 12/9 29/20	17/3	31/10 31/21	11/1	24/10
check [1] 32/17	context [1] 13/19	deadlines [1] 23/7	disclose [2] 8/23 11/4	E
checked [1] 27/19	continually [1] 24/21	dealing [1] 12/21	disclosed [2] 26/24	
Childs [2] 15/2 21/8	continuance [3] 1/14	decision [5] 27/11	29/20	each [1] 12/3
citation [1] 6/15	2/14 30/16	30/19 30/20 31/5 31/23	disclosure [6] 4/14	EDCR [1] 31/4
cite [2] 20/20 21/6	continue [3] 6/24	declaration [4] 8/15 8/17 22/17 24/14	4/15 9/3 11/11 28/3	education [1] 12/17 efforts [1] 16/18
cited [3] 11/2 24/18	19/20 30/17		30/12	
29/16	contract [1] 12/19	defects [7] 11/4 11/8 24/22 29/21 29/24	disclosures [3] 4/24	either [3] 9/4 11/8 33/1
civil [1] 12/18	contractor [1] 5/15	29/24 30/1	28/4 28/11	elected [1] 5/7 electrical [4] 4/3 4/8
claim [7] 2/25 8/11	contractors [1] 9/6	defendant [8] 1/9 2/14	discount [1] 18/2	4/9 9/10
13/2 13/6 13/8 13/13	control [1] 17/12 conveniently [1] 18/15	18/8 18/13 20/13 22/17	discoverable [1] 30/1 discovered [7] 5/11	email [3] 26/13 32/20
13/18	conveyance [3] 12/25	25/15 25/20	11/8 15/19 16/3 16/5	32/24
claimed [1] 23/19	13/1 13/14	DEFENDANT'S [1]	24/12 24/16	encouraged [3] 28/6
claiming [3] 9/8 13/12	cooling [2] 4/18 9/19	1/13	discovery [22] 10/22	28/12 28/12
15/20	copies [1] 33/1	defendants [28] 1/16	10/23 13/19 18/6 23/19	end [1] 3/23
claims [10] 2/25 11/14	copying [1] 10/25	1/22 2/8 2/16 8/7 13/4	25/3 25/4 25/5 25/5	enrichment [1] 11/16
12/4 12/5 12/8 13/15	corporate [1] 27/3	13/8 15/17 15/17 15/21	25/19 25/20 25/22	ensure [1] 11/18
13/25 19/8 28/25 29/20	correctly [1] 33/5	15/21 16/7 16/11 16/18	25/24 25/25 26/22	entertain [1] 29/1
CLARK [4] 1/2 2/1 3/9	cost [2] 8/12 8/14	18/9 18/16 18/23 19/1	26/24 27/9 28/18 28/20	entire [3] 3/25 5/23
5/17 clear [5] 3/9 3/15 19/19	costs [2] 5/18 14/2	19/15 20/3 20/5 22/9	30/16 30/16 31/24	28/2
<b>Clear [5]</b> 3/9 3/15 19/19	could [10] 4/25 5/11	25/21 26/23 29/18	discuss [1] 21/21	entirely [1] 19/15
24/7 30/12 clearest [1] 30/5	6/2 7/5 7/7 8/5 11/8	29/20 29/23 30/13	discussing [1] 24/1	entitled [3] 12/7 13/6
clearly [2] 11/10 27/16	15/23 24/12 24/16	defendants' [7] 7/8	dislike [1] 17/13	33/6
client [1] 26/8	could've [2] 10/20	15/2 17/1 21/11 26/2	dispute [4] 10/17 13/3	ESCOBAR [1] 1/11
clients [1] 26/8	24/12	29/25 30/23	24/14 26/22	escrow [1] 11/19
close [1] 11/19	counsel [5] 10/25 14/7	defense [5] 16/15	disputed [1] 13/23	ESQ [2] 1/20 1/22
closed [4] 25/4 28/18	29/16 31/8 32/7	16/24 21/17 24/15	disrespectful [1] 32/5	essentially [2] 20/14
30/17 31/24	counterclaim [1] 13/5	29/16	DISTRICT [2] 1/2 1/11	29/18
closer [1] 14/13	countermotion [4]	deficiencies [1] 7/17	<b>do [16]</b> 5/19 6/1 8/10	establish [1] 19/15
code [1] 4/6	1/14 1/14 2/14 10/21	defined [1] 27/18	21/12 22/6 23/9 23/10	estimate [1] 8/12
comes [1] 28/18	COUNTY [4] 1/2 2/1	demand [1] 13/16 demonstrated [1]	23/18 23/19 23/20 24/8	even [8] 13/15 17/18 19/16 22/6 24/1 24/13
coming [1] 16/5	3/9 5/17	29/18	25/5 28/8 30/2 32/18	25/5 28/16
Commissioner [2]	couple [1] 19/23 COURT [21] 1/2 1/11	denied [1] 8/17	33/5 document [2] 22/18	event [1] 13/22
25/21 26/25	12/2 14/3 17/6 20/20	denies [1] 30/15	33/2	everybody [1] 31/6
common [4] 11/14	21/1 21/3 21/4 21/7	department [2] 2/3 5/3	documentation [1]	everyone [1] 31/8
12/4 12/5 12/11	21/10 22/1 24/20 25/17	<b>Department 14 [1]</b> 2/3	27/13	everything [6] 6/9 6/15
common-law [4] 11/14	26/2 28/25 30/15 31/4	deposition [25] 2/21	documents [21] 14/6	17/18 20/21 28/17 29/4
12/4 12/5 12/11	31/24 32/5 32/13	6/15 6/19 16/21 18/2	14/23 14/24 15/4 16/25	evidence [13] 8/7
compel [1] 26/2	Court's [1] 30/20	18/19 19/13 19/25 20/9	16/25 20/14 20/14	16/23 18/8 20/2 20/6
complaint [4] 8/19	covenant [1] 12/20	20/19 20/23 22/23	20/17 21/21 21/21	20/12 21/10 21/16
8/19 10/15 12/6	cover [3] 15/24 16/11	22/24 23/23 25/15	21/23 21/24 22/17	21/19 22/11 24/21
concealment [1] 12/13 concluded [1] 33/3	16/18	25/16 26/3 26/7 26/11	22/19 23/25 24/1 24/2	29/23 30/6
concrete [1] 4/11	covering [2] 15/25	26/12 26/16 26/18	26/24 26/25 27/5	exactly [3] 6/2 6/4 6/5
condemned [2] 16/10	16/6	28/15 28/16 28/16	does [4] 5/14 7/25 11/4	
16/10	COVID [1] 28/22	depositions [2] 26/8	11/11	examined [2] 6/3 6/4
condition [4] 19/9	cracks [2] 4/10 4/10	26/14	doesn't [6] 5/13 5/17	example [1] 16/4
	crazy [1] 17/17	DEPT [1] 1/6	17/22 23/12 23/21	excess [1] 15/3
				1446
		1	1	· · · · •

E	foreclosed [1] 12/3	has [19] 3/3 5/16 11/12	32/20 32/25	28/10 29/17
exclusively [1] 16/24	foreclosing [1] 11/22	14/3 17/6 17/25 18/25	illustrate [2] 10/15	introduces [1] 30/7
excuse [6] 15/8 28/7	Forgive [1] 2/15	20/11 22/10 23/5 25/16	13/7	introducing [1] 29/23
30/9 31/13 31/15 31/20	form [4] 4/15 9/3 28/4	25/19 25/21 25/22 26/1	illustrated [2] 2/23 7/4	
exercise [1] 11/12	30/25 formalities [1] 27/4	29/15 30/24 31/22 32/12		invent [1] 23/14 INVESTMENT [1] 1/4
Exhibit [2] 22/15 22/18	format [2] 32/22 32/22	hasn't [1] 25/4	19/10 19/13 23/23 24/3	
exhibits [1] 20/22	forms [1] 4/14	hate [1] 17/13	immediately [2] 14/25	
expensive [1] 5/19	forth [1] 23/7	have [59]	15/23	is [88]
expert [16] 5/25 5/25	forward [3] 23/8 27/23	having [2] 17/14 27/23	impact [1] 27/5	issue [14] 3/19 5/21
6/4 7/4 7/6 7/8 7/10 7/12 7/13 7/18 8/13	30/18	he [67]	important [2] 28/1	13/23 16/7 17/22 17/23
16/1 18/22 24/14 26/16		he's [2] 22/16 23/14	29/11	17/25 19/6 25/6 25/16
29/25	10/12 14/25 16/4 16/8	hear [4] 14/12 15/14	Importantly [1] 12/2	26/9 27/3 29/19 29/22
expert's [2] 7/15 24/15	16/25 20/16 21/23	17/18 32/18	imposed [1] 11/7	issues [28] 4/5 4/7 4/8
explained [1] 29/25	Frank [2] 2/22 32/12	hearing [2] 25/20	IMPOSITION [1] 1/14	4/9 4/17 5/1 7/16 7/21
exposed [1] 4/9	frankly [4] 16/9 20/5 26/1 31/9	26/13	improvement [1] 18/17	9/15 9/23 10/16 10/17 15/1 15/5 15/6 15/16
expound [1] 24/22	fraud [2] 12/10 12/11	hearsay [3] 14/23 16/24 20/14	improving [1] 18/11 in [100]	15/18 16/1 16/4 16/20
expressly [1] 11/17	fraudulent [6] 11/15	heating [2] 4/18 9/18	inability [1] 26/10	17/4 18/3 18/7 21/17
extort [1] 13/8	12/12 12/13 12/25 13/1	here [10] 14/6 18/14	inadequate [2] 9/4	21/18 22/2 22/4 25/5
F	13/14	18/25 23/10 24/1 28/18	12/16	it [47]
fact [11] 13/23 13/24	Fund [1] 8/8	29/12 29/17 30/8 32/3	INC [2] 1/7 1/25	it's [17] 6/8 6/18 13/10
17/23 17/25 18/3 18/15	fungus [1] 10/2	hereby [1] 33/5	included [14] 5/1 12/2	15/12 15/20 17/23 18/1
18/21 22/3 25/6 29/19	further [1] 15/5	Highlands [1] 11/21	12/23 15/3 16/21 16/23	20/19 22/16 26/6 26/22
29/23	G	him [2] 10/25 26/19	20/4 20/5 20/6 20/9	27/15 27/25 29/6 30/12
facts [17] 2/24 8/20 9/2	general [3] 5/15 11/22	himself [1] 5/19	21/2 22/10 23/4 30/22	30/16 31/24
10/14 11/24 13/7 13/25	general [3] 5/15 11/22 18/5	hired [1] 5/17 his [14] 4/12 5/4 5/6	includes [3] 2/21 6/15 14/22	Item [1] 9/24 itself [2] 3/18 16/2
19/14 19/16 19/17 22/4	generalities [1] 25/3	5/25 6/5 8/12 8/15 8/17	including [2] 4/9 9/10	
23/14 23/23 24/4 24/25	generally [2] 11/7	9/2 10/25 11/1 16/13	incorporation [1] 27/4	J
30/7 30/7 factual [11] 15/1 15/5	29/11	18/18 26/19	indicated [3] 5/13 8/11	January [1] 23/1
15/6 15/16 16/20 17/4	genuine [6] 17/23	history [1] 23/13	31/25	<b>JD [1]</b> 1/25
21/17 21/18 22/2 22/4	17/25 18/3 25/6 29/19	holding [1] 29/14	indicates [1] 23/21	job [1] 17/24
23/5	29/22	home [2] 13/11 29/11	indiscernible [2] 31/15	
failed [6] 7/18 8/23	get [7] 2/17 5/6 5/7	honestly [1] 29/2	31/18	14/18 15/11 21/14
18/22 25/15 29/22 30/2	22/5 23/12 26/10 33/1 getting [1] 3/18	Honor [10] 2/4 2/19	inducement [1] 12/12	25/13 32/17 judgment [45]
failure [1] 12/16	GFCI [5] 4/8 9/11 9/11	6/11 7/1 10/7 14/8 17/10 20/2 25/9 32/12		jury [3] 16/16 16/16
fair [1] 12/20	9/13 19/9	HONORABLE [2] 1/11	27/1 27/8 30/22	16/20
faith [4] 12/20 19/11	give [2] 21/9 27/10	24/19	inherited [1] 23/12	just [19] 5/19 6/8 6/25
29/2 29/4 false [1] 9/4	giving [1] 6/13	hope [1] 32/7	initial [4] 8/12 16/22	6/25 10/5 16/9 17/22
families [1] 32/8	go [11] 14/3 14/7 17/20	how [4] 15/9 28/1 29/2	21/12 21/15	21/14 21/14 23/14
fast [1] 6/25	19/21 23/17 25/2 26/12	29/11	inspect [5] 3/16 3/24	23/14 25/11 25/13 27/1
favor [1] 13/20	28/9 29/17 32/19 32/19	however [1] 15/20	11/17 24/10 28/7	29/6 29/10 30/10 31/18
fees [2] 14/1 30/14	going [7] 2/17 25/12	hundred [3] 14/23 15/4		31/19
few [2] 29/9 31/21	28/9 28/19 28/20 29/17 30/17	23/24	7/7	justifying [1] 12/4
fiduciary [1] 12/14	good [6] 2/5 2/11	hurry [1] 17/17 HVAC [4] 4/4 4/22 5/1	inspection [20] 3/18 3/19 5/6 5/7 5/12 5/22	Κ
file [1] 26/1	12/20 17/24 29/2 29/4	10/1	6/2 6/6 7/9 7/11 10/19	keep [2] 18/9 23/8
filed [8] 2/20 12/23 15/2 16/23 22/23 23/6	got [1] 17/12		15/18 16/13 19/3 24/11	key [1] 30/7
23/6 31/4	grant [2] 19/14 30/13	<u> </u>	27/24 28/13 29/5 29/12	kind [1] 21/23
files [1] 14/21	granting [4] 12/4 24/20		29/14	knew [11] 4/20 8/8
filing [2] 13/18 22/25	28/24 30/3	17/17 19/25 21/12	inspections [6] 3/22	9/24 11/8 16/17 18/8
find [3] 13/22 21/14	grants [1] 28/25	27/13 30/21 31/1 32/10	4/1 5/14 5/20 6/6 9/6	19/1 19/12 26/18 26/18 29/13
29/7	<b>great [3]</b> 6/21 16/15 31/11	32/15 32/20 I'II [4] 6/24 14/3 19/21	inspector [2] 5/16 5/17	knocked [1] 16/10
finding [2] 7/15 19/17		25/10	install [1] 9/12 installation [1] 4/23	know [19] 9/9 15/12
findings [2] 24/15	Н	l'm [21] 6/13 6/15 7/1	instead [1] 16/10	16/22 20/20 21/17 22/2
24/15	had [21] 3/8 3/21 3/24	10/5 10/7 21/9 21/15	intended [1] 20/8	22/6 22/7 25/24 27/8
finishing [2] 4/7 7/22 first [5] 20/23 27/13	4/17 5/13 5/22 5/23 6/4	23/22 25/12 27/10	intends [1] 26/1	28/8 28/21 28/22 29/9
27/15 27/20 29/8	6/16 7/9 8/9 15/17	27/21 28/9 28/19 29/17	intent [1] 15/22	29/10 29/13 29/15
flip [2] 15/23 15/23	16/25 23/3 23/16 23/18	30/2 30/10 30/17 31/7	intentional [1] 11/16	29/17 31/25
Flipping [1] 8/8	24/11 24/24 26/16	31/8 31/16 31/21	interest [1] 27/23	knowing [1] 29/5
floor [4] 4/10 15/25	26/17 27/22 hadn't [1] 23/6	l've [7] 6/8 6/20 27/12	interesting [1] 21/14	knowledgeable [2] 2/22 24/3
16/5 16/6	handyman [1] 4/22	30/5 31/2 31/2 31/25 identified [2] 5/1 7/13	interference [3] 6/22 8/6 23/17	known [3] 8/24 16/17
Flooring [1] 10/12	happened [2] 18/23	if [12] 5/21 17/11 19/13		29/21
followed [2] 4/24 5/1	18/24	19/16 20/8 23/22 25/5	20/18	
following [1] 10/5	happens [2] 10/8 15/12	25/11 31/10 32/20	into [5] 9/21 10/14 27/1	
				1447

L	making [1] 8/17	Mr. Day [20] 2/11 14/4	NRS [3] 11/10 12/9	our [13] 2/20 2/25 6/14
land [1] 10/12	management [1] 18/13		12/15	7/8 7/10 7/10 7/12 7/15
language [1] 24/18	manager [1] 5/16	17/24 18/5 18/14 19/24	NRS 113.140 [1] 11/10	13/5 13/15 17/24 22/24
large [1] 22/19	manner [1] 9/1	20/15 22/13 23/11	NRS 645 [1] 12/15	27/1
LAS [2] 2/1 3/4	many [8] 14/6 15/6	23/22 24/21 25/12 26/5	NRS Chapter 113 [1]	out [2] 25/2 32/7
last [1] 25/11	15/22 16/1 16/11 16/13	27/7 30/24 32/11	12/9	outlets [6] 4/8 4/8 9/11
late [6] 16/22 19/25	16/18 31/2	Mr. Frank [1] 32/12	numerous [3] 15/15	9/11 9/13 19/9
22/14 26/5 27/7 31/3	MARCH [3] 1/12 2/1 23/2	Mr. Lee [12] 2/11 2/18 3/10 6/7 10/4 17/9	15/24 17/3	outlines [1] 9/7 outstanding [1] 25/22
later [1] 31/4	Marshal [1] 32/16	22/12 25/10 29/16	0	over [4] 14/4 14/23
law [17] 3/17 11/2 11/6	material [10] 13/23	30/21 31/7 32/11	observation [1] 11/25	15/4 31/19
11/14 12/4 12/5 12/11	13/23 17/23 17/25 18/3	Mr. Miao [23] 3/2 3/20	observing [1] 16/12	overwhelming [1] 24/4
19/2 19/18 19/19 20/20	25/6 29/19 29/23 30/6	4/24 5/13 5/22 7/9 7/22	obtain [1] 5/3	owned [4] 7/19 7/19
21/10 24/6 24/7 24/20	30/7	8/20 9/12 10/22 18/2	obvious [5] 4/12 7/14	18/9 18/23
25/7 29/15	materially [1] 8/24	18/18 18/21 19/4 19/8	10/19 19/4 24/16	
laws [1] 24/10 lawsuit [2] 19/11 30/13	matter [4] 10/19 24/6	19/12 19/25 23/5 23/21	obviously [1] 28/16	Р
laying [1] 21/23	24/20 23/7	24/3 24/9 26/13 26/15	October [3] 28/18	page [1] 2/4
least [2] 3/3 19/15	may [3] 6/7 29/13	Mr. Miao's [5] 6/14	30/17 31/25	page 1-2 [1] 2/4
LEE [15] 1/22 2/7 2/11	31/16	6/19 20/9 22/24 28/15	off [3] 25/24 26/9 27/14	
2/18 3/10 6/7 10/4 17/9	McDonald [1] 11/20	Ms. [1] 32/21	offer [1] 8/17	15/3 15/4
22/12 25/10 26/4 29/16	me [13] 2/12 2/15	Ms. Reid [1] 32/21	Oh [2] 3/13 32/19	paragraph [6] 5/10
30/21 31/7 32/11	10/22 10/24 10/25 15/8	must [3] 9/5 15/8 32/5	okay [24] 2/5 2/11 3/14	
left [1] 16/20	17/11 20/18 28/7 30/9	mute [1] 32/10	6/8 6/21 6/24 7/2 7/3	paragraph 25 [1] 8/22
legal [1] 21/1	31/13 31/15 31/20	muted [1] 32/12	10/10 14/5 14/10 14/15	paragraph 27 [1] 9/3
legally [1] 20/25	mean [5] 15/17 17/22	my [13] 10/13 22/5	14/18 15/11 15/12 15/15 17/8 25/12 28/14	Paragraph 29 [1] 9/5 paragraph 31 [1] 9/7
let [2] 20/18 25/10	20/1 21/7 29/6 mechanical [1] 4/3	22/5 25/13 25/18 26/7 26/8 27/10 29/7 29/18		Paragraph 31A [1]
let's [2] 2/17 28/23	mention [1] 31/1	30/12 30/19 31/8	32/14	9/10
liability [2] 11/7 11/22	mentioned [1] 19/24	·	old [4] 4/20 13/10 28/8	paragraph 7D [1] 5/10
license [1] 5/15	merely [1] 13/7	Ν	29/6	part [1] 5/4
licensed [2] 3/22 9/6	merit [5] 8/2 8/20 18/7	need [4] 6/8 7/23 31/4	omitted [1] 18/15	partial [4] 1/16 2/13
licenses [1] 27/5	23/5 24/4	31/8	omitting [2] 24/23	13/24 19/16
lightly [1] 30/4 like [15] 2/5 3/12 6/9	meritless [1] 13/8	needed [1] 23/19	26/15	particular [2] 3/1 31/2
14/11 19/25 21/1 27/1	met [1] 18/25	negligent [2] 11/15	on [36]	parties [5] 1/10 8/5
27/13 28/4 29/10 30/21	Miao [26] 2/22 3/2 3/20		one [16] 8/23 9/12	32/21 32/23 32/23
31/1 32/10 32/15 32/20	4/24 5/13 5/22 7/9 7/22	NEVADA [7] 1/2 2/1	15/13 15/13 25/13 26/8	party [2] 8/9 14/21
limited [2] 5/9 5/10	8/20 9/12 10/22 18/2	3/17 3/22 11/3 12/2	26/9 27/15 27/21 28/7	PDF [2] 32/22 33/2
line [4] 2/22 9/17 27/20	18/7 18/18 18/21 19/4	24/7	29/10 29/11 30/5 33/1	people [1] 17/14
32/20	19/8 19/12 19/25 19/25	never [6] 4/17 4/24 5/16 12/22 19/18 23/3	33/2 33/2	percent [1] 23/24
litigation [1] 23/9	23/5 23/21 24/3 24/9		only [9] 3/21 13/18 15/5 19/11 20/6 22/10	period [2] 18/10 18/12
little [5] 10/4 10/5	26/13 26/15 Miao's [5] 6/14 6/19	new [2] 18/6 23/14 next [1] 32/15	27/21 33/1 33/2	perjury [1] 8/15 permits [7] 4/19 5/2
14/11 14/17 16/22	20/9 22/24 28/15	no [43]	oOo [1] 33/4	5/3 7/22 7/23 9/6 9/25
lived [1] 18/16	MICHAEL [2] 1/22 2/7	nonappearance [1]	open [5] 4/12 7/13	person [5] 2/21 15/13
living [1] 18/20	microphone [1] 14/13	26/21	10/19 19/4 24/16	18/19 24/3 32/11
LLC [1] 1/4	million [1] 13/13	nondestructive [1]	operated [1] 18/12	pertains [1] 22/22
local [1] 5/3 long [3] 18/12 18/15	mind [1] 18/9	3/25	opportunity [5] 6/16	phone [1] 31/8
28/21	misrepresentation [2]	nondisclosed [1]	22/8 23/3 23/18 24/24	phonetic [2] 11/25
long-term [1] 18/15	11/15 11/16	29/24	oppose [2] 13/15 23/19	
look [10] 5/8 5/21 7/21	moisture [1] 9/21	nondisclosure [3] 9/8	opposing [1] 14/21	pickup [1] 26/20
8/18 12/6 12/7 19/13	mold [3] 5/5 5/6 10/2	11/7 11/23	opposition [11] 1/13	pictures [1] 7/5
20/21 24/13 30/24	moment [4] 20/18	none [2] 14/24 22/14 noninvasive [1] 3/25	2/14 2/17 12/23 14/20 15/2 20/8 20/22 21/9	piece [1] 24/8 place [1] 8/1
looked [3] 5/23 9/3	25/10 28/7 30/10 Monday [1] 26/16	not [62]	24/13 24/23	placed [1] 0/1 placed [1] 16/6
14/19	MONETARY [1] 1/14	notable [1] 9/11	or [35]	plain [1] 24/18
looking [3] 3/1 8/22			order [2] 30/21 32/22	plaintiff [40]
30/11	26/14 28/17 28/20	note [2] 18/14 32/1	ordered [3] 25/21	plaintiff's [24] 2/16
looks [1] 28/4	30/16	noted [2] 4/5 8/15	25/25 26/25	2/21 2/25 6/4 6/5 7/4
lot [1] 29/15 louder [3] 14/11 15/7	morning [1] 2/11	nothing [5] 8/10 20/7	orders [3] 31/3 31/3	7/13 7/18 8/13 10/18
15/8	most [3] 2/22 4/21 24/3		31/9	12/8 13/7 15/16 15/20
	motion [39]	notice [2] 8/1 26/7	original [10] 6/6 13/16	16/25 17/3 18/22 20/8
Μ	motions [2] 14/19 30/4		20/4 20/10 20/11 20/12	21/11 24/14 26/16 29/8
Macintosh [1] 11/25	move [3] 25/12 28/22	novel [2] 17/24 18/1	21/20 21/22 21/25	29/20 30/15
made [5] 14/18 16/14	30/18	<b>now [12]</b> 2/3 5/13 6/14	22/10	plaintiffs [6] 13/12
16/16 16/18 28/11	moving [2] 23/8 27/23	10/13 12/6 13/12 13/18 15/14 23/21 25/4 29/15	originally [2] 8/16 21/11	15/19 28/5 29/3 29/22 30/2
make [6] 6/22 6/24	Mr [2] 14/7 26/4	32/14	other [10] 3/8 3/8 4/22	plaster [1] 15/25
28/12 30/24 31/5 32/23	Mr. [63] Mr. Childs [2] 15/2	NRCP [3] 1/14 2/15	12/22 13/14 15/13	pleadings [3] 17/19
makes [1] 32/21	21/8	30/14	20/21 21/20 27/20 31/7	17/21 27/13
				1448
				1440

Р	purchased [8] 3/3	repairs [1] 8/2	Section [1] 27/18	4/13 4/25 7/3 7/24 8/4
please [18] 2/6 2/18	11/23 13/11 15/21	repercussions [1]	Section 7 [1] 27/18	8/7 18/18 19/8
3/12 6/7 6/10 6/23 10/4	15/22 16/3 27/22 29/9	29/13	see [3] 22/6 28/23 29/2	specifies [1] 11/6
10/6 14/11 15/7 15/8	purchasing [6] 3/8	reply [14] 14/20 16/22	seen [2] 16/1 30/5	specifying [1] 10/22
17/9 17/10 17/14 31/5	9/13 18/16 28/9 29/6	20/5 20/7 20/7 20/19	self [1] 22/21	Springs [1] 11/6
32/4 32/10 32/15	29/11 purpose [2] 13/18	20/24 21/2 21/8 22/6 22/10 22/23 22/24	self-authenticating [1]	stand [1] 17/7 start [5] 2/18 3/1 14/10
plenty [1] 28/20	19/11	24/23	seller [6] 3/21 4/16	17/11 27/14
plumbing [2] 4/4 9/15	pursuant [2] 2/15 31/3	report [3] 7/4 7/6 7/18	4/25 7/23 11/4 28/11	started [3] 10/13 16/5
point [2] 22/5 25/13	put [1] 27/1	<b>REPORTING</b> [1] 1/25	seller's [3] 4/13 9/3	28/21
portion [1] 22/19	· · · · ·	reports [1] 16/1	11/10	starts [1] 31/6
position [1] 15/20 potential [4] 4/9 5/5	Q	represented [1] 31/17	sellers [2] 9/12 28/3	status [1] 32/17
5/11 8/4	questions [5] 14/3	request [3] 10/24	selling [1] 18/11	Statute [1] 11/3
preclude [1] 17/4	14/5 17/6 19/21 19/23	13/15 30/15	send [1] 33/1	statutes [2] 24/10
precluded [1] 16/12	quickly [4] 6/25 15/13	requested [1] 9/12	sense [1] 29/12	24/19
prefer [1] 31/9	17/11 25/12 quite [1] 29/9	requests [1] 12/23	sent [2] 26/13 32/20	STEVEN [3] 1/20 2/9 14/8
premises [1] 16/13	quote [3] 3/21 3/23	requirement [2] 3/17 5/6	September [2] 27/16 27/25	still [9] 11/12 18/20
prepare [1] 30/21	7/13	research [1] 21/13	session [1] 2/4	25/6 25/16 25/19 25/22
prepared [2] 21/6 21/9		resided [1] 4/17	set [2] 23/7 26/16	26/1 28/5 32/20
present [3] 19/18	R	residential [6] 3/6 5/8	settle [1] 8/16	strongly [1] 28/12
21/19 22/3 presentation [3] 10/13	Ragsdale [1] 32/16	27/15 27/21 27/24	settlement [3] 1/18	structural [1] 9/23
17/1 21/24	raise [1] 25/2	30/11	13/16 32/18	structure [2] 4/2 16/9
presented [3] 22/4	rather [1] 17/18	resides [1] 18/17	several [1] 2/23	subject [1] 8/25
22/9 27/8	re [1] 23/13	respect [6] 16/21 17/5	sewer [1] 9/17	submit [4] 21/13 31/10
preventing [1] 21/3	re-examine [1] 23/13 reach [1] 11/24	27/14 28/24 29/19 32/5	short [1] 18/10	32/22 32/25
price [1] 13/12	read [1] 6/17	respond [6] 21/8 22/8 23/3 23/17 24/24 25/21	should [14] 5/2 16/9 16/15 16/16 16/17	submitted [1] 17/7 subpoena [2] 26/19
primarily [1] 16/24	reading [3] 6/8 21/2	responded [2] 25/19	16/20 18/2 19/14 20/4	26/19
primary [1] 16/7	21/15	25/23	20/7 20/9 24/5 29/10	substantial [2] 23/17
prior [16] 3/20 4/6 4/12	reads [1] 8/22	response [1] 20/8	29/13	23/18
4/14 4/15 5/4 7/19	ready [1] 27/10	responses [1] 27/1	show [3] 18/25 26/20	such [2] 8/5 11/24
10/18 11/9 11/19 16/17 16/19 18/10 18/16 26/6	real [2] 4/13 28/3	rest [1] 19/22	29/25	suggest [1] 15/5
26/13	really [5] 14/12 17/13	retain [1] 3/22	shown [1] 19/4	suggesting [2] 21/7
problems [4] 15/24	30/7 31/3 31/18	retained [1] 5/25	shows [2] 27/16 28/1	21/10
16/11 16/13 16/19	realtors [1] 18/13 reason [3] 10/13 14/12	retaliatory [1] 13/19	sic [1] 15/19	suitable [1] 11/18
procedural [1] 23/13	30/2	reveal [1] 16/7 review [4] 6/17 21/4	signed [1] 30/12 similar [1] 3/7	summary [45] supervise [1] 12/16
proceedings [3] 1/8	reasonable [4] 10/19	28/6 29/7	simply [5] 20/13 23/14	supplement [9] 2/20
33/3 33/6	11/12 19/3 24/11	reviewed [4] 6/9 6/20	26/6 26/22 27/9	2/23 6/14 6/17 22/22
process [6] 3/1 8/11	reasonably [1] 11/20	21/1 27/12	Sir [2] 31/22 31/22	22/23 23/16 24/23
13/2 13/5 13/9 13/21 produced [3] 22/18	received [1] 4/13	reviewing [1] 21/4	slash [2] 10/2 10/12	24/25
22/20 25/25	receiving [1] 31/3	Revised [1] 11/3	slow [1] 17/11	supplemental [2]
professional [6] 5/7	recognized [1] 7/17	RICO [3] 8/9 12/24	slower [6] 3/12 6/8	21/13 23/4
5/14 5/15 5/17 5/21	recommended [1] 3/21 record [3] 2/6 6/22		6/10 10/4 10/5 17/15	supplemented [1] 23/1
10/19	6/24	right [8] 2/12 6/14 6/19 17/12 21/5 27/10 27/12		support [2] 20/3 22/19
professionals [1] 3/22	recovery [1] 12/8	27/21	so [34] some [4] 4/5 14/11	supported [1] 14/24 supporting [1] 15/4
prohibited [1] 21/2	references [2] 6/13	risk [1] 5/7	21/12 25/2	Supreme [1] 12/2
project [1] 5/16	28/17	roof [3] 4/3 7/16 10/1	someone [1] 28/6	sure [5] 28/12 30/24
properly [3] 26/7 26/10 28/23		rule [4] 11/22 29/1	something [3] 20/25	31/5 32/21 32/23
properties [3] 3/4 3/8	referred [1] 27/18	30/15 31/10	21/2 25/12	surprise [1] 31/23
29/9	refused [2] 28/5 29/5	Rule 11 [1] 29/1	somewhat [3] 13/22	systems [8] 4/3 4/3
property [38]	refutes [1] 30/6 Reid [1] 32/21	S	17/23 18/1	4/18 4/18 9/10 9/16
proposed [1] 31/3	related [20] 1/10 2/25	safe [1] 32/7	sooner [1] 31/9 sophisticated [2] 3/3	9/18 9/19
proposition [1] 21/7	3/9 3/16 5/15 7/21 8/9	sagging [1] 7/16	29/12	Т
protect [2] 3/18 11/12	13/19 13/20 13/24 19/6	sale [1] 8/10	sorry [5] 7/1 10/7	tactics [1] 23/9
provide [1] 21/8	19/8 19/10 22/17 24/7	same [4] 6/2 6/4 6/5	15/11 31/16 31/21	take [4] 25/14 26/12
provided [1] 23/4 provides [2] 11/3	24/8 24/10 24/15 27/3	7/9	sought [1] 19/7	30/4 30/24
11/10	27/8	sanctions [2] 1/14 29/1		talking [2] 10/13 20/19
providing [1] 24/14	relates [2] 9/15 23/25	say [2] 23/2 25/11	6/10 14/11 15/7 15/8	teeny [1] 10/5
purchase [21] 3/6 3/20	relevant [1] 23/24	saying [3] 22/16 26/13	17/14 25/11 31/17 32/4	
4/7 4/12 4/14 4/15 4/21	relied [2] 16/24 20/13 relies [1] 5/19	27/21	speaking [7] 15/13	tenant [1] 18/15
5/4 5/8 10/18 11/9 12/3	relieve [1] 24/19	says [2] 20/20 31/10 scheduled [1] 26/10	17/11 19/24 30/10 31/7 31/8 32/11	tenants [2] 8/1 8/6 term [1] 18/15
13/12 16/6 16/17 16/19	removed [1] 16/7	second [5] 8/18 8/19	specific [1] 28/10	terms [8] 2/23 3/5 3/9
19/3 24/17 27/14 29/8	render [1] 22/1	10/15 26/11 32/2	specified [14] 3/5 3/7	3/15 10/21 11/2 17/21
30/11	repair [2] 8/12 8/14	Secondly [1] 28/3	3/15 3/16 3/24 4/11	19/2
				1449

Т	9/13 13/11 14/5 18/10	up [7] 4/6 4/24 5/1	where [5] 8/15 11/7	
testified [1] 3/20	18/12 18/17 19/3 21/25	15/24 16/5 16/11 16/18		
testimony [13] 14/24	23/12 24/11 24/17	upon [5] 5/19 16/13	whereas [1] 24/21	
16/23 20/12 21/19	26/17 26/18 28/21 TKNR [4] 1/7 4/16 7/19	16/24 20/13 24/22	which [18] 4/1 6/14 6/15 8/2 8/9 11/2 14/24	
21/22 22/6 22/8 22/8	8/23	use [3] 5/18 8/25 20/8	15/3 15/4 16/6 16/12	
22/16 23/4 23/24 24/2 25/1	today [2] 2/22 23/2	used [1] 3/8	17/4 19/9 20/14 22/25	
testing [1] 6/1	told [1] 26/19	usually [1] 20/21	23/20 25/22 30/1	
than [4] 4/22 20/7	too [4] 5/18 15/13	utilizing [1] 18/12	while [10] 7/19 18/5	
21/21 31/4	17/11 17/24 took [2] 22/25 31/19	V	22/13 23/11 25/2 25/24 26/5 27/7 27/14 27/24	
Thank [7] 2/19 3/14	top [1] 23/8	value [1] 8/25	who [8] 2/22 3/3 4/16	
6/12 14/15 17/8 17/10	training [1] 12/16	various [1] 15/18	9/12 18/16 25/15 25/21	
25/8 that [242]	TRAN [1] 1/1	VEGAS [2] 2/1 3/4	32/11	
that's [16] 3/14 7/2	transcribed [2] 1/25	vent [1] 4/4	Who's [1] 31/14	
11/20 15/10 16/15	33/6	venting [1] 9/21	why [3] 2/18 2/24 30/2	
16/22 20/6 21/2 25/25	Transcriber [1] 33/10 TRANSCRIPT [1] 1/8	very [7] 2/5 17/18 17/21 18/19 19/19 24/7	will [7] 6/7 14/12 14/14 25/11 27/5 29/1 30/13	
30/7 30/19 30/19 30/19	translator [1] 26/9	30/21	Williams [1] 33/10	
31/11 31/11 31/11	trial [1] 21/25	video [4] 6/22 8/5	within [4] 11/24 16/2	
their [18] 8/13 11/14 13/2 15/21 20/3 20/5	tries [2] 24/22 25/2	23/17 33/6	19/17 31/9	
20/6 20/7 21/8 21/15	triplex [4] 15/19 15/25	view [2] 29/18 30/12	without [7] 4/19 9/25	
21/20 21/22 21/24	16/12 16/19	visible [1] 4/10	11/1 18/7 23/5 24/1	
21/25 22/3 22/9 22/10	troubling [1] 19/2 true [2] 9/2 23/14	W	28/16 <b>WLAB [1]</b> 1/4	
22/10	truly [1] 33/5	wait [1] 32/19	word [3] 25/11 32/22	
them [6] 5/18 10/20 31/9 31/10 32/22 32/25	try [6] 8/16 17/12 17/14	waived [2] 27/22 29/4	33/2	
themselves [1] 11/13	23/9 23/13 23/17	waiver [1] 28/17	words [2] 20/21 27/20	
then [13] 9/7 10/3	trying [2] 23/8 23/22	waives [1] 11/14	work [4] 4/19 4/21 7/22	
10/14 14/1 18/11 18/11	turn [2] 8/18 14/4	wallcoverings [1] 15/25	9/5	
20/23 23/1 25/12 26/19	Twenty [1] 32/2 Twenty-second [1]	walls [1] 16/2	worry [1] 10/8 would [13] 6/9 11/17	
30/8 30/11 31/11	32/2	want [7] 10/23 23/21	14/1 15/4 17/4 19/3	
there [43] there's [19] 8/7 8/20	twice [1] 32/25	25/11 28/8 28/13 32/4	21/24 24/19 25/3 25/6	
10/16 13/3 13/13 13/23	two [2] 26/8 33/1	32/18	26/18 26/25 31/15	
17/23 18/7 18/15 20/21	type [2] 6/2 27/4	wants [1] 21/4	would've [3] 6/1 8/12	
20/22 21/3 21/16 25/25	U	warranted [1] 13/4 warranty [1] 11/11	15/19 written [2] 25/18 25/22	
28/20 29/19 30/6 30/18	uncovered [1] 10/20	was [60]	wrote [2] 10/22 10/24	
32/17 thereafter [1] 18/24	under [8] 3/17 5/10	wasn't [4] 22/16 23/10		
these [12] 4/11 4/24	11/6 12/8 12/15 24/18	26/11 27/14	X	
5/1 6/13 7/24 10/16	29/20 30/14	water [1] 9/21 we [44]	XIV [1] 1/6	
10/17 12/23 16/12	underlining [11] 3/5 5/18 6/18 7/21 10/14	we [44] we'll [2] 17/6 18/14	Υ	
19/15 19/17 28/22	12/6 19/2 19/8 23/16	we're [8] 2/4 17/17	Yeah [5] 7/1 10/9 10/11	
they [36]	27/3 27/6	24/1 32/3 32/3 32/3	14/17 22/13	
they'd [1] 22/21 they're [4] 9/8 21/18	underlying [5] 3/19	32/6 32/14	year [3] 13/10 28/8	
22/1 28/9	19/12 23/25 24/5 26/7	well [12] 6/17 14/12	29/6	
they've [2] 29/4 29/9	understand [3] 20/1 29/10 29/11	14/18 15/4 17/13 20/2 21/3 22/19 24/21 25/18	years [1] 4/20	
think [2] 29/16 30/18	understandable [1]	32/5 32/8	14/17 17/10 17/13	
third [1] 8/4	3/7	went [1] 10/14	17/16 31/14	
this [69] thorough [2] 17/19	understanding [2]	were [34]	yesterday [2] 14/19	
17/21	25/14 25/18	what [15] 3/19 5/22	14/20	
thoroughly [3] 17/18	understood [1] 5/6 undisputed [17] 2/24	15/14 16/7 16/16 16/17 18/9 18/14 18/23 18/24	yet [1] 22/1 you [61]	
17/22 29/25	8/20 9/2 10/14 13/6	20/1 25/3 26/15 26/24	you're [7] 15/14 20/19	
those [15] 12/23 13/14 16/19 20/16 21/21	13/10 13/25 18/21	29/13	30/11 31/10 31/17 32/7	
21/23 21/24 24/10	19/14 19/16 19/17	what's [2] 9/11 19/1	32/20	
24/10 24/21 25/5 26/25	23/23 24/2 24/4 24/21	whatever [1] 21/4	you've [2] 6/16 17/12	
27/4 27/5 30/1	24/25 24/25 unhappy [1] 18/19	whatsoever [1] 14/25 when [24] 3/1 5/8 5/23	<b>your [16]</b> 2/4 2/5 2/19 6/9 6/11 7/1 10/7 14/8	
though [1] 17/18	unjust [1] 11/16	7/18 7/19 7/21 8/18	14/12 17/10 20/2 25/9	
throughout [2] 11/3	unless [3] 14/3 17/6	9/13 11/16 11/23 11/23	30/22 31/17 32/7 32/12	
28/2 THURSDAY [1] 1/12	19/21	12/6 15/20 15/23 16/5	yourself [1] 17/13	
tile [1] 16/5	unopposed [2] 13/25	16/6 18/23 19/24 20/18		
tiles [1] 4/10	19/6 unquote [1] 7/13	23/6 24/13 28/18 29/4 30/11		
time [17] 4/2 4/5 4/21	until [2] 16/3 22/5	whenever [1] 14/20		
				1450