1	a	And you never knew what was paid out on this claim?
2	А	The number that I knew about was the approximately 1.3
3	million.	
4	Q	Okay. So we're in the same exhibit
5	A	Okay.
6	Q	and it's IN-LO 155.
7	A	IN-LO 155. Okay.
8	0	And it says, "Policyholder's release for Fireman's Fund policy
9	number f	NZF03034346."
10	A	Okay.
11	Q	Okay. Now, this isn't signed, your counsel produced this.
12	A	Okay.
13	0	We've never seen a signed release. This doesn't have a date
14	on it, but	if you look up in the first paragraph it says,
15		"For and in consideration of the total claimed payments to
16		me at this time for the sum of \$1,617,300.38, the receipt of
17		which is hereby acknowledged."
18		So you didn't ever see this policyholder release before?
19	Α	I mean, at this moment in time, I cannot recall it, but and
20	you're sa	ying I did sign this?
21	Q	I'm asking you did you sign a release, because I'm asking
22	you did y	ou sign a release?
23	Α	I had to have signed a release. Yes.
24	٥	Okay. So you would have read it? This is the policyholder
25	release.	Your counsel produced this.

A Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Q It's not signed.

A Okay. I'm not sure if exactly what mine said. If this was the exact same one, but I had to have signed a release in order to get the insurance money so I could pay DVC.

- Q So you did know how much was being paid out, correct?
- A No, that is not correct, ma'am.
- Q Well, how -- okay. And let me just --
- A Okay.
- Q -- clarify this a little bit. So you signed a -- you had to sign a release for the insurance company to pay out a final amount, correct?
 - A That is correct.
- Q Okay. So you would have looked at the amount, would you not have?

I don't recall this 1.6 million and the reason why is that I was more concerned about the 1.3 million that I was supposed to pay. I don't -- I did not count the pass through stuff that went directly to, let's say, to SERVPRO to -- for the mitigation, or -- or the condos, and stuff like that. I -- I don't know. Those are just pass through deals. I -- I don't know how much those were, but my main concern was that the -- the number that does stick in my head that I do distinctly remember was the approximate 1.3 million.

- Do you know how much money you paid to Desert Valley Contracting?
 - Okay. Let me think here. Approximately 1.1 -- I don't know

	1	
1	А	But as far as what is on on copies here, yes, it appears so
2	yes.	
3	Q	Okay. And you produced in this litigation all the checks that
4	were paid	to any contractors, including Desert Valley Contracting,
5	correct?	
6	A	I believe so.
7	Q	Okay.
8	А	I believe I did.
9	Q	So this one is for 50,000, 9/24/14. And when did you enter
10	into the c	ontract with Desert Valley Contracting; do you recall?
11	А	It was in August of 2014, I believe.
12	Q	Okay. So then does that refresh your memory whether or
13	not this w	ould have been the first check?
14	A	I mean, it was pretty close. It had to be because that's
15	pretty a	s far as the dates go, it sounds like it's pretty close.
16	Q	Okay. And then let's go to the next Exhibit 420.
17	А	Okay.
18	Q	And this one is Desert Valley Contracting 10/22/2014, and this
19	one is for	\$349,773.27; do you see that?
20	А	Yes, I do.
21	٥	Okay.
22		MS. HURTIK: And, Your Honor, do you want these on the
23	Elmo, or	can you
24		THE COURT: I could read these ones. Thank you.
25		MS. HURTIK: Okay.
	1.1	

1	BY MS. HURTIK:		
2	Q	So then there's the check 421, which is 3351, and this is 1/12.	
3	And is tha	at 2015?	
4	A	That is correct, 2015, yes.	
5	α	And how much is that one?	
6	А	23,961.60, I believe.	
7	Q	Okay. And then the next one IN-LO 422, 3383	
8	A	Ma'am, I think that's 3363.	
9	Q	3363.	
10	A	Yeah.	
11	٥	Okay. 300,000 and that's a payment progress payment to	
12	Desert Va	lley?	
13	Α	That is correct.	
14	0	Okay. And then the next one IN-LO 423, 7/22 or 7/2 does	
15	it '15?		
16	А	Of 2015, that is correct.	
17	a	And that is in the amount of?	
18	A	350,000.	
19	٥	350,000. Okay.	
20	A	Yes.	
21	Q	And then IN-LO 425, check 3398, 9/10/2015, that's in the	
22	amount of 25,000, correct?		
23	А	That is correct.	
24	Q	Okay. And then you have 4425, and that is in the amount of	
25	25,000, and is the date 9/25/2015?		

	II .	
1	А	No, it looks I think it's 9/23/2015, I believe.
2	Q	Okay. 9/23/2015.
3	А	Yes.
4	Q	Is that everything that you paid to Desert Valley Contracting?
5	A	As far as I could recall right now, yes.
6	٥	Okay. And do you know the total number that you paid to
7	Desert Va	Iley Contracting?
8	А	I could add this up. I don't know off the top.
9	a	Okay. So if we were
10		MR. BOSCHEE: I do.
11		MS. HURTIK: I do.
12		MR. BOSCHEE: Sorry.
13		THE COURT: You're okay.
14		THE WITNESS: I'm sorry I don't. Yeah.
15		THE COURT: I don't, so if somebody could tell me.
16		MS. HURTIK: So I'll represent that we added these up and
17	it's 1,123,	734.89.
18		MR. BOSCHEE: Yeah. That's what I got.
19		MS. HURTIK: Is that correct?
20		THE COURT: Oh, good.
21		MS. HURTIK: So we're in agreement.
22		THE COURT: Do both parties stipulate to the
23		MR. BOSCHEE: We agree on the math.
24		THE COURT: Okay.
25		MR. BOSCHEE: That's newsworthy.

	110	
1		MS. HURTIK: Can we just take one second, Your Honor?
2		THE COURT: Sure.
3		MS. HURTIK: And I know this is a housekeeping matter, and
4	maybe it's	stupid on my part, but we stipulated to all the exhibits, but I
5	haven't be	en offering them. Are they all admitted?
6		THE COURT: They're all admitted.
7		MR. BOSCHEE: They're all admitted.
8		THE COURT: They're all admitted.
9		MR. BOSCHEE: Yeah, they're all admitted.
10		MS. HURTIK: Okay.
11	1	THE COURT: Yeah.
12		MR. BOSCHEE: Obviously, when we start doing math and
13	things, we	should probably at least discuss
14		THE COURT: Christian, they're all admitted.
15		MR. BOSCHEE: what the totals are, but that's yeah.
16		THE COURT: Well, they're all
17		MS. HURTIK: Yeah.
18		THE COURT: all the exhibits are officially admitted.
19		MS. HURTIK: Okay. Just want to make sure, because I
20	usually an	n used to
21		THE COURT: No, that's fine.
22	BY MS. H	JRTIK:
23	Q	Okay. So that's the total amount that, to you knowledge, that
24	Desert Va	ley was paid or DVC?
25	A	Yes. That is correct.

		ľ	
	1	a	Okay. And we discussed earlier at the previous exhibit, that
	2	the amour	nt that was given for the entire job was 1,320,429.28, correct?
	3	А	Yes, if they completed the job. Yes.
	4	Q	Okay. So the 1.320 and I'm just saying approximate
	5	minus wha	at they were paid is what they what their contract would
	6	have calle	d for 1.32042928, so the difference between those and I'm
	7		ave to do the math I just want to make sure
	8		MR. BOSCHEE: All right. Hold on. So
	9	BY MS. HI	JRTIK:
	10	Q	So because I have it right here, but I just want to make sure.
	11	So that is	the difference between those is \$196,694.39, I'll represent
	12	and your	counsel will confirm. We just want to make sure we have the
	13	same num	nbers.
	14		MR. BOSCHEE: I think that's right. Yes, that's right. That's I
	15	had.	
	16		MS. HURTIK: Okay.
	17	BY MS. H	URTIK:
	18	Q	So
	19		MR. BOSCHEE: My calculator was a little slow because it's
	20	on a phon	ne.
	21		MS. HURTIK: That's why I've got the big one.
1-	22		MR. BOSCHEE: I know. Epic fail.
	23	BY MS. H	URTIK:
	24	Q	So if earlier we talked about the contract, correct?
	25	А	Yeah, earlier today. Yes.

1	۵	Yeah. And there was a little discussion about what the	
2	contract really meant what the contract said versus what it meant,		
3	correct?		
4	A	What it said versus what it I'm I'm not	
5	۵	So let me clarify, okay. So we talked about if you terminated	
6	Desert Va	lley Contracting then the client was owed its profit; do you	
7	remembe	r that discussion?	
8	А	Me, being the client?	
9	Q	Well, it's worded that way. Remember we had a discussion	
10	and the ju	idge said that it wasn't being read correctly?	
11	А	Okay. I I do remember that the	
12	Q	You do remember.	
13	А	judge did interject.	
14	Q	So let's go back to it.	
15	A	Okay.	
16	a	So it's Exhibit 560.	
17	А	Wait, are we going to go back to IN-LO 4	
18		MR. BOSCHEE: 560.	
19	BY MS. HURTIK:		
20	Q	560. Just go back to 560.	
21	A	Oh. 560.	
22	Q	Yeah, you're okay. I'm going to be switching	
23	А	Okay.	
24	Q	you back and forth.	
25	A	Hold on a second here.	
	11		

Q But you tell me when you get there, so that we make sure everybody is on the same page.

A Okay. I'm here.

O Okay. So remember there was discussion on the first page of this contract -- and if you go down, and you get past the top part there's some paragraphs. There's two main paragraphs that are pretty big. And what I'm going to do is, I'm going to put it up on this Elmo, because it's small, and we'll make it a little bit easier hopefully. Okay. And I've got it highlighted, so it's easier to see, maybe. Let's hope.

Okay. So see the areas I have highlighted?

A Yes, I do.

Q Can you read it good on that?

A Yes, I can.

Q Okay. So I'm going to kind of point you where I am. Okay. It says, "Should client terminate the contract." What's your understanding of who the client is?

A "Should client terminate contract." I'm the client.

Q Okay. "The contractor", what's your understanding of the contractor?

A That would be DVC.

Q Okay. "After work has begun, but not completed in full, the client", which is you, "shall be responsible for any and all fees and costs with the work performed, plus the profit that the client would have made on the job had the client not repudiated the contract." Do you see that?

A That's where -- yeah, I do see that, yes.

O So there's -- okay. So the intent of this, we would have to speak to the contractor about, but you're not the one getting profit on this, the contractor would be the one getting profit, not you, correct?

MR. BOSCHEE: Well, object, Your Honor. Object to form and the document says what it says. I mean, if we want to clarify it with the contractor, that's fine, but --

MS. HURTIK: We can do that.

MR. BOSCHEE: -- we've now gone over this like three times.

MS. HURTIK: Well, I'm going back because I want to -- we just talked about numbers. So we just talked about numbers about what the total contract price was versus what DVC was paid.

THE COURT: So he -- so are you rephrasing the question, in light of the objection then or --

MS. HURTIK: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. She's rephrasing.

MS. HURTIK: I will.

MR. BOSCHEE: Okay, then. Okay. Well, I'll wait for the next question I guess.

THE COURT: Okay.

BY MS. HURTIK:

Q Okay. So I'm just kind of trying to bring you around. So we just talked about what was paid to DVC and what the bid was for, and that the difference of what they weren't paid was about approximately 196,000 — a little bit more. Okay. Do you recall that?

A I do recall that conversation right now. Yes.

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

	Α	No.
	Q	Okay. We're going to look at the second page of that.
	Α	Okay.
	Q	And it says in the second paragraph
	Α	Okay.
	Q	"The contract will be governed by the laws of the State of
		Nevada and should the client breach the contract, they shall
		be responsible for all attorneys' fees and costs associated
		with contractor having to collect any and all amounts due
		under the terms of the contract."
		So do you think that if you breached the contract, you'd be
resp	onsibl	e for attorneys' fees and costs for DVC?
	Α	According to this sentence, it looks like that I, the client,
wou	ıld if	I did breach the contract, then I would be responsible for the
atto	rney fe	es.
	Q	Okay. And then the next paragraph says,
		"The client shall indemnify the contractor for any and all

"The client shall indemnify the contractor for any and all costs and fees associated with collection of any amounts due to the contractor pursuant to the terms of the contract, and/or any change orders or addendum if client refuses to pay the amounts due and owing to contractor."

Do you believe that you would have to pay for any change orders or additions if you refused to pay the amounts due and owing to DVC?

If they were written and they were expressed, then yes. And

	11		
1	I and they were signed changed orders, then yes.		
2	Q	Does it say written there?	
3	А	Not on that particular sentence; however	
4	a	Okay.	
5	A	I believe there was another sentence that said that any and	
6	all change	e orders had to be written. I can't remember where I saw that.	
7	Q	Okay. If you can turn to Exhibit 569. Okay. So I want you to	
8	go to IN-L	O 68, and it's actually there's two pages IN-LO 68 and 69	
9	A	Okay.	
10	Q	but the majority is on 68.	
11	A	Okay.	
12	Q	So I've highlighted to make it a little easier for you to see.	
13	A	Okay. Sure.	
14	Q	So this appears to be an email from Daniel Merritt from	
15	Desert Valley Contracting on August 25th, 2015, at 3:23 p.m. Do you see		
16	that?		
17	A	Yes, I do.	
18	٥	And this is it says, "Subject change order, not including	
19	material for bathroom walls." It says, "To Eugene Promotion		
20	Properties.com" and Rachelle Elliston Desert Valley Contracting , and		
21	Dennis Zachary Desert Valley Contracting.		
22	A	I I do see that, yes.	
23	Q	Okay. Do you ever remember seeing this email?	
24	А	Yes, I do.	
25	Q	Okay. So this says,	

"Eugene, attached is the supported change order for items that were not in my original estimate for the repairs to the home. I will send you over a copy of this original estimate to match this and show you where the price difference is."

And then we'll skip a little bit, but the next line it says,
"Please let Tina know that she has to reselect the wall tiles for the
bathrooms, otherwise this order will be increased by 24,000." Okay.

"I have looked over everything and there are more items that need to be a part of this change order, but they've already been paid for, or settled out, so this is what is remaining regarding this."

Okay. "The balance that we cannot pay, due to the fact that they do not have the funds allocated in our estimate."

Do you recall this?

- A Yes, I do.
- Q So you did receive change orders, correct?
- A No, ma'am. So this particular one, once I got this email we did not do these at all. We did not do the bathroom wall tiles at all.
 - Q Okay.
- A Once there was a price associated to it, as I was very clear that we were not going to go above and beyond the insurance money.
- Q Okay. So if you go down to the next paragraph, and I've highlighted for ease.
 - A Yes.
- Q And this says, "I have attached the bids and highlighted what Gordy was going to charge for the wall install, if performed."

Okay. We're going to skip past that because you're not doing it, you said?

- A Yeah, I did not.
- Q Yeah.
- A We didn't.
- Q But then it says,

"This also includes Eagle Sentry's numbers for the items that they need, such as the Lutron panels in the theater area as well. If there are any other items that are unforeseen, we will make sure to address them. Please review this and let me know if you have any questions, as my next email will be the estimate for the original scope of work, so that you may see that none of these items are in there. I am also going to list the upgrades offered below and what we have credited back to make these happen, less the amount of this change order."

- A Okay.
- Q Okay. So now, let's move this up. There's a list. So this list it says, "Switch glass mirrors with electrical wiring framing and installation." Was that a change order?
 - A Yes, it was.
- O Okay. "Wine room with cooling unit, glass racks, wiring, framing, and lighting." Was that a change order?

A When -- when you are saying it's a change order, are you saying that -- that's something I directed, because these are not change orders that I talked to subcontractors about at all.

1	Q	Who decided on that there were going to be switched glass	
2	mirrors with electrical wiring?		
3	A	Well, so that was between myself and Daniel from Desert	
4	from DVC.	And he's the one that had all the talks and the change orders	
5	from the si	ubcontractors.	
6	Q	Okay. But who decided the wine room was going to have	
7	glass racks	s, wire framing, and lighting?	
8	А	That's what I wanted.	
9	Q	Okay.	
10	А	Yes.	
11	Q	So these were at your direction, correct?	
12	А	These are these were at my what I wanted, correct.	
13	Q	Okay. So, "Master bathroom mirrors, \$20,000 raw materials,	
14	5,000 for th	ne install and wiring." That was a change order, correct?	
15	Α	That is a change order. May I add, though, that this email	
16	was sent to	o me over a year after we started this job, and this is the first	
17	time he's ever hitting me with any type of pricing or anything that was		
18	associated with any type of upgrades at all.		
19	Q	Did you make you had an interior designer?	
20	Α	Tina.	
21	a	Tina.	
22	А	Yes.	
23	Q	Okay. So did you have one plan and you never changed it,	
24	you never made any changes		
25	A	The only time that	

Q -- from the beginning?

A -- the -- the only time that I made changes was because that material was no longer available. Like, she would pick something out and either the color had to change, or the -- because, like, she goes, oh, I thought this manufacturer was still making it, but they don't, and we'd have to switch it; however, there was nothing installed. It was not ordered yet. It was just something that once her and I went over something, and I said oh, okay, I like that, then she would make sure that it's still in stock at -- like, I -- I forget, like, Tuscany, or -- I can't remember the other stores around town, but those type of stores.

And then they would tell her, oh, they no longer make that any more. And then so we would have to reselect. That is the only time I -- I reselected something. I never installed anything and said oh, I don't like that, take it out. Never,

Q So, but there were change orders made, because things weren't available, correct?

A No. They weren't -- so the selection -- how the selection worked was, basically her -- she would come to me with let's -- let's just say three different things, says do you like A, B, or C. And I'd be, like, I like B. She goes okay. So you like B. She would go down make sure that it was available and in stock, and if it wasn't -- because it was not ordered yet, because we couldn't order it if it's not in stock, or if it's not here. Then she would say oh, that is no longer available, or that color is no longer available, or the -- whatever reason. It's not available, so you have to reselect. That's the only time I would reselect.

	1	Q Okay. So this master bathroom mirrors 20,000 raw
	2	materials, 5,000 for install and wiring, this was in the original bid?
	3	A I I don't what do you mean it was in the original bid?
	4	Q So this email
	5	A Yes.
	6	Q let's go back.
	7	A Yes.
	8	Q It says, "I have attached the bids and highlighted", we'll skip
10	9	past that, okay. He says, "Please review this and let me know if there are
	10	any questions, as my next email will be the estimate for the original
	11	scope of work so that you may see that none of these items are in there."
	12	A Okay.
1	13	Q So I'm going to list the upgrades offered below and what
	14	we've credited back to make these happen. So these
	15	A Okay.
- 1	16	Q were in the original bid, or no?
	17	A I don't I never seen the original bids to the subcontractors
	18	from DVC to the subcontractors, vice versa, so I don't know what the
	19	original bid said; however, I do know what you're talking about in the
	20	master bathroom mirrors, if that's what you're asking.
	21	Q Well, I'm okay. So let's just keep on going through the list.
	22	A Okay.
	23	Okay. Because you're saying these are change orders.
	24	"Granite for the laundry room countertop area. Original was laminate."
	25	A Yeah. I don't know what it was made out of, but yes, that's

if Danny says it was laminate, then it was laminate.

- Q "Pool decking for the rear pool area."
- A But can -- can I go back to the laundry room? It was not granite that I put in there. It was a man-made quartzite, which was pretty -- fairly inexpensive.
 - Q It was more than laminate though wasn't it?
 - A It was definitely more than laminate.
 - Q Yes. Okay. So we'll get to the actual --
 - A Okay.
- Q -- we'll get to the actual numbers. I just want to be clear that you're saying these are upgrades, correct?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Okay.
- A But I just wanted to clarify that it wasn't granite that I put in the laundry room. It was a -- it was a man-made quartz.
- Q Okay. And pool decking for the rear pool area -- okay -- the interior of the house was affected, so why are you replacing pool decking?
- A So there were cracks in the driveway area. They had used this big machine -- so I -- and I -- I can't remember the name of it, but it's a -- basically it dries out the house, because there was a flood and it's huge. And basically it makes a ton of noise, because it's vibrating for hours, and hours, and hours. Anyway, so that -- what that did was it cracked quite a bit of my driveway. It cracked all around there.

And so Daniel said hey, you know what, we're going to go

ahead and take care of that. We're going to have the -- the concrete guy out here taking care of all that stuff for you. I said okay. And he said, is there anything else that you want done while he's out here, and I said, oh, I -- you know, there's some pool decking area that's also cracked too, and then that's when he said we'll -- we'll have him take a look at that also.

- Q So are you saying that the pool deck was -- decking for the rear pool area was cracked as a result of this machine, or are you just --
 - A No, no, no, no -- I'm -- I'm not stating that at all.
 - Q Okay.
 - A No.
- Q All right. So then the -- you said "they cracked", SERVPRO of Henderson was the one who used that machine, correct?
- A I don't know exactly who put that machine out there. I was not there at the moment that they were putting the machine. I just know there was a huge machine in my driveway.
- Q Okay. "House painting and stucco patches across the perimeter." Okay. That wasn't related to the flood, correct?
 - A No, that was not.
- Q Okay. "Membrane for the downstairs floor, net \$11,000."
 That was an upgrade, correct?
- A I don't know if that was an upgrade, but however, it was something that Daniel wanted to put in there and I wanted to put in there.
 - Q It wasn't there previously, correct?

A You know, I don't know if there was a membrane there previously or not.

O Okay. So now it says, "Installation cost 30,000 over budget for the downstairs tile flooring." That was an upgrade, correct?

A No, ma'am. That was from -- well, what I believe this was from is they over ordered a lot of material. DVC ordered -- over ordered a lot of material for the flooring.

Q DVC measured for the flooring or the flooring contractor?

A I don't know. I was not there, but Daniel was my general contractor and I believe -- or DVC was my general contractor. Dan -- Daniel was my point of contact and, as far as I knew, he's the one that was coming out and measuring everything. I don't know if there was a flooring contractor that did it, or it was Daniel, but someone had to have been there to say, this is where we're going to be using limestone, and this is where we're not using limestone anymore.

- Q So what was Rob Ramirez's role?
- A He was a supervisor.
- Q So when wouldn't it have been Rob Ramirez's role to --
- A I don't know when --
 - Q -- figure this out?

A -- when they actually sat there and measured that stuff out.

No, I don't -- I do not know, and I do not recall that, because Robert

Ramirez was not there from the very, very start. He was hired on at some point

Q So why use -- so why use Robert Ramirez if Danny is your

contact? Why use Robert Ramirez?

A Because Daniel told me he was not, like -- they needed a supervisor. Daniel is not a supervisor. He's not going to be there at the house every single second of the day.

Q But they told you that nobody at -- they had other supervisors from Desert Valley Contracting on the job, didn't they?

A Yes. And I recommended that if they didn't have anyone qualified, because they did mention that their guys aren't really up to speed on this type of home. I said, well, I suggest that --

Q Who told you -- who told you that?

A I believe it was Daniel. And I said, you know, I think we should use Robert Ramirez, because he knows this house. He -- he built it. And, you know, he's going to know, like, all the little intricate details of what's behind those walls.

Q Okay. So let's continue on the list. So we stopped at the downtown -- or downstairs tile flooring.

A Yes.

Q Then it says, "ESP closet foil phase, 7,000", which was not approved by the insurance for this upgrade. What was that?

A Okay. The original closet that I had they no longer had that type of finish anymore. And the only other finish was this type of finish. This is from what was told to me. I don't know exactly. I'm not a closet expert, nor a finish expert in closets, but they said that that's the -- that's the finish that is now available today, 12 years later.

Q "Extra wall paper \$14,000 for wall paper. Insurance only

allowed 4,000."

A Once again, this one I know for sure that Daniel ordered incorrectly because he, himself, told me that -- so I had this wood veneer wall covering that goes into the formal dining room. And they over ordered probably four or five times more, or maybe even six times more than they should have, and the reason is, is that Daniel told me he made this mistake, he thought that he's supposed to measure that in square feet -- no, wait -- he's supposed to -- he thought he -- he measured it thinking it was supposed to be in square feet, but in -- in -- in truth, is that in wall coverings it comes in square yards.

So when we got this wall covering shipment, we're like wow what -- what do we need all this for, and that's when Daniel said, oh, wow, he goes, I -- I really screwed that one up. I thought it was in square footage, but it's in square yards.

- Q Danny said that?
- A Yes, Danny said that for sure.
- Q Okay. And Dyba Interiors Tina did not measure for the wall covering?
 - A No -- no.
 - Q "Remove the LED lights in both rotundas."
 - A That was more of a cost-saving thing that I -- I had them do.
- Q Okay. "New order from Tuscany for the replacement broken granite was over 2,500 and the broken granite was 900."
- A I don't know which room he's referring to this -- this particular one. And I cannot recall what he's talking about on that

Q Okay. So,

"You have paid 2,100 for the duct cleaning, which we will factor in this equation, but the larger difference from the 2,500 slab to 900 slab is the issue which takes up most of the allowance: the granite install is \$12,000 over the insurance company's allowance for granite install, but this is absorbed. Most of the trades to install these upgraded items are absorbed, but these are for the costs that we cannot,"

And it goes to the next page, "bury. Thank you."

A Yes.

Q So was he -- your understanding was he was telling you, not all of these things are covered in the bid -- original bid, correct?

A No. What he was saying right there is that everything is absorbed, except for he -- he -- he did state that I did -- I paid for the duct cleaning, because they did not want to sit there -- they wanted to wait a while for the duct cleaning; however, because of the time of the year, and everything like that, I had other trades telling me you got to get this duct cleaning done, or else you're going to have a bigger problem than you have right now. So I went ahead and paid for that because this is my house. And I wanted to go ahead and get that thing done because I did not want a bigger problem later on, because I think at that time of year, this was August, there was like a monsoon time, and it's like really humid. And they told me to get my duct cleaning done, and I got that done, and I paid for that out of my own pocket.

Furthermore, if you look at this, Danny is saying that everything here is absorbed. He's saying that we're taking care of all this. The issue here is the \$2,500 slab versus the \$900 slab, and then the granite install for \$12,000, which I believe he's talking about is the -- the limestone difference because they -- they ordered way too much.

- Q But you're not sure who did the measurements for that?
- A I'm not 100 percent sure, no.
- Q Okay.

THE COURT: If you're done with that exhibit, this would be a good time.

MS. HURTIK: Yeah, we can take a little break.

MR. BOSCHEE: I'm just saying, like, five minutes.

THE COURT: All right, Well, I --

MS. HURTIK: No, we can take a little break.

MR. BOSCHEE: Run down the hall break.

THE COURT: -- I'm saying more than five.

MS. HURTIK: Well, yeah, that's okay. Because you've been here all day.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. BOSCHEE: And I do, Your Honor, I do have to today -- I do need to adjourn, if we can, at 4:45, if that's all right with everybody. I need just a couple of minutes early.

THE COURT: That's fine.

MR. BOSCHEE: Okay.

	II .	
1		THE COURT: All right. Well, let's take 15.
2		MR. BOSCHEE: Okay.
3		THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you.
4		[Recess at 3:11 p.m., recommencing at 3:41p.m.]
5		THE COURT: Okay
6		MS. HURTIK: I'll try to be more lively.
7		THE COURT: No. That's not a problem.
8		MS. HURTIK: Or maybe not.
9	BY MS. HURTIK:	
10	Q	Okay. So, Mr. Inose, let's go you're still in Volume 8. I
11	think that's what and I want you to go to Exhibit 586. So just tell me	
12	when you get to	
13	A	I just got there right now.
14	٥	Okay. So 586 starts with IN-LO 426 through 429.
15	A	Okay.
16	a	These are checks that are paid to Summit Tile & Stone. So
17	let's go through the we're going to go through them and then I'm	
18	going to ask you some questions. Okay. So the first check, and I have a	
19	little trouble with your fives. I'm not sure if they're fives or sixes.	
20	A	That's a five.
21	0	Okay. So check 3420, December 12th, 2015, that's the first
22	one, for 16,406.50 to Summit Tile & Stone. Was this paid after you	
23	terminated Desert Valley Contracting?	
24	A	Yes, I believe so.
25	Q	Okay. And that says in the memo final payment what does

1	it say?
2	A I believe it says final payment on original contract. That's
3	what I believe it says.
4	Q Okay. And that's your handwriting; you wrote that?
5	A Yes.
6	Okay. And then the next one is IN-LO 427 Bates stamped?
7	A Yes.
8	Q Just turn the page. And that's dated 12/12/2015, and that is
9	3,593.50. That's also to Summit Tile & Stone, correct?
10	A That is correct.
11	Q And what does that say in your memo?
12	A I believe it says it's a progress payment. And there's an
13	invoice number, I believe it says 1503, but I'm not a hundred percent
14	sure that's what it says.
15	Q And this was paid after you terminated Desert Valley
16	Contracting, correct?
17	A I believe so, yes.
18	Q Okay. And then the next one, IN-LO 428, it's check 3439. It's
19	dated 1/14/2016; is that correct?
20	A That is correct.
21	Q And that's for 5,302.50, correct?
22	A That is correct.
23	Q Okay. The first one we talked about, it was dated 12/12/2015,
24	and that said final payment.
25	A Yes.

1	Q	This one's after that date?	
2	A	That is correct.	
3	Q	What is this for?	
4	Α	So throughout this job Desert Valley did not do a good job a	
5	making sure a lot of areas were finished, and so in order for me to get		
6	my house done, I had to pay Summit Tile & Stone the moneys owed in		
7	order to get my house complete.		
8	Q	So you're saying but the only one that you wrote for	
9	original contract was the first check. The other two were not it doesn't		
10	say it was for the original contract, does it?		
11	A	That's correct. But like I said, it was because there was a lot	
12	of things missing and I'm not going to go without, you know, certain		
13	areas not being done. That's not how my house was before.		
14	٥	Okay. So let's go IN-LO 429. It's dated 4/22. Does that say	
15	2016 as well?		
16	А	Yes, ma'am.	
17	Q	And that is for \$7,429 to Summit Tile & Stone as well,	
18	correct?		
19	A	That is correct.	
20	a	What was that for? Because that's quite a bit after the other	
21	two tha	t's three months after the January one and four months after	
22	when you	when you said the final payment was made. What was that for?	
23	A	You know, I honestly do not know exactly what this was for,	
24	but I guarantee you that this was for something to put my house back		
25	together. I just don't know the specific, what these invoices how they		

It says I believe this is invoice number 150 -- 1503.

Q Okay. So you're saying IN-LO 427 says invoice 1503. But if you go back to IN-LO 429, that check also has invoice 1503.

A Yeah. So that's probably the final payment for 1503. So basically, I probably paid them like half of what was owed on 1503 on December the 12th, and then on April the 22nd I probably paid them the full balance.

Q So if I was to pull up the invoices that you are listing here, it's going to match the 7,429.50 check dated 4/22/2016, and it's going to match the invoice 15 -- or the other check, the 3421 on 12/12/2015?

A It should.

Q It should. But what about the others? There's no invoices on those. The memo line's blank.

A Yeah. I don't know exactly what check number 3439 would be for, but -- and I don't want to make any assumptions, but it was definitely made to Summit Tile & Stone.

Q Okay. So if we were to add these invoices up -- because this is part of what you're saying is your damages, correct?

A That is correct.

Q So these amount to -- these are one, two, three, four checks.

They go all the way to 2016. When was your notice of completion,
certificate of occupancy issued on the house?

A I do not recall exactly when it was.

Q Okay. Did you have any work done after the certificate of occupancy was done?

- A Absolutely.
- Q So was it extras that you did?
- A No, ma'am. Like I had explained to you before, a certificate of occupancy, you only need the bare minimum in order to be -- make it livable. That does not mean that all of the things that were supposed to be in my house are back in my house.
 - Q Okay.
- A Like there were still missing sinks, flooring, back -- I mean, there's a lot of things that were missing.
 - Q Did you make any changes?
 - A No.
- Q After Desert Valley Contracting was off the job you didn't do any changes?
 - A When you -- can you define changes?
- Q You didn't change anything from the bid that was done by Desert Valley Contracting and what the scope was in each of the contractor's contracts after Desert Valley was gone?
- A I don't know each and every contractor's contract. That's the first thing. I don't know what was in their scope because I didn't see their contracts.
- Q So you wouldn't know whether or not there were upgrades or change orders, would you?
- A No. What I'm saying is that when you have certain areas of the house that are just not complete because Desert -- DVC did not complete them, I had to finish them off and complete them.

	11		
1	Q	Okay. So if we were to add these checks for Summit	
2	A	Okay.	
3	٥	they amount to	
4		MS. HURTIK: Do you want to add it because	
5		MR. BOSCHEE: Well, you have the calculator.	
6	BY MS. HURTIK:		
7	Q	\$32,731.50. Is that what you paid Summit after Desert	
8	Valley was gone?		
9	А	Whatever these add up to, then, yes. If that's what it adds up	
10	to.		
11	Q	Okay.	
12	А	I did not I did not add it up right now.	
13	Q	Well, you gave a calculation as to what your damages were,	
14	what you had to pay out.		
15	А	That's correct.	
16	Q	So you do know what that number is, correct?	
17	А	The total number or what is just owed to Summit.	
18	Q	The total number. What's the total number?	
19	А	It's probably 60-, 70,000. I'm not really a hundred percent	
20	sure.		
21	0	Okay. Probably 60- or 70,000. Okay.	
22	А	You're talking are you talking the I'm sorry. Can you	
23	clarify that for me, please? As far as like the difference?		
24	0	So you're claiming that you had to pay subcontractors after	
25	DVC was off the job		

1	А	Okay.	
2	Q	to complete the	
3	А	Okay.	
4	Q	to complete the house	
5	А	I get it.	
6	0	correct?	
7	A	Yes. That equaled out to like 200 and I don't remember the	
8	exact amount, but two approximately 260,000.		
9	a	But were all of those amounts that were paid out, were they	
10	included in the original scope?		
11	А	Yes. So of that, a hundred and I can't remember the exact	
12	number, but that stuff was part of their original contracts.		
13	Q	And if it wasn't, then these would be upgrades, correct?	
14	А	No, that is not correct.	
15	Q	Okay. So let's go to Exhibit 587. This consists of two pages,	
16	and it's Bates stamped IN-LO 430 and IN-LO 431.		
17	A	Okay.	
18	Q	There's a check dated 12/14/2015, and that says \$15,000. In	
19	the memo what does that say?		
20	А	You know, it says invoice number, but I I cannot read the	
21	invoice number exactly because there's a black line covering half the		
22	numbers.		
23	Q	Okay. So who told you to pay these amounts to the	
24	subcontractors? Who gave you the amounts and the invoices to pay to		
25	the subcontractors?		

- As far as how much that they were owed, you mean?
- Right here. This HyBar. HyBar, you paid them --
- -- 15,000, you say for invoice 72, maybe 98, I can't really read it, but who gave you that invoice and said, here, you owe me this, pay it?
- So the -- so after DVC was fired, I went to every subcontractor and asked them if they could finish the job, and they agreed to do it, and I asked them what DVC had paid them and what was
- All right. And the amounts we discussed earlier were
 - Approximately, yes.
- And so their amounts were included in Desert Valley Contracting's estimate, correct?
- Like I said earlier, I didn't see their original contracts, but I believe, yes, they were included in that 1.32 million, I believe.
- Okay. So you didn't ask for any confirmation or proof, documentation of what they had actually been paid?
- They showed me invoices, their invoices. I did not get copies of those. And they showed me what DVC had paid. Like let's take Summit Tile -- I'll just give an example. Summit Tile showed me on their computer screen what was paid, what was still owed, and we had a meeting. I went down to their office and they said this is what DVC has paid up to this point and this is what's left on their contract.
 - So they showed you checks?

	II .	
1	А	The actual checks, no. It was on their computer, like a
2	some sort	of accounting software.
3	Q	So they actually you did ask them for confirmation of what
4	was paid?	44
5	А	Yes. I had to know what was owed still. They wanted to get
6	paid, just a	as much as I wanted to get my house done.
7	٥	Okay. All right. So HyBar, this is 15,047.43, and the second
8	check is da	ated and I can't tell. Is this 1/15/2016?
9	А	That is correct.
10	Q	And it says final?
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	Okay. Is that all, these two checks are all that you paid
13	HyBar, or	is there anymore?
14	А	As far as I know, this should be it.
15	Q	Okay. And those amount to \$19,743?
16	A	That looks like it, yes.
17	Q	Okay. So now let's go to Artesia
18	A	What
19	Q	which is Exhibit 588.
20	А	Okay.
21	Q	So if there was another exhibit that said you paid HyBar in
22	February o	of 2016, that would have been for an add-on, after the fact?
23	А	I would not know unless I saw the invoice to refresh my
24	memory.	
25	Q	So you didn't keep the invoices with your checks?

	1	А	What I keep no, I do not keep the invoices with my checks.
	2		MS. HURTIK: Hold on just a minute.
	3		[Pause]
	4	BY MS. H	URTIK:
	5	۵	Okay. Go to Exhibit 599.
	6	А	599. 599. Okay. All right.
1 =	7	۵	It's in the same book.
	8	A	Okay.
	9	Q	Okay. So this consists of it starts with IN-LO 469 to 471.
	10	A	Okay.
	11		MS. HURTIK: Sorry. I'm not in the right place. Hold on a
	12	minute.	Just one second because I'm looking for something, and I had it
	13	written fo	r this number and it's not.
	14		[Pause]
	15	BY MS. H	URTIK:
	16	a	So we're going to come back to that because I'm not finding
	17	it right no	w.
	18	A	Okay.
	19	Q	But there's a check that you wrote for 1978 on 2/18/2016, and
	20	that, agai	n, is a couple months after the first initial one in December.
	21	А	Okay.
	22	Q	So you were continuing to have HyBar do what at your
	23	house?	
	24	A	Do you happen to have the invoice number to that, I mean
	25	invoice?	Because I could tell you exactly what that was for if I could see
		1.0	

		11	Time to the second seco
Ī.			
-	1	the invoice	e. Is it in here at all, in these exhibits?
	2	Q	I'll have to find it for you.
	3	А	Okay.
	4	Q	But we're going to move on. I'm asking you if you recall.
- 1	5	A	I do not recall right now, no
-	6	٥	Okay.
	7	А	I do not.
- 1	8	Q	All right. So Artesia Cabinets
1	9	А	Oh.
	10	Q	if you go to Exhibit 587.
Ц.	11		THE COURT: I think Artesia was 588.
	12	MS. HURT	TK:
	13	Q	Okay. You're there on that exhibit, right?
	14	A	Ma'am, I that one shows HyBar.
	15	٥	I'm sorry?
	16		MR. BOSCHEE: 588.
	17		THE WITNESS: Oh, I thought she said I'm sorry.
	18		MS. HURTIK: 588.
	19		THE WITNESS: Oh, sorry, sorry, sorry.
	20		THE COURT: She said 587, but
0	21		MR. BOSCHEE: The Judge corrected it.
-4	22		THE COURT: Yeah.
	23		THE WITNESS: Oh, oh. Okay, okay.
	24	BY MS. H	URTIK:
	25	Q	Okay. On 588 the first one is Artesia. It's IN-LO 432 through
			- 97 - JNT0

1	434.	
2	А	Yes.
3	Q	So these are a series of checks to Artesia. What did Artesia
4	Cabinets	do?
5	А	Artesia Cabinets did the cabinetry.
6	Q	The cabinetry in where?
7	А	In the house.
8	٥	Well, there's cabinetry in several rooms. Which rooms?
9	А	Oh, jeez, in the kitchen, in oh, my gosh, let me think here.
10	Master ba	throom, kitchen. I believe I'm blanking out right now. I'm so
11	sorry. I de	efinitely remember the kitchen, a hundred percent sure in the
12	kitchen. L	et me think.
13	Q	Laundry room?
14	А	I believe oh, pantry, laundry room.
15	Q	Outside the theater room?
16	Α	Outside the theater room. They did the I have a theater
17	cabinet ov	ver there that was that was damaged, yes.
18	Q	Okay. So this says this first check is dated 12/14/15; is that
19	correct?	
20	А	Yes, that is correct.
21	Q	And that's in the amount of \$33,000, correct?
22	A	That is correct.
23	Q	Then the next check, which is 433, is 1600 and that is dated
24	12/14/15,	and that says in the memo theater cabinets, pool
25	А	And pool bath.

	П	
1	Q	Pool bath?
2	A	Yes.
3	٥	Are these upgrades?
4	А	No, they are not upgrades.
5	Q	So there was a pool bath cabinet that had to be replaced as
6	well as th	e theater cabinet?
7	A	So the theater cabinet was there. The pool bath is instead
8	of doing a	a sauna back in the pool bath, what we did was, to be cost
9	effective,	we just put a changing room in there.
10	٥	Okay. So the next check, which is IN-LO 434, that's for \$5,932
11	and it say	s final. Is this all of the checks that you paid to Artesia after
12	Desert Va	lley was off of the project?
13	A	As far as I could recollect right now, yes, that is correct.
14	0	Okay. Why was this so late after all of the rest? It's dated in
15	May of 20	16.
16	А	So on that particular one, I believe it's because scheduling,
17	and also t	hey had to still make the cabinet.
18	Q	Okay. I'll represent that those three checks total \$40,532. Is
19	that all th	at you paid Artesia, and you believe that that was part of the
20	scope of t	the contract?
21	А	Yes, that is correct.
22	Q	And you don't believe that any of that was upgrades?
23	Α	No.
24	<u>a</u>	Okay. So now let's go to Exhibit 589.
25	A	Okay.

	1.	Q	So E90 consists of IN LO 425 through 4202
			So 589 consists of IN-LO 435 through 438?
	2	A	Yes. I see that.
	3	a	Okay. These checks are written to Desert Home Electric,
	4	correct?	
	5	A	That is correct.
-	6	Q	All right. So the first one is for \$8,997.60?
	7	A	That is correct.
	8	Q	It says final. That's dated 12/15/2015?
	9	Α	Yes.
	10	Q	Okay. Again, we have another one just following that that is
	11	Bates stam	ped IN-LO 436 that is written on the same date and that is
	12	\$4,000, and	d I can't read in the memo. It gives an invoice, but what does
-	13	it say after	that?
	14	A	It probably says progress payment.
	15	Q	What does it say?
1	16	Α	Progress payment.
	17	a	Okay. So you wrote so that one is written after that
	18	check num	ber's 3430. The check you wrote previously is 3429, and that
	19	one said fi	nal payment. Why'd you write final payment on the check that
	20	you wrote	before the next check that was 3430?
	21	Α	So that was on DVC's original contract that they had with
	22	Desert Hor	me Electric. So, however, there was still a lot of work to do to
	23	get my ho	me working, and to have all these things done, which either
	24	DVC misse	ed or they just I don't know what they were doing. But
-	25	Q	So these okay. So these were additional items that were
		M	

1 not on the original estimate? 2 3 4 That's all it was. 5 Q 6

- Once again, I don't know what the original estimate said. However, this is just to get my house back working in order again.
- So my question to you is if you don't know what the contracts say, you don't know what the scope is, how do you know what to pay these contractors?
 - You're talking about like, let's say, Desert Home Electric or --A
 - Q Any of them.
- A Okay.

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

- Q Any of them.
- 12 A After DVC got fired, correct?
 - Q Right.
 - Okay. Like I said, I -- I talked to each and every one of them after DVC got fired and I asked them how much did DVC pay them and how much is still owed, and what else do we need to do in order to make this house run again, I mean, just so it's back to normal.
 - Q But that's not the question.
 - A Okay. I'm sorry.
 - 0 The question is how do you know that these weren't in the scope of the estimate and that they were already paid for this?
 - A I'm going by what the contractors told me at that point.
- 23 Q The subcontractors?
 - A The sub -- I'm sorry, yes. The subcontractors, yes.
 - 0 Okay. So then you have, on 1/14/2016 --

1		I'm so sorry. Where are you now?
2	0	The next one in order, 437.
3	A	Okay.
4	٥	That's dated 1/14. Is that a 2016 as well?
5	A	Yes, it is.
6	٥	And that's for \$5,044. And then you have after that, on IN-LO
7	438, you h	ave a check that's written in August of 2016, and it says final
8	and that o	ne's \$477.95. So these weren't extras? These
9	A	No. This is just to get my house back together again to have
10	it working	
11	٥	Okay. Have it working, or have additional electronics
12	installed?	
13	A	No. There was nothing as far as what do you mean by
14	extra elec	tronics installed?
15	Q	Did you upgrade your electronics in the house? Did you
16	have upgr	rades in the house?
17	Α Α	From when it was original?
18	0	Uh-huh.
19	Α Α	There was probably some lights certain areas and stuff like
20	that becau	use they had to change certain things around, Desert Home
21	Electric, a	nd when I found that certain things weren't working correctly
22	as they sh	ould have been, whether it be something like recessed lighting
23	or whatev	er it may have been that there was, they had to come out and
24	take care	of it.
25	Ω	Okay. But we don't have the invoices here to say what this

1	is?	
2	A	I don't know exactly what these relate to, correct
3	Q	Okay.
4	A	at this moment in time.
5	٥	So let's just go with the numbers right now, and then we'll
6	go throug	h invoices a little bit later here.
7	A	Okay.
8	0	Okay. So if you take these checks and, you know, you put
9	final, but	then after that you've got progress payments.
10	A	Right.
11	Q	So doesn't that indicate that you're having additional work
12	done that	wasn't part of the contract?
13		MR. BOSCHEE: Objection. Asked and answered.
14		THE COURT: Overruled.
15		MS. HURTIK: You have to answer.
16		THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Could you rephrase
17	that ques	tion, please?
18		MS. HURTIK: Okay.
19		MR. BOSCHEE: Or repeat it.
20		THE WITNESS: Or repeat it.
21		THE COURT: Yeah, you could repeat it because I overruled
22	the object	tion.
23		MR. BOSCHEE: Yeah.
24	BY MS. H	URTIK:
25	Q	So these checks, the first one you wrote final, that's in

12/15/2015?

- A That's correct.
- Q You then write three checks after that. They're for progress payments?
 - A That's correct.
- Q So this is -- are they for additional work, because you wrote final on this one in December?

A Yes. Like I had explained to you before, that's the final that Desert Home Electric had as the original scope of work that -- that they believed that -- between Desert Valley and Desert Home Electric.

However, they said that in order to get your house -- there was a lot of things that DVC missed. They said these additional things have got to be done because -- or else the house is not going to be working properly.

- Q Who said DVC missed?
- A DH -- Desert Home Electric.
- Q And you're -- okay. So they told you that specifically; somebody from Desert Valley Home Electric told you that specifically?
- A Desert Home Electric told me that DVC, yes, missed a lot of things, missed a lot of items.
 - Q Who told you that?
 - A Steve from Desert Home Electric.
- Q Okay. So if you were to add up these four invoices, they add up to 18,519.35. So you're claiming those all are related to the original bid; is that correct?

1.	А	I don't know what the original bid is, but
2	Q	Okay. There we go. We'll move on. So Exhibit 590. Who is
3	ESP?	
4	А	They do the closets.
5	Q	Okay. This is a check, 1/14/2016, it says final, and I can't read
6	what	
7	Α	\$5,500.
8	Q	No. What do you got in the memo?
9	A	Oh, final closet, and then my address.
10	Q	Okay. So this \$5,500, are you saying this is part of the
11	original e	stimate
12	A	Yes, this is
13	Q	or you're not sure because you never saw the contract and
14	scope of v	work?
15	А	No. So they so when I talked to ESP, DVC had paid them a
16	deposit, b	out they did not give them the rest of the money. So I asked
17	ESP if the	y would go ahead and take a discount on this particular one,
18	and they	agreed to it, and I went ahead and paid it and subsequently
19	saved a b	it of money on there.
20	Q	Didn't you ask all the contractors to take discounts?
21	A	The other contractors were not how do I say they were
22	not open	to that.
23	Q	But you asked them, correct?
24	А	I don't know who I did and who I did not ask. I cannot
25	romombo	e that

Q When you built the house the first time around, were there any contractors that you still owed money years later?

A The only one that we had a dispute with was a drywall paint company and that was because their paint supplier came to me and saw my house and said that my -- my subcontractor did not pay for the paint that was used on my house.

Q So --

A So I went ahead and paid it.

Q I'm sorry.

A And I can't remember how much it was for right now. I went and paid it, but then the paint and drywall company, the ones that were the laborers, came and said, well, you owe us this money, and I said, no, I don't because I paid your supplier that amount of money and there's no way I'm going to pay you guys double here, that's ridiculous.

Q So none of the other subcontractors -- you didn't owe any of the previous subcontractors any money after that other house was -- when the house was originally completed?

A Oh, you're asking me to remember 12 years ago. I don't recall any at this moment right now. I believe everybody was paid, everything was buttoned up. There was no other liens that I remember on my house at all either.

Q And you -- strike that. Let's go to Exhibit 591. This is only one check. What did Custom Landau do?

A Custom Landau did my stainless steel -- I'm so sorry, let me -- cladding. Cladding. Stainless steel cladding.

Q Where?

THE COURT: So pretend the Judge doesn't know what that means. What's stainless steel plaiding [phonetic]?

THE WITNESS: Cladding.

THE COURT: Oh, cladding

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm not even very good at this either.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE WITNESS: But it's like trim, I guess the stainless-steel trim around certain areas of my house. Like the foyer had all this stainless steel and DVC completely missed it and so I had to get Custom Landau out there to put stainless-steel cladding or trim around there.

THE COURT: Okay.

BY MS. HURTIK:

- Q Okay. So this then was not in the original scope of work?
- A I believe that DVC missed it completely.
- Q So this would have been a change order, correct?
- A I would not call it a change order. My house had it before and I just wanted it thereafter.
 - Q So this is -- you paid Custom Landau in 12/16/2015, 1475?
- A Yeah. I believe I paid them two different checks because I remember them coming out two different times. So there might be a check missing here.
 - Q Is that all they did; was that all the cladding?
- A The ones that -- I don't know. I cannot recall what they did prior to DVC getting fired, but I do remember that the stainless-steel

	1	cladding	was missing in certain areas of the house and it was there
	2	before.	and throwing in contain arous of the measo and it was thore
	3	Q	Okay. So give me a second here.
Π."	4	A	Okay.
	5	Q	I want to keep you in that book right now, but I may have
	6	А	Okay.
	7	Q	to get you out of it, so hold on a minute. Sorry. Go ahead
	8	and grab	Binder 9 behind you, and leave that one there that you've got.
	9	A	So leave this one open here?
	10	٥	Yeah, leave that open
	11	A	Okay.
	12	a	because we're going to go back to it. So Exhibit 634.
	13	A	Okay.
	14	a	It's all the way to the back, last one. Okay. So are you all the
	15	way back	to 634 yet?
	16	А	Yes, I am.
	17	Q	Okay. So I want you to go to Bates stamp 872 and 873.
	18	A	Okay.
	19	0	These are two checks; one says final payment that's dated
	20	and I can	t read your handwriting. It's either 3/10/2016 and 3/19? I'm not
	21	sure. Ma	ybe they're both 3/10/2016.
	22	А	Yes.
	23	0	Okay. The first one is check 3468
	24	A	Okay.
	25	٥	for 1190.

A Okay.

Q And it says final payment. And then the next one that's Bates stamped 873 is for 1250, and that is 3469.

A Okay.

Q And what does that say in the bottom memo?

A Okay. So one says final payment 6141, and on Bates stamp number 872 it says final payment for 5410, which relates to the other page that we have open, 5410, on book number eight.

Q Okay. So are those --

A Bates stamp --

Q -- three amounts, the two checks written in March of 2016 and the December check written, December 16, 2015, are those three amounts all that you paid Custom Landau after Desert Valley was terminated?

A I believe so, yes.

Q So that's \$3,915, and you're claiming that those were not in the original scope of work because DVC missed it, correct?

A I believe -- I don't know if it was in the original scope of work, but it may have been. I don't know if 5410 is part -- I don't know. I don't know what was in their scope of work. All I do know is that the stainless-steel cladding was not there that was supposed to be there. That's all I know.

Q Okay. Let's go back to -- well, hold on one second. So stay in this binder.

A Okay.

I would have produced it, yes, correct.

Ш			
	1	Q	Okay. And as we sit here today, again, this is something that
	2	you can't	tell me whether or not it was in the original scope of work,
	3	correct?	
IJ.	4	A	You're talking about the original one between DVC and
	5	Desert Ho	me Electric? Yeah, correct, I don't know what was in that
H	6	contract.	
	7	Q	So you don't know whether this was additional add-ons that
	8	you were	doing from the original scope that the insurance approved?
	9	А	Like I said, I just needed everything to work in my house like
	10	it did befo	ore. That's all I wanted.
	11	Q	Okay. So let me ask you a question. You put different kinds
	12	of toilets	n your house, correct?
	13	A	Afterwards, yes.
	14	Q	And were those smart toilets?
	15	A	No, not at all.
	16	a	What were they? What was the difference in these kinds of
	17	toilets?	
3	18	Α	Just the brand name.
	19	a	Just the brand name?
	20	A	Just the brand name.
	21	Q	They didn't have any electronics
	22	А	No, ma'am.
	23	Q	or anything like that?
	24	A	Zero.
	25	٥	Zero electronics. Okay. And the mirrors that you put into the

master bathrooms --

A Yes.

Q -- they're the same mirrors with TVs in them that were in them -- that were previously in the house?

A No. So back when I first built the house back in 2006 or 2008, when we did the -- we had TVs behind the mirror back then, and they were bigger TVs. However, back then they didn't have them all integrated. Like it wasn't all in -- you couldn't buy it from a company and the TV was already back there. We had to do it all ourselves. So I had to buy a separate TV, have a contractor come out and custom -- custom -- do something with the mirror and coordinate that with the electrician, the mirror company, and then the person doing the fabricating.

Today's world it's completely different. There's companies actually that have mirrors that have these little TVs that are integrated in the mirrors already. And, you know, everybody felt that that was the way to go instead of getting -- making it more complicated.

Q So this costs more money than the way you had it before, correct?

A I cannot remember the cost of what the original mirrors cost back in 2006 to 2008. However, I do know that they're expensive and I do know that my TV was much bigger.

- Q The new TV was much bigger?
- A No. My old one was much bigger.
- Q Okay. So let's go to Exhibit 592.
- A Okay.

1	THE COURT: And that's back in the other binder, right?
2	MS. HURTIK: Yeah, that's in the other binder.
3	THE WITNESS: Oh.
4	MR. BORSCHEE: And which number was it again?
5	MS. HURTIK: That's in Binder 8.
6	THE WITNESS: Okay. Hold on one second here.
7	MS. HURTIK: Sorry.
8	MR. BORSCHEE: Which number?
9	MS. HURTIK: It's 592.
10	MR. BORSCHEE: 592. Okay
11	THE WITNESS: Can I put this one away for right now?
12	MS. HURTIK: Go ahead, put it away
13	THE WITNESS: Okay.
14	MS. HURTIK: for now, because what is going to happen is
15	we're running out of time.
16	MR. BORSCHEE: We still have what, 20 minutes? But yeah.
17	Just trying to make myself feel better.
18	MS. HURTIK: Make me feel better.
19	MR. BORSCHEE: I'm trying to make myself feel better.
20	MS. HURTIK: I'm cutting down on you.
21	BY MS. HURTIK:
22	Q Okay, So IN-LO 441.
23	A Yes.
24	Q Okay. This is a check, 1/29/2016, to West Coast Concrete and
25	this one says final \$10,000. Is that the only amount that you paid to

1	West Coa	st Concrete after DVC was terminated?	
2	A	I believe so, yes.	
3	Q	And what was that for; that was for the pool upgrade?	
4	Α	That was for the driveway. That's my handwriting right	
5	there. It s	says driveway.	
6	Q	Driveway. Wasn't the driveway like 23,000?	
7	А	I talked them down. I West Coast Concrete is another one	
8	that I did	I was able to have a call with and I was able to get them	
9	down in pricing.		
10	٥	Okay. So if I can show you a check that Desert Valley paid	
11	them for \$23,000 for the driveway, what would you say? Do you think		
12	you're incorrect?		
13	А	I never saw that. I just know that they were supposed to be	
14	owed a ce	ertain amount of money, and that's what they represented, and	
15	so I was able to talk them down to \$10,000.		
16	Q	How much did you say the pool decking was supposed to	
17	be?		
18	А	Oh, I don't know how much that was.	
19	Q	But you said you just talked them down 10,000?	
20	А	No. I talked them down to 10,000.	
21		THE COURT: Well, he's talking you just said pool decking.	
22	I thought	you, the witness, was talking about the driveway.	
23		THE WITNESS: Driveway.	
24		MS. HURTIK: Driveway. Driveway.	
25		THE COURT: So let's talk apples and apples.	

BY MS. HURTIK:

- Q Right. Is it for the driveway or is it for the pool decking?
- A I believe this was -- I believe this was for the driveway because it says driveway.
 - Q But you didn't write an invoice?
- A I did not.
 - Q Okay. Okay. Let's go to Exhibit 593.
 - A 593. Okay.
 - Q Okay. So this is IN-LO 442 and it's dated 1/25/2016, Eagle Sentry, 41,729.39. Was that your final payment after DVC left the job?
 - A No, I do not believe it was.
 - Q You think there's another payment after that?
 - A I believe there was, yes.
 - Q For what?
 - A You know, and I don't know the timeline exactly on when I paid them, but there was a particular -- it was something to do with my Crestron and Lutron control that I had to purchase because it was not -- it controls my house, my whole electronics in the house, and if -- that thing, that particular thing had shorted out in the flood and DVC did not catch it. However, if I wanted my controls to all work, I needed this particular electronic piece, and Eagle Sentry told me if I don't get that piece, your Crestron and/or Lutron is not going to work correctly. But I don't remember the day I paid for that.
 - Q So the 41,729.39, you believe that that is part of the contract?

A I believe that this is part -- this is the final payment for the original contract between DVC and Eagle Sentry.

Q And this was no upgrades, no additional electronics?

A This is whatever they had. I don't know exactly what they had, but this is everything.

Q Okay. And this is where I'm having a little bit of disconnect and I want to make sure. You never saw the contract, you never saw the scope of work, so you don't really know whether this was within the scope or not, correct?

A You're talking -- you're talking the item that I had to purchase; is that what you're talking about?

Q Correct.

A Oh, for sure, it wasn't, because they found out after -- once they put my house back together, started getting -- so electronics are funny. Like once you start getting it working, that's when you figure out, oh, my gosh, well, this wasn't there and this needs replacing, and that's what happened in this particular case.

O Okay. So we're going to go to Exhibit 594. Okay. This is a check to Furniture Medic. What does this got to do with the reconstruction?

A You made this clear in the deposition that it did not. This was content.

Q Okay. So the amount of that, of the amounts that you paid out after DVC left the job, this \$3,212 would be deducted from that total that you gave me, correct?

1	A I believe so, yes, that is correct.		
2	Q Okay. Okay. Who's Green Clean?		
3	A Green Clean is a cleaning company.		
4	Q Okay. So hold on. Green Clean is a cleaning company that		
5	you retained after Desert Valley was off the job, correct?		
6	A That is correct, I believe so.		
7	Q And it was not part of the contract, correct?		
8	A Well, Danny told me Danny from DVC told me that they're		
9	going to do a construction clean, because the house was just a		
10	complete it was a complete mess, and that they were going to go		
11	ahead and bring in cleaning people to take care of all that, to do a		
12	construction clean. And then before they turned over the house to me,		
13	they were going to do a final clean.		
14	Q Okay. But you don't know that that was part of the contract,		
15	correct?		
16	A The contract between a cleaning company and them, no, I do		
17	not know about that.		
18	Q Okay. So you're claiming as damages invoices that you paid		
19	to Green Clean, which is three invoices. If you go into Binder No. 9,		
20	which you should did you put it back?		
21	A I think I just put that one back.		
22	Q Okay. Grab Binder No. 9.		
23	A What number?		
24	Q Go to Exhibit 634.		
25	A 634. Okay.		

	II .	
1	Q	Okay. IN-LO 879.
2	А	Yes.
3	٥	So you paid a check on 1/25/2016 of 1750 to Green Clean?
4	А	That is correct.
5	Q	You paid another check, 2/5/2016, same amount, 1750?
6	А	That is correct.
7	Q	Which is IN-LO 880?
8	А	That is correct.
9	Q	And then you paid another check months later, 7/13/2016,
10	which is I	N-LO 881, for 495?
11	А	That's correct.
12	Q	Okay. So those amounts were not included in your original
13	contract v	with DVC, were they?
14	А	I don't know if it was a I don't know the original contract
15	would, bu	at I do know what Danny what Daniel told me was that they
16	were goir	ng to do a construction clean and they're going to do a final
17	clean.	
18	Q	Well, you paid \$3,995
19	A	Yes.
20	a	to clean the house three different months?
21	A	No, no. So the first one, ma'am, is a deposit. So I had to
22	reserve li	ke a date and time for them, and so it looks like they probably
23	did it on t	he second check, which is on February the 5th, I did what's
24	called a c	onstruction clean, which because the place was just
25	complete	ly filthy everywhere, how DVC left it. I had to have a

construction cleanup crew come in and just -- at least get it to the point that we could see things off the -- off everything. It was -- it was just really dirty, really dusty. Things were all over the place. It was just a mess.

- Q Well, DVC left it. There were subcontractors working on the house, correct?
 - A Yes, and DVC was the general contractor for them.
- Q Okay. But DVC, the last time you terminated them sometime in November of 2015, correct?
 - A That's correct.
- Q Okay. You had subs in there working until December, according to your final inspections, correct?
 - A Yeah, that is correct.
- Q Okay. So these cleans are in -- a deposit in January, a final deposit maybe, I'm not sure, I can't tell, on February 5th, and then an invoice, not a deposit, not a final, but an invoice in July of 2016.
 - A That's correct.
 - Q That's quite a bit of time after --
 - A Yep.
- Q -- so that couldn't have been for cleaning after Desert Valley left the project?
- A So that was the final clean. So after they do the construction clean, and it took that much longer to finish up the house because there were so many things to do for the house, that between the construction clean and the final clean, that's how long it took.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

So you're saying that -- but this \$3,995 was not a part of the original contract, was it?

I don't know if it was part of the original contract. I'm just going off of what Daniel told me, that they were going to do a construction clean and a final clean. I wouldn't even know that terminology.

Q Whose Hardy's Home Service?

They are a -- what are they called? Like a -- like a handyman A type of a place, for lack of better terminology.

What did they do?

So there were certain areas of my home that had blinds in them and they were completely -- they were either missing or not reusable, so I had to have them order new blinds for me and put them up for me.

But those weren't part of the original contract? That would have been content, correct?

No. That's not content. It's part of what DVC did because they were not there to either, A, stop people from destroying things, or whatever it may be. These shades were just completely destroyed. They were not reusable at all. We tried to reuse as much as we possibly could from the original. Like all my appliances were reused. Even though they were damaged, scratched, I reused them.

- Q All your appliances were reused?
- A From what I remember, all of them in the kitchen, yes.
- So you used all the subzero refrigerators that were in your

	11		
1	0	How do you know DVC took them down and not SERVPRO,	
2	who did	the original cleaning, the remediation?	
3	А	That I'm not 100 percent certain, but I'm pretty sure it was	
4	DVC.		
5	a	Based on what?	
6	А	They were there a majority of the time. I don't know what to	
7	tell you.		
8	Q	Well, I'm asking you because there was somebody before	
9	them. Th	ere was SERVPRO of Henderson who came out and did your	
10	remediation. So the rebuild was Desert Valley contracting, correct?		
11	Α	That's correct.	
12	Q	Okay. So how do you know who took down blinds?	
13	Α	I don't know 100 percent sure because I was not there	
14	Q	Okay.	
15	А	to watch them take down the blinds.	
16		MS. HURTIK: Okay. So, Brian, you Your Honor, can we	
17	stop for o	ne minute?	
18		THE COURT: Sure.	
19		MR. BOSCHEE: Whatever's a good break point for you. You	
20	tell me. I'	ve got five, ten more minutes.	
21		MS. HURTIK: You've got five, ten more minutes?	
22		MR. BOSCHEE: Yeah. If you've got another	
23		MS. HURTIK: Let's stop because I will go beyond that five	
24		MR. BOSCHEE: Okay. Okay.	
25		MS. HURTIK: Yeah.	

	II.		
1	MR. BOSCHEE: That's cool.		
2	MS. HURTIK: Okay.		
3	THE COURT: So break for the day?		
4	MS. HURTIK: Yeah.		
5	MR. BOSCHEE: Sure.		
6	THE COURT: Okay.		
7	MR. BOSCHEE: And then tomorrow we're going to have one		
8	subpoenaed witness at 10:30. He should be quick. I guess we'll come		
9	back with him, although my examination of him probably won't be		
10	nearly as long now because you've gone through all of my exhibits.		
11	MS. HURTIK: I told you, you should pay me.		
12	MR. BOSCHEE: That was really nice of counsel. And then		
13	we've got another subpoenaed witness coming at 3'ish.		
14	MS. HURTIK: Three, yeah.		
15	MR. BOSCHEE: And then I have no schedule constraints the		
16	rest hopefully tomorrow or Wednesday, so.		
17	THE COURT: My calendar tomorrow, bear with me.		
18	MS. HURTIK: My goal was to accommodate you.		
19	THE COURT: Much, much order than today. It's criminal		
20	tomorrow and it goes a lot		
21	MR. BOSCHEE: Okay.		
22	THE COURT: faster. So we have technically more but,		
23	yeah, we should be done by 10:30.		
24	MR. BOSCHEE: Well, I'm sorry. It gave us both a chance to		
25	give Teddy Parker a hard time about taking		

THE COURT: Good.

MR. BOSCHEE: So that was fun. I always like to give Teddy a hard time, so.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll see you at 10:30.

MR. BOSCHEE: Okay. See you in the morning. Thanks,

Judge.

MS. HURTIK: Okay. See you in the morning. Thank you, Your Honor.

[Proceedings adjourned at 4:42 p.m.]

* * * *

ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.

John Buckley, CET-623

Court Reporter/Transcriber

Date: February 4, 2020

	11		
1	Q	Okay. And who did you have supervising the building of the	
2	house?		
3	А	Robert Ramirez and Shannon [phonetic] Foltz	
4	Q	And was Mr. Ramirez a licensed contractor?	
5	А	That I do not know.	
6	٥	Okay. And was Shannon Foltz a licensed contractor?	
7	А	I do not know.	
8	a	Okay.	
9		THE COURT: How do you spell Foltz?	
10		THE WITNESS: F-O-L-T-Z, I believe.	
11		THE COURT: Okay.	
12	BY MS. HURTIK:		
13	Q	So you proceeded to complete the house. How did you get a	
14	certificate	of occupancy without a general contractor?	
15	A	I'm not sure exactly how it worked at the time, but I believe	
16	it's because I was an owner builder and I personally did not go down to		
17	get the C	of O, so I do not know exactly how that process worked.	
18	Q	Okay. So during that period when you completed your	
19	house, were you pretty much hands on?		
20	А	As far as?	
21	٥	The processes.	
22	А	Some yes, some no.	
23	Q	Okay. And you had several subcontractors that you used	
24	that were	working for the general previously?	
25	А	I believe there were some, yes.	

1	А	I met them at the house, correct.	
2	0	Okay. And was it SERVPRO of Henderson?	
3	A	I I just know it was SERVPRO.	
4	Q	Okay. So at that juncture did that start did they have	
5	discussio	n with you and you have a contract that you signed with them	
6	to start general clean up?		
7	А	I don't remember any contract at this time that I signed;	
8	however, they were already starting clean up. I don't know if Rommel		
9	had signed the contract or I had signed the I don't know.		
10	٥	Okay. So once they had did they do all of the cleanup for	
11	the water intrusion?		
12	А	When you say "they" meaning SERVPRO?	
13	Q	SERVPRO.	
14	A	SERVPRO, yes. SERVPRO, as far as I know, did all the	
15	cleanup. I don't know how much Desert Valley Contracting or Contractor		
16	did and how much SERVPRO did. I'm not 100 percent sure of that.		
17	Q	Okay. But you are aware that they Desert Valley	
18	Contracting is not the same entity as SERVPRO that did your		
19	remediation?		
20	А	No, I to me, they were all the same. They Desert Valley	
21	Contract -	- D can may I may I call them DVC?	
22	Q	You can call them DVC.	
23	Α	Okay.	
24		THE COURT: DVC?	
25		THE WITNESS: Desert Valley Contracting.	

1 THE COURT: Okay. 2 THE WITNESS: Yeah. DVC a lot of times they came in wearing SERVPRO shirts, so I believed that they were a part of 3 4 SERVPRO. BY MS. HURTIK: 5 Okay. So you recall we had your deposition taken early on. 6 This is the first time you're stating to me that you didn't know that it was 7 two different entities -- the two different corporations? 8 9 There is a gray area there for me that I didn't know exactly 10 who was who, correct. 11 Okay. But as we stand here today, you cannot say definitively that those are the same company, or the same individuals, 12 13 can you? 14 Correct. I cannot say that either. 15 Okay. So do you know who the contact was at SERVPRO of 16 Henderson? Do you -- okay. So when you're saying that, are you saying 17 18 the first person I talked to? 19 Q Yes. 20 Okay. His name was George [phonetic]. 21 Q Uh-huh. 22 I do not remember his last name. 23 Okay. So when did Desert Valley Contracting become involved in the project? 24 25 A Are you asking me date?

	11		
1	a	Uh-huh. Well, approximately. How soon after SERVPRO	
2	А	It was almost immediate. It was very, very it was it was	
3	almost rig	ht after. As soon as met George.	
4	Q	Okay. So Desert Valley Contracting did somebody	
5	recomme	nd Desert Valley Contracting to you?	
6	A	Correct. George from SERVPRO recommended Desert	
7	Valley DVC.		
8	Q	And he never indicated that they were the same company,	
9	did he?		
10	A	He did not mention that they were the same company;	
11	however, they said that they had some sort of relation together, and I		
12	don't know what that relation was.		
13	Q	Okay. So as we sit here today, are you trying to say that it's	
14	the same	people that own the same that own SERVPRO of Henderson	
15	that remediated your house and Desert Valley Contracting?		
16	A	No no, ma'am, I'm not.	
17	Q	Okay. I just want to be clear on that.	
18	А	Yeah no, I'm not.	
19	٥	Okay. So there's some binders that are behind you.	
20	A	Okay.	
21		MS. HURTIK: And may I approach, Your Honor?	
22		THE COURT: Sure. Yeah.	
23	BY MS. H	URTIK:	
24	Q	Okay. Just for ease, they're numbered 1 through 9. And I'm	
25	going to	oull down why don't you pull down number 9. It's all the way	

	1	
1	at the end	1,
2	A	Get up?
3	Q	Yeah, you can get up. And then put it right there.
4	А	You said number
5	Q	Because I'm just trying going to try to guide you for the
6	first and t	hen after that you can pull for yourself. Volume number 8.
7	A	Number 8.
8	Q	8.
9	А	Okay. 8.
10	Q	Volume number 8. Okay. So now on the front of this well,
11	there sho	uld be an index in this.
12	А	I think it's backwards.
13	۵	It's opened backwards?
14	A	I think so. Or, you know what, I don't know actually.
15	Q	Yeah, it's backwards. What the heck happened to this?
16	A	It looks like it's out of order.
17		MS. HURTIK: Okay. Something's wrong with the binder.
18		THE COURT:
19		MR. BOSCHEE: Which exhibit are you looking for?
20		MS. HURTIK: Well, there's the index is missing out of it, and
21	the ever	rything is switched
22		MR. BOSCHEE: May I approach, Your Honor?
23		THE COURT: Sure.
24		MR. BOSCHEE: Maybe just help? I don't know.
25		THE COURT: Sure.
	1.I	

	11	
1		MS. HURTIK: Yeah, well.
2		MR. BOSCHEE: To the extent that I offer any help at all.
3		MS. HURTIK: Yeah, but they're all upside down. Here's the
4	index. W	ell, somebody must have dropped it.
5		MR. BOSCHEE: Dropped it.
6		MS. HURTIK: Dropped it and put it back in wrong.
7		MR. BOSCHEE: Yep. That's exactly what it looks like
8	happened	d.
9	BY MS. H	URTIK:
10	0	MS. HURTIK: Okay. So let me just organize it for a minute.
11	Okay. Be	cause I'm going to ask you some questions and I don't want I
12	want you	to be able to turn to things. Okay.
13	A	Okay.
14	Q	So I'm going to
15		MS. HURTIK: Your Honor, I'm just going to take this down
16	next to m	ine and make sure it's
17		THE COURT: Okay.
18		MS. HURTIK: right first. Sorry.
19		MR. BOSCHEE: If you just want to give him do you want to
20	give him	this one so you can keep going or
21		MS. HURTIK: You want to switch?
22		MR. BOSCHEE: Yeah, then we can
23		MS. HURTIK: Okay. That's fine.
24		MR. BOSCHEE: That's fine.
25		MS. HURTIK: You guys can
	11	

there
u know.
aching
v, 1
ler is
naybe
n here,
ide. So
nber,
i

	40.	
1	and then	within that number there can be more there's identifying
2	page nun	nbers.
3	A	Okay.
4	Q	And then they're called Bate numbers.
5	A	Okay.
6	0	So I'll identify where I want you to turn. Okay.
7	A	Okay.
8	Q	And if you need a minute, you tell me you need a minute.
9	A	Okay.
10	٥	Okay. So I would like you to turn to Exhibit Number 560.
11	Okay. So	Mr. Inose, I'll represent that this is a contract between Desert
12	Valley Co	ntracting and yourself. Have you ever seen this before?
13	А	Yes, I have
14	Q	Okay. Can you tell me what this contract was for?
15	А	This was for a work authorization to get my house to
16	perform -	work authorization contract to perform scope of work.
17	٥	To do the remediation, but to do the rebuild on the house?
18	А	To do the rebuild on the house.
19	Q	And, in fact, Desert Valley Contracting only did the rebuild,
20	right?	
21	А	I don't know how to answer that one. For the most part yes.
22	٥	Okay. So we'll come back to that. For the most part later.
23	A	Okay.
24	Q	So this contract that you entered into with Desert Valley, if
25	you can to	urn to the second page where it's Bates stamped on the bottom

	III.	
1	IN-LO a	nd I'm just going to do the last two or three numbers so it's
2	Number 2	
3	А	Okay.
4	a	What was the date that you entered into this contract with
5	Desert Va	
6	A	It says, "August the 4th of 2014"; however, that is Dan
7	Daniel's w	vriting. That is not my writing.
8	Q	Is that your signature?
9	А	That is my signature, yes.
10	٥	Okay. So you entered into his contract with them on August
11	4th, 2014.	Was the flood about the same date as that?
12	Α	It was probably a day ahead of that maybe or two days
13	ahead of t	hat. I'm not 100 percent sure.
14	Q	Okay. And underneath so in the one, two the third
15	after the t	hird paragraph, there's an account and it says, "To be amount
16	to be dete	rmined." And then it has Desert Valley Contracting signature
17	and this is	insurance company Fireman's Fund. Do you see that?
18	А	Yes, I do.
19	Q	So did you turn this claim over to your insurance
20	homeown	er's insurance company?
21	А	Yes, I did.
22	Q	Okay. And was the how soon did the representative or
23	adjuster c	ome from Fireman's Fund to look at the property?
24	А	It it was fairly quickly. I don't remember exactly how many
25	days after	it was.

wanted to make sure that things were, I guess, copasetic in his eyes. I -- I'm not really sure why he had a third party there.

Q Okay. So you meet with -- well, why did you pick Desert Valley Contracting after speaking to them?

A So in that time, you have to understand I was under a lot of stress, and I was very shell shocked, to say the least, that this is happening to my house. It was -- it was a lot of damage to my house. It was crazy. And I asked around to my other contractors, like, does -- that do custom homes, and they told me that they do -- they will not touch something that insurance is involved in. And then so George had recommended -- I'm so sorry -- George from SERVPRO had recommended Desert -- DVC.

Q DVC.

A And said I highly recommend these people. We have -- we're a good strong relationship with them, and we know them very, very well. And we feel that they could do a great job on your house.

- Q Okay. Had you ever had a homeowners insurance claim on any other properties?
 - A Not up to this point, no.
 - Q Okay. Have you since?
 - A No.
- Q Okay. So and just -- so this isn't the first property you've ever owned, is it?
 - A No, it is not.
 - Q Okay. How many properties do you own when you -- did you

	II.	
1	own at th	e time that you built this house?
2	А	At the time I I built the house?
3	Q	Uh-huh.
4	A	May I give a approximate number, because
5	Q	Sure.
6	А	I this is 12 years ago. Maybe around five to six I'm
7	guessing.	I'm not really 100 percent sure exactly.
8	Q	And did you own or do you still own commercial buildings
9	and resid	ential properties as well?
10	А	Yes, I do.
11	Q	And do you own them in California, as well as Nevada?
12	A	The commercial properties I own are in Nevada. And I have
13	residentia	Il properties in California, as well as Nevada.
14	Q	But during the time that this occurred, and shortly thereafter,
15	within the	three-year-time period, you had other residential properties in
16	Nevada, d	lidn't you?
17	А	I had one other one, yes.
18	۵	Just one, not two?
19	A	When when I when this when the flood happened?
20	۵	When the flood happened and within the next three years.
21	A	Oh, within the next three years?
22	Q	Uh-huh.
23	A	I did sell one, and I bought another one, yes.
24	Q	Okay. So you at the same time you owned this property,
25	you owne	ed another property here in Nevada?

	11	
1	A	I had one other property, yes.
2	Q	And what was the address of the other property?
3	А	It was 2326 Caserta, that's C-A-S-E-R-T-A, Court.
4	a	And did you rent that property out?
5	А	No.
6	0	Okay. So did you stay in that property during part of this
7	remediat	ion and rebuild?
8	А	No.
9	Q	Why not?
10	А	It was on the market to sell and it was in escrow to be sold.
11	Q	When did you purchase that property?
12	А	Approximately approximately 2001 or 2002.
13	Q	Okay. So you purchased that property prior to building the
14	house on	St. Croix?
15	А	That is correct.
16	٥	Okay. Do you still own this house: Caserta?
17	A	No.
18	Q	Okay. And there was there's no other properties you own
19	in Nevada	
20	А	Other than the commercial ones that we just talked about
21	٥	Uh-huh.
22	А	right now?
23	Q	Yeah.
24	А	And so I sold Caserta, and I bought another house right after
25	I sold Cas	

1	Q	And what was the address of that second property that you
2	purchase	d?
3	А	It's 2254 Buckingham Court in Henderson, Nevada.
4	Q	Okay. And when did you purchase Buckingham?
5	А	I I don't know the date. I don't know I just know it was
6	after I sol	d Caserta. I don't know the exact date.
7	Q	So but you had that
8	А	It was I could tell you it was probably around 2015.
9	٥	Oh, you didn't purchase that until 2015?
10	A	I'm thinking it's around you you said three years from the
11	flood unti	l after, correct?
12	Q	Uh-huh.
13	A	Yeah, so it was in that time frame.
14	Q	Okay. So you weren't living here full time in Nevada when
15	the flood	occurred, correct?
16	Α	Not full time, no.
17	Q	Okay. And your residency was in California, correct?
18	А	No, my residency is Nevada.
19	۵	Okay. But you lived in California?
20	А	I lived in both.
21	Q	Okay. So let's say once a month how often were you here in
22	Nevada e	very month?
23	А	Pretty much, yes.
24	Q	How many days a week?
25	A	It varied. Sometimes I was here for a whole week.
	14	

Q It states -- what does it say -- how is the money to be paid for the repairs?

- A Oh. In -- in the second paragraph?
- Q Uh-huh.
- A Could you repeat the question one more time, please?
- O Okay. Why don't I just read it to you? And then you can tell me. So in that second paragraph it said that -- it says that,

"It's understood and agreed that contractor will perform all repair work in good and workman like manner in accordance with general conditions, will have policy of insurance full force, will comply with local safety standards and performs all work accordingly."

Then the -- okay. Then it goes down. It says, "The undersigned", which is you --

- A Wait, what?
- "hereby transfers the signs and conveys to contractor his/her/their right title and interest in and to the insurance policy proceeds and all drafts for work performed to be performed by the contractor. Accordingly, undersigned authorize and directs their insured named below to make Desert Valley Contracting a payee on all insurance drafts for all insurance work performed by the contractor on the above damaged property."

Do you recall reading that?

A Yes, I do. I just read right now, yes.

25

A No, there was not.

Q Okay. So the house was paid off so there wasn't any mortgage company that would have had to be put on any drafts from the insurance company, correct?

A No. That -- oh, that is correct.

Q Okay. So when -- so your understanding was even if the checks didn't come with DVC's name on it, you were to pay DVC for the work performed and contracted, correct?

A Yes. However -- as -- as it reads now, yes; however, I did not get this contract until after we were in a lawsuit.

 Okay. So then underneath that paragraph, the next paragraph it says,

"If for any reason the undersigned or the contractor terminates the contract prior to the actual work beginning, the undersigned is responsible to pay all costs and fees associated with preparation for beginning the job, such as permits, materials ordered, any and all such fees and costs for services performed."

Did you understand that you would be responsible if you fired them to pay for any work that they had already done?

A Yes. At your office. Yes, I did. When we were going through depositions, yes.

Q Okay. So if you continue down here and it says, "Should client terminate the contractor" -- after work has completed,

"after work as begun, but not completed in full, the client

shall be responsible for any and all fees and costs associated with the work performed plus the profit that the client would have made on the job had the client not repudiated the contract."

So is it your understanding that if you terminated them you would have still been responsible for any profit that they would have earned if you had not terminated them?

A Yes. How I read it now, yes. And as long as the work was in good workman like manner and condition, yes.

Q Okay. That's not what it says though. It just says that I you terminated them, they would be entitled to the profit that they would have made on the job and the cost if you repudiated the contract, correct?

MR. BOSCHEE: Objection, Your Honor. Asked and answered, and that's not what the entire provision says.

MS. HURTIK: Well, I'm not done.

THE COURT: Yeah, so I'm having a hard time -- I thought my eyesight was fairly good. This is quite small.

Let me at least --

MS. HURTIK: Do you want me to blow it up?

THE COURT: No, if I focus on it I can read it, but bear with me a moment. Let me read the actual paragraph here.

MS. HURTIK: And just so you're clear, Your Honor, I'm going through the entire paragraph, so I'm not just picking. I will continue in this paragraph.

1 and I'll read this and --2 3 MS. HURTIK: Sure. 4 5 6 7 should say what I'm struggling with. 8 9 10 11 THE COURT: Sure. 12 BY MS. HURTIK: 13 14 completed, 15 16 17 18 So the guestion is -- and I think that you already this one and 19 20 21 22 23 stayed on the job, correct? 24

25

THE COURT: Yeah, so just let me -- bear with me a moment THE COURT: -- get some context for myself. [Pause] THE COURT: So was the question that -- I don't know if I MS. HURTIK: Do you want me to repeat it, Your Honor? THE COURT: Yes, please. MS. HURTIK: I'd be more than happy to.

Okay. So my question is, it says, after work has been

"After work has begun, but not completed in full, the client shall be responsible for any and all fees and costs associated with the work performed, plus the profit that the client would have made on the job had client not repudiated the contract."

I was on the second part, but we're going to make sure -- so your understanding was that if you terminated DVC, you would have been responsible to pay them profit that they would have earned had they

THE COURT: So is your question assuming that DVC is the client?

E:		
	1	MS. HURTIK: No. Okay. He entered into a contract with
	2	DVC. If the client is Mr. Inose. If Inose terminates them, then the
	3	contractor would be entitled to the profit and the profit that he would
	4	have had had he not repudiated the contract.
- 1	5	MR. BOSCHEE: Well, that's great. Now, we don't have to ask
4	6	him the question.
	7	THE COURT: Hold on one second.
	8	MS. HURTIK: Well, I mean, but he's I mean, I'm just trying
	9	to
	10	THE COURT: No, no
	11	MS. HURTIK: Sorry. I'm
	12	THE COURT: So
	13	MS. HURTIK: trying to clear it up.
	14	THE COURT: I mean, I'm going to quote, because you're
The state of the s	15	quoting from
	16	MS. HURTIK: Well, I just
	17	THE COURT: "plus the profit that the client would have
8	18	made on the job had client not repudiated the contract." I mean
Ti .	19	MS. HURTIK: Well, it says
	20	THE COURT: how is you know, doesn't that anyway
2	21	MS. HURTIK: Okay.
	22	MR. BOSCHEE: And that was and I recall objecting at that
-	23	question, but, you know and then Your Honor read the paragraph, and
	24	so I don't know where that leaves us.
	25	THE COURT: Okay.

MS. HURTIK: Well, okay.

THE COURT: Neither do I.

MS. HURTIK: So it goes to the intent, Your Honor. If you read the top of that, it is clearly --

THE COURT: No, I just want to make sure we're quoting, if we're going to quote from the paragraph, that we quote accurately, because it says, "plus the profit that the client would have made on the job had client not repudiated the contract." Anyway, that's what it says, that phrase anyway.

MS. HURTIK: Okay.

BY MS. HURTIK:

Q So it goes on to say,

"Upon termination of contractor services, client is responsible to pay all fees and costs incurred by the contractor within five days of termination by either party."

And if any request that these costs will -- now I've got to have the eye problem -- "If any requests for additional work to be performed are made during the scope of the job, all such requests must be put in writing so that these costs will be added to the scope of work. If the scope of work is beyond any insurance claim, the owner agent, or authorized party will pay all claims within ten days of completion of work. Any materials will be paid for prior to the additional work being performed."

What's your understanding of that clause right there

1	regarding	, Mr. Inose, what does that what's your understanding of that
2	clause?	
3		MR. BOSCHEE: Just the part you just read, Counsel?
4		MS. HURTIK: Just the part I just read.
5		MR. BOSCHEE: Okay.
6		THE WITNESS: That basically if either party were to
7	terminate	each other then somebody would be responsible for payment.
8	BY MS. H	URTIK:
9	٥	That you would be responsible for payment. It says client is
10	responsib	le.
11		THE COURT: Well, you
12		MR. BOSCHEE: Objection.
13		THE COURT: Yeah.
14		THE WITNESS: Well, that's
15		THE COURT: So you asked him what his understanding was.
16	He told yo	ou, so if you want to follow up on what he said, that's fine,
17	but	
18		MS. HURTIK: Sure.
19		THE COURT: the way you phrased that last question was
20	not appro	priate.
21		MS. HURTIK: Sure.
22	BY MS. H	URTIK:
23	a	So it says, "If the scope of the work is beyond any insurance
24	claim, the	owner agent, or authorized party will pay all claims within ten
25	days of co	ompletion of work." Okay.
	Charles A. A.	

1 Wait, I'm -- I'm so sorry. I -- I just -- I'm trying to find where 2 you're at right now. 3 It's kind of small. So let's make it simple. I'm having trouble 4 reading it too so --5 THE COURT: I believe we all are. 6 BY MS. HURTIK: 7 O Okay. If you had change orders that were beyond the 8 insurance scope of work, is it your understanding, you were to pay for 9 those? 10 MR. BOSCHEE: Objection. Calls for speculation and 11 assumes facts not in evidence, as to the change orders that he may or 12 may not have gotten. 13 MS. HURTIK: We're not even talking -- we're talking about 14 just the contract. 15 MR. BOSCHEE: Oh, I understand, but the way you asked the 16 question I think is asking to speculate. 17 THE COURT: So what are the objections? 18 MR. BOSCHEE: The objection is it calls for speculation if 19 assuming he had received changed orders one; and then two, assumes 20 facts not in evidence, because that's obviously a contention in this case, 21 and she just asked him if you received changed orders, he's responsible 22 for them. 23 THE COURT: That's sustained. 24 So you can rephrase.

MS. HURTIK: Okay.

25

24

25

BY MS. HURTIK:

Q So it says,

"If any request for additional work to be performed are made during the scope of the job, all such requests must be put in writing, and these costs will be added to the scope of the work. If the scope of work is beyond any insurance claim, the owner, agent, or authorized party will pay all claims."

And it says a little bit more, but is your understanding that if there were -- was work performed that was beyond the insurance scope of work, you would be responsible to pay that?

A How I read it is that if there were any additional work to be done, a written -- a -- where is it at -- it'd have to be in writing.

Q Uh-huh.

A To let me know what that was and probably the costs associated to it.

Q And would you be responsible to pay it if those were the -- if that was the case?

- A If I am reading just that section of the paragraph?
- Q Uh-huh.
- A Then yes, if I'm reading just that section of the paragraph.
- Q Okay. and then if you go -- go ahead and turn to -- we're still in this exhibit --
 - A Okay.
 - Q -- go turn to the second page, which is IN-LO 23.
 - A Okay.

1	Q And at the bottom of the first paragraph it says, "Contractor
2	has the right to stop work"
3	A Wait. I'm so sorry.
4	THE COURT: Yeah, let's I'm having a hard time following
5	too. Where are you at? Page 23, which paragraph?
6	MS. HURTIK: First paragraph.
7	THE COURT: First paragraph. Okay.
8	MS. HURTIK: Last line.
9	THE COURT: Last line. Well, the last line of the first
10	paragraph says, "Released", or not.?
11	MS. HURTIK: The last line in the first paragraph says, "In the
12	event the insurance proceeds are not issued, contractor has the right to
13	stop work until such time insurance proceeds are released."
14	THE COURT: So that starts the third line from the
15	MS. HURTIK: That's the last sentence in the paragraph.
16	THE COURT: Okay. So you said last line.
17	MS. HURTIK: Okay. So I will
18	THE COURT: Because we're trying to follow, so let's be
19	precise.
20	MS. HURTIK: Okay.
21	THE COURT: So last sentence of the first paragraph that
22	begins, "In the event", right?
23	MS. HURTIK: Yes.
24	THE COURT: Okay. And you'll have to re-ask your question
25	too.

1 MS. HURTIK: Okay. 2 BY MS. HURTIK: 3 Q So, Mr. Inose, this says, if "the insurance proceeds are not 4 issued, contractor has the right to stop work until such time insurance 5 proceeds are released"; is that correct? 6 A Yes. 7 0 Okay. Did DVC stop work on the project at any time? 8 A In my opinion, yes. 9 Okay. And was DVC paid all of the insurance proceeds for 10 the scope of work that they completed? 11 Can you repeat that whole question one more time, please? 12 0 Was Desert Valley Contracting paid all of the proceeds of the 13 bid for the contract? 14 For the whole bid? No. 15 0 Okay. So, Mr. Inose, did you terminate Desert Valley 16 Contracting? 17 A Yes. Okay. And let's go back just for a clarification matter, 18 19 because I want to make sure that we're clear on a few things. That 20 Exhibit 560 it's Bates stamped IN-LO 22 to 23. That was produced by 21 your counsel. So you said you never had this, but your counsel 22 produced this contract. 23 No, ma'am. What I said was I did not have this until after we 24 were in a dispute.

So you did sign the contract, correct?

25

Q

A I do not recall signing this contract at all; however, that is my signature, and it is -- that is my handwriting on the printed portion of it.

Like I explained to you before, at the time of this happening, I was in -- in shambles, and I -- I could not remember a lot of things. There was so many things going on at that time.

- Q Okay.
- A So I do not remember exactly signing this contract.
- Q Okay. And is it your practice to not read contracts before you sign them?
- A No, not typically. Typically, yeah, I would read a contract; however, in -- in this circumstance, like I said, it was under severe just I I didn't even know what to do. It was crazy.
 - O Okay. And you're a businessman, correct?
 - A I do own businesses, yes.
 - Q Yeah. So you're used to reading contracts, aren't you?
 - A To some extent, yes.
- Q Okay. So you enter into the contract with Desert Valley Contracting to rebuild the house, correct?
 - A That is correct.
 - Q And when did you terminate Desert Valley Contracting?
- A I could approximate the month, but I don't know the exact date or anything like that. It was the latter half of 2015, probably around November of 2015.
- Q Okay. And let's go to -- hold on one moment. So did you have contracts with any of the subcontractors to do the work on the

1	house?	
2	А	Directly? Are we talking prior to them getting terminated or
3	after they	got terminated?
4	٥	Prior to them being terminated.
5	А	No, I did not have contracts with them.
6	٥	Okay. And when did you first start talking to the
7	subcontra	octors?
8		THE COURT: Like, so you mean, talking generally with
9	people we	orking on the project, or do you mean, so if you could clarify
10	your ques	stion. I don't even get exactly what you're asking.
11		MS. HURTIK: Sure.
12	BY MS. H	URTIK:
13	Q	So, Mr. Inose, you terminated the general contractor, so
14	you	
15		THE COURT: He's already testified to that.
16		MS. HURTIK: Yeah, I'm trying to clarify
17		THE COURT: Okay.
18		MS. HURTIK: it for you, Your Honor.
19	BY MS. H	URTIK:
20	Q	So you terminated the general contractor, so then when did
21	you first i	reach out to the subcontractors?
22	A	It was shortly around that time. I do not recall the exact date
23	but it was	s right around that time.
24	Q	Okay. So you believe it was in November of 2015?
25	A	It was somewhere around there, yes.

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

Q Okay. I'm going to -- in that same binder, go to Exhibit 561.

Okay. This is an inspection -- a permit inspection history. And I want you to look at the first column and it says, "Inspection history for permit." And I think it says BRBB 2014009896. The first column says, "Scheduled." The first four scheduled dates say, "12/17/2015." Do you see that?

A Yes, I do.

Q Okay. So the first line 12/17/2015, it says, "Description", the second column, "Final two", it says, "Completed 12/17/2015", and then it says, "Result pass." Do you know what inspection that was for that that passed?

A Not at all.

Q Okay. Then go to the second one, 12/17/2'15. It says, "Final mechanical completed 12/17/2015." And it says, "Passed." Do you see that?

A Yes, I do.

Q So is it your understanding that the mechanical passed -- the final mechanical inspection passed on 12/17/2015, on your house?

A That's what it looks like, yes.

Q Okay. And then the third line is 12/17/2015, and it says, "Final plumbing 12/17/2015." That says, "Passed", as well. Is that your understanding that the plumbing was finaled [sic] and passed at that time too?

A Yes, it appears so.

Q Okay. Then the fourth line says, "12/17/2015, final electrical."

It says, "Completed 12/17/2015." And it says, "Passed." Is it your understanding that the final electrical was passed at that time as well?

- A Yes, it appears so.
- Q So you terminated DVC in November of 2015 sometime, correct?

A Like I said, I don't know if it was November, or I don't know exactly what month it was. I just know it was the latter portion of the year.

Q Okay. And your plumbing, mechanical, electrical, and there's another item, which it doesn't clarify, those were all finaled [sic], the house was completed, as to those items, which are those times on 12/17/2015, correct?

A When you say "completed", in the eyes of the inspector, yes, it was completed.

- Q Okay. So since you bring that up, "in the eyes of the inspector", you didn't agree with the inspector?
 - A No, no, not at all. That's not what I meant by that at all.
 - Q Okay.
 - A What I --
 - Q Why don't you --
- A -- what -- if I may expatiate on that, I'm just saying that in order to get a final, from my understanding, it's basically, to get it to a certain point where it's like the bare minimum to get it passed.
- Q So you think a final inspection is for bare minimum, it isn't completion?

1	just tell				
2	A	Oh, okay.			
3	0	I'm going to try to get some			
4	A	Okay.			
5	Q	names.			
6	A	Yeah, okay.			
7	Q	Okay. What about so you're unsure Diversified?			
8	A	I am unsure about Diversified.			
9	۵	So DH Electric?			
10	A	Nope, they were not.			
11	a	DH Electric was not original?			
12	А	No.			
13	a	Sunrise Service?			
14	A	Sunrise Mechanical was, but not Sunrise Service. The the			
15	distinguis	h between them is Sunrise Mechanical did the HVAC stuff and			
16	Sunrise S	ervices did plumbing and I did not use them as plumbers in the			
17	first contract, so no.				
18	Q	Artesia Kitchen and Cabinets?			
19	A	No.			
20	Q	No, they weren't original?			
21	A	They were not original.			
22	0	Okay. Creative Closets?			
23	A	Creative Closets?			
24	Q	Uh-huh.			
25	А	No, they were not original.			

1	Q	Dyba Interior?				
2	А	Dyba Interior was original.				
3	۵	Okay.				
4	А	She's a designer.				
5	۵	Okay. So Dyba Interior was your original designer and you				
6	used her again on the reconstruction?					
7	А	That is correct.				
8	٥	Okay. Eagle Sentry?				
9	Α	Yes, they were.				
10	Q	Summit Tile & Stone?				
11	А	No, they were not.				
12	Q	Flooring and Counters [phonetic]?				
13	А	No, they were not.				
14	Q	High Bar?				
15	А	Yes, they were.				
16	Q	Did you insist that Rob Ramirez be the superintendent on the				
17	job?					
18	А	The same as the subcontractors, ma'am. I did highly				
19	recommend that Robert Ramirez be on this job as supervisor, yes.					
20	Q	Okay. And Rob Ramirez, again, you're not sure if he actually				
21	had a lice	had a license a contracting license?				
22	А	No, ma'am. I do not know.				
23	Q	So how much was the do you know how much the final bid				
24	was to co	was to complete your house to put it back in the condition it was before?				
25		MR. BOSCHEE: Objection. Final bid, or final estimate?				

MS. HURTIK: Final estimate.

MR. BOSCHEE: Okay.

THE WITNESS: The one from the insurance company that Daniel worked out, that one?

BY MS. HURTIK:

Q The one from Desert Valley Contracting that --

A Yes -- yes, I'm sorry. Yes, from DVC that -- yes, Daniel worked out with the insurance company, yes. It was approximately 1.3 million.

Q Okay. And did you have any upgrades on the house when you put it back together?

- A In some certain areas I did have some upgrades, yes.
- Q Okay. And what areas were those that you had upgrades?

A The upgrades that I did were in the wine room, and other than that just the doors in the -- that lead into the lounge; however, I must add that I did not do certain other areas in the house. I had a -- a multi-person sauna -- temperature-controlled sauna that was all wood that we did not do. And also, I had a dome roof -- a dome ceiling -- I'm sorry -- not a roof -- a dome ceiling in the lounge that I did not do that was very labor intensive, so I decided not to do it.

Q Okay. And so in the wine room, who was the contractor that did the wine room?

A It was High Bar and Artesia Cabinets, and I believe that -- and also DVC themselves because they did the drywall work, and the painting in there.

Q Okay. And did you -- what did you change? What was the major change that you made in the wine room?

A Okay. On the wine room I -- so I put glass instead of where drywall was before. So before I had glass door, and then I still have a glass door, but I also now put in a glass wall where there was drywall before.

- Q Was that a significant increase in cost?
- A What would you define as significant?
- Q Was it increase in cost from the drywall?
- A Yes, it was an increase in cost in drywall, yes.
- Q And did you think that you needed to pay for that increase in cost?
 - A No, ma'am.
 - Q Why not?
- A Like I stated earlier, right now, the sauna was taken out, which I do not know how much it is, but it's quite a bit of money. There was other things that we did not do in -- in lieu of so we were able to spruce up some areas that -- that I felt was better -- the money was better used.
- Q So you were involved in going through the financials with DVC to determine where the money should be used?
- A I'm not sure I understand that question. When you say that I went through the financials with them what do you mean by that, ma'am?
 - Q Well, they gave you an estimate?

1	А	No, they never gave me an estimate on that. On you're			
2	you're talking are we just talking about the wine room right now?				
3	٥	They gave you let's go back.			
4	А	Okay.			
5	O.	They gave you an estimate and you told me what the amount			
6	was?				
7	A	Correct.			
8	Q	And the amount was what?			
9	А	Approximately 1.3 million.			
10	Q	Okay. And the estimate had a breakdown of every room,			
11	correct?				
12	A	I don't know about that, ma'am. I'm not sure about every			
13	room, no.				
14	Q	Okay. So are you saying that you never looked at the			
15	estimate?				
16	A	Is that the one that was I had mentioned before that was			
17	very hard for me to understand?				
18	Q	Okay. Let's go to Exhibit 571. Are you there?			
19	А	Yep. Yes, ma'am, I am.			
20	Q	What this is, is you'll see on the forint the first page starts			
21	with IN-LO 71 and this exhibit goes all the way back quite a few pages to				
22	IN-LO the last page is 156.				
23	A	Okay. Yes, I do see that.			
24	٥	Okay.			
25		MR. BOSCHEE: Okay. And then I'm going to lodge an			
	11				

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

24

25

objection as to this line of questioning because I believe this estimate was the second estimate that Danny Merritt created for the insurance company in June and not the first estimate that I think you're asking questions about. I think the first estimate is a different exhibit. I think you're looking at two different estimates. I'm sorry. I'm just -- I think that's --

THE COURT: Well, if that's true, that's fair.

MR. BOSCHEE: -- right.

BY MS. HURTIK:

Q I'm going to ask you about this one. Okay.

MR. BOSCHEE: Okay.

THE WITNESS: That's fine.

THE COURT: Okay.

BY MS. HURTIK:

All right. So if you look at the first page, it says, "IN-LO 71." And there's some email transmissions and your name is on some of them -- to Brian -- and there's one from Brian Lynch. On the bottom of this first page -- are you there on 71?

Yes, I am here, yes. A

Okay. And this says, "We received the final estimate from your contractor. We've also received the estimates for the final costs related to your content repairs or replacement." And then he has, "The following documents are attached for your review." And that lists out what is attached in this exhibit. So where I want to lead you in this -- and this is dated June 19th, 2015. So have you ever seen the -- I'm going to

1	the count	ertops? When they were replaced, did you pick countertops							
2	out?								
3	А	I did pick the countertops out, yes.							
4	Q	Okay. So they had an edge on them where they hadn't							
5	before, correct?								
6	А	They I don't you know, honestly I don't recall what it had							
7	back in 2006 to 2008. I don't remember the exact edge that I used to								
8	have on them. And you're are you ask okay. So are you asking if I								
9	did a bullnose edge?								
10	٥	Uh-huh.							
11	А	I I'm not 100 percent sure of that, ma'am. I don't know							
12	what a bu	what a bullnose edge is.							
13	a	Do you know what a mitered edge is?							
14	Α	A mitered edge?							
15	Q	Uh-huh.							
16	А	I learned of that terminology when they were putting in							
17	one of the	the countertops. Yes.							
18	Q	Okay. So you put in mitered edges?							
19	А	You know, I still don't know exactly what a mitered edge is.							
20	I but that's what they were calling it. Yes.								
21	Q	And they told that that was an additional cost?							
22	А	Nobody told me that.							
23	Q	Danny Merritt never told you that?							
24	Α	Daniel Merritt never told me that.							
25	Q	Okay. So as we flip through this estimate, if you go to IN-LO							

1	85								
2	А	Okay.							
3	Q the top says, "Dining room."								
4	A Yes.								
5	۵								
6	А	Yes yes.							
7	Q	Okay. So this estimate was going through room-by-room,							
8	correct?								
9	А	Yes, it appears so, yes.							
10	۵	Okay. So let's go all the way to IN-LO 132.							
11	Α	132. Okay.							
12	Q	Okay. And this says there's totals, and it says, "ACV total",							
13	and at the bottom it says, "1,320,429.28." Is that the amount that it was								
14	your understanding was given to the insurance company?								
15	A You mean that the insurance company was giving to me; is								
16	that correct?								
17	٥	Is this this is a this was prepared you can see by							
18	looking at it								
19	А	Yes.							
20	0	this was prepared by Desert Valley Contracting.							
21	А	Yes, correct.							
22	Q	It is an estimate for the repairs to the reconstruction of the							
23	house, correct?								
24	A	Okay. I get you I get what you're saying. Yes, it was this							
25	was a an estimate from DVC to the insurance company, yes yes.								

	II.							
1	Q	Okay.						
2	A	I'm sorry. I thought I thought you meant something else.						
3	I'm sorry.							
4	a	So this amount that they gave the insurance company was						
5	for 1,320,4	29.29, correct?						
6	A	Yes, it appears so.						
7	Q	Okay.						
8	A I don't know what ACV stands for, but yes.							
9	Q	Okay. So now let's go stay in this same exhibit and go to						
10	IN-LO 154.							
11	А	IN-LO 154. Okay.						
12	Q	And just tell me when you you're there?						
13	A Oh, I'm here. Yes.							
14	Q	I'm just going to make sure the judge is.						
15		So now this is kind of hard to read. Can you read this?						
16	А	Are you asking me?						
17	Q	Yes, I'm asking you.						
18	Α	Yes, I I can, yes.						
19	Q	And I'm going to put it up here, just maybe it will help.						
20		THE COURT: That's fine. Yeah. No. Thank you.						
21		MS. HURTIK: I hope.						
22		THE COURT: You might have to zoom in.						
23		MS. HURTIK: It's okay. My eyes are having problems too,						
24	so							
25		THE COURT: Okay.						

1	MS. HURTIK: I don't have my glasses. They got taken					
2	because they weren't right.					
3	THE WITNESS: There it is. It's much clearer now.					
4	THE COURT: Yeah.					
5	MS. HURTIK: It's not clear for me, but okay. Let's hope it is					
6	for you.					
7	THE WITNESS: Yes.					
8	MS. HURTIK: See what happens when you get old.					
9	THE WITNESS: Oh, no, believe me, I have the same exact					
10	issues. That's why I'm taking off my glasses sometimes.					
11	THE COURT: And putting them back on and taking them off.					
12	MS. HURTIK: Is this better though, can you see it better?					
13	THE COURT: Uh-huh.					
14	MS. HURTIK: Okay.					
15	BY MS. HURTIK:					
16	Q So okay. Up at the top, and I'm going to there's a table to					
17	the right. Okay. Over here.					
18	A Yes yes.					
19	Q Okay. And so it says, " SERVPRO mitigation final bill." The					
20	first line. And it says, "96,753.95." Could you see that?					
21	A Yes, I do.					
22	Q Okay. And then it says, "First advance payment to Desert					
23	Valley 50,000." And then if you just go down the line, it shows other					
24	advance payments to Desert Valley, 349,773; 23,961. And then a fourth					
25	advance 300,000. And then a final payment to Desert Valley 554, 508.41.					

	11								
1	Do you se	e that?							
2	А	I do see that, yes.							
3	Q	Okay. So does that indicate, to you, that SERVPRO was a							
4	separate entity?								
5	А	Oh, I I'll be honest with you, ma'am, I I don't even I							
6	didn't even look at this.								
7	a	So this was sent to you for so that you could get a final							
8	number of what you were going to be paid out on the claim, correct?								
9	А	Yes, it is correct.							
10	۵	Okay. So you're saying you never looked at it?							
11	А	Ma'am, no. I relied on Daniel from Desert Valley to handle all							
12	the numbers for me.								
13	Q	Q Okay. And my question is, when we started talking about							
14	this exhib	it, the emails let me make sure that I'm correct on this							
15	А	No, it was sent to me.							
16	a	Sent to you?							
17	А	Yes.							
18	Q	And Danny isn't CC'd on this is he?							
19	А	I I don't I don't know about that one. He must have							
20	gotten it before. Well, he's the original sender, isn't he?								
21	Q	It says let's go back to the first page, where it says, "IN-LO							
22	71."								
23	A	Okay.							
24	Q And it shows Brian Lynch to Eugene								
25	PromotionProperties.com. That's the only person it shows going to and								
	1.6								

it says, "Good afternoon, Mr. Inose."

- A Yes, I see that.
- O Okay. So he sent it to you, and you're telling me you never looked at his?

A I believe these are in attachments and I recall seeing these type of estimates before and I asked Daniel about it, and I -- and I believe I said this in the deposition -- I don't -- I cannot make heads or tails out of these estimates. Some of them are in square footage, some of them each, and then it has a drawing, and I -- I would not know the cost of anything, as far as what it cost to pull this wall out, paint this wall, or -- or anything. And Daniel told me -- he goes, he kind of chuckled and said, don't -- don't even worry about that, that's between us and the insurance company. So I -- I quite frankly, did not look very carefully at this after that, because I could not make heads or tails out of this.

I -- prior to this, I did look at it. Not this particular one, but I did see this type of estimate before, and I think I made a comment like this is like Swahili to me. I don't get it.

- Q Okay. So there's a highlighted portion here. It's not on yours highlighted, but I did it so that you could see it on here.
 - A Oh, okay.
- Q So it says additional living expenses. So you were paid out it says, "Towne Place Suites rental payments." And there's several rental payments and I believe that they total approximately 120,000.
 - A Okay.

O Then it says, "Total", and see where my -- well, I'm not --

For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper. 7.

Dated this 2 day of June, 2016.

HOLLEY, DRIGGS, WALCH, FINE, WRAY, PUZEY & THOMPSON

BRIAN W. BOSCHEE, ESQ. (NBN 7612) WILLIAM N. MILLER, ESQ. (NBN 11658) 400 South Fourth Street, Third Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Attorneys for Defendants

11218-00/1681899.doc

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

	I	HEREBY	CERTIFY	that	the	foregoing	EUGENE	INOSE'S	ANSWER	то
COM	PL	AINT AND	COUNTE	RCL	AIM,	was submit	tted electron	ically for fil	ing and/or se	rvice
with th	ne	Eighth Judi	cial District	Court	t on t	the May	of June, 20	16. Electro	nic service o	f the
forego	ing	document :	shall be mad	e in a	ccord	lance with t	he E-Service	List as follo	owe.	

Carrie E. Hurtik, Esq.
Rachel L. Shelstad, Esq.
HURTIK LAW & ASSOCIATES
7866 West Sahara Avenue
Las Vegas, NV 89117
Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counterdefendant

An employee of Holley, Driggs, Walch, Fine, Wray, Puzey & Thompson

HOLLEY-DRIGGS-WALCH FINE-WRAY-PUZEY-THOMPSON 口

EXHIBIT 3

Electronically Filed 07/08/2016 05:29:17 PM

CLERK OF THE COURT

1 CCAN CARRIE E. HURTIK, ESQ. 2 Nevada Bar No. 7028 RACHEL L. SHELSTAD, ESQ. 3 Nevada Bar No. 13399 RACHEL A. SLOANE, ESQ. 4 Nevada Bar No. 14120 HURTIK LAW & ASSOCIATES 5 7866 W. Sahara Avenue 6 Las Vegas, Nevada 89117

7 (702) 966-5206 Facsimile churtik@hurtiklaw.com 8 rshelstad@hurtiklaw.com rsloane@hurtiklaw.com 9

(702) 966-5200 Telephone

Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counter-defendant, 10 DESERT VALLEY CONTRACTING, INC.

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Case No.:

Dept. No.: XV

DESERT VALLEY CONTRACTING, INC. a Nevada corporation,

Plaintiff,

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

27

28

IN-LO PROPERTIES, a Nevada limited liability company; EUGENE INOSE, an individual; JEFFREY LOUIE, an individual; DOES 1 through 10; and ROE ENTITIES 1 through 10,

Defendants.

EUGENE INOSE, an individual;

Counterclaimant,

DESERT VALLEY CONTRACTING, INC., a 25 Nevada corporation; DOES I through X, inclusive, and ROE CORPORATIONS I 26 through X, inclusive,

Counterdefendants.

PLAINTIFF/COUNTER-DEFENDANT,
DESERT VALLEY CONTRACTING, INC.'S ANSWER TO DEFENDANT/COUNTERCLAIMANT, EUGENE INOSE'S COUNTERCLAIM

A-16-734351-C

PLAINTIFF/COUNTER-DEFENDANT, DESERT VALLEY CONTRACTING, INC.'S ANSWER TO DEFENDANT/COUNTERCLAIMANT, EUGENE INOSE'S COUNTERCLAIM

COMES NOW, Plaintiff/Counter-defendant DESERT VALLEY CONTRACTING, INC. (hereinafter "Plaintiff/Counter-defendant, DVC" or "Counter-defendant"), by and through its attorneys, CARRIE E. HURTIK, ESQ., RACHEL L. SHELSTAD, ESQ., and RACHEL A. SLOANE, ESQ., of the law firm HURTIK LAW & ASSOCIATES, hereby Answers Defendant/Counterclaimant, EUGENE INOSE (hereinafter "Counterclaimant") Counterclaim as follows:

THE PARTIES

- Answering Paragraph 1 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant admits the allegations set forth in said Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 2 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering
 Counter-defendant admits the allegations set forth in said Paragraph.
- 3. Answering Paragraph 3 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. Answering Paragraph 4 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant assert that the allegations contained therein constitute legal conclusions, to which no response is required. To the extent said paragraph is determined to contain factual allegations made against Counter-defendant, Counter-defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to enable it to admit or deny the allegations and on that basis deny the allegations contained therein.

5. Answering Paragraph 5 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.

6. Answering Paragraph 6 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.

7. Answering Paragraph 7 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.

8. Answering Paragraph 8 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.

9. Answering Paragraph 9 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.

10. Answering Paragraph 10 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the

1

remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.

- Answering Paragraph 11 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering 11. Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 12 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering 12. Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 13 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering 13. Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 14 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.
- 15. Answering Paragraph 15 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.
- 16. Answering Paragraph 16 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant asserts that the allegations contained therein constitute legal conclusions, to which

no response is required. To the extent said paragraph is determined to contain factual allegations made against Counter-defendant, Counter-defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to enable it to admit or deny the allegations and on that basis deny the allegations contained therein.

- 17. Answering Paragraph 17 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.
- 18. Answering Paragraph 18 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.
- 19. Answering Paragraph 19 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant denies each and every allegation in this Paragraph.
- 20. Answering Paragraph 20 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant denies each and every allegation in this Paragraph.
- 21. Answering Paragraph 21 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.
- 22. Answering Paragraph 22 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.

- 23. Answering Paragraph 23 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.
- 24. Answering Paragraph 24 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.
- 25. Answering Paragraph 25 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.
- 26. Answering Paragraph 26 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant denies each and every allegation in this Paragraph.
- 27. Answering Paragraph 27 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.
- 28. Answering Paragraph 28 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.
- 29. Answering Paragraph 29 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the

2

3

4

remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.

- Answering Paragraph 30 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.
- 31. Answering Paragraph 31 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 32 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering 32. Counter-defendant denies each and every allegation in this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 33 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant denies each and every allegation in this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 34 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering 34. Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 35 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering 35. Counter-defendant denies each and every allegation in this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 36 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant denies each and every allegation in this Paragraph.
- 37. Answering Paragraph 37 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant assert that the allegations contained therein constitute legal conclusions, to which

no response is required. To the extent said paragraph is determined to contain factual allegations made against Counter-defendant, Counter-defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to enable it to admit or deny the allegations and on that basis deny the allegations contained therein.

38. Answering Paragraph 38 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant asserts that the allegations contained therein constitute legal conclusions, to which no response is required. To the extent said paragraph is determined to contain factual allegations made against Counter-defendant, Counter-defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to enable it to admit or deny the allegations and on that basis deny the allegations contained therein.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Breach of Contract)

- 39. Answering Paragraph 39 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant repeats and re-alleges the response set forth to Paragraphs 1 through 38 and incorporates the same by this reference as if fully set forth herein.
- 40. Answering Paragraph 40 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.
- 41. Answering Paragraph 41 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant denies each and every allegation in this Paragraph.
- 42. Answering Paragraph 42 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant denies each and every allegation in this Paragraph.
- 43. Answering Paragraph 43 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant denies each and every allegation in this Paragraph.

- 44. Answering Paragraph 44 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant asserts that the allegations contained therein constitute legal conclusions, to which no response is required. To the extent said paragraph is determined to contain factual allegations made against Counter-defendant, Counter-defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to enable it to admit or deny the allegations and on that basis deny the allegations contained therein.
- 45. Answering Paragraph 45 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant asserts that the allegations contained therein constitute legal conclusions, to which no response is required. To the extent said paragraph is determined to contain factual allegations made against Counter-defendant, Counter-defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to enable it to admit or deny the allegations and on that basis deny the allegations contained therein.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Breach of the Implied Covenant of Good Fair (sir) and Fair Dealing)

- 46. Answering Paragraph 46 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant repeats and re-alleges the response set forth to Paragraphs 1 through 45 and incorporates the same by this reference as if fully set forth herein.
- 47. Answering Paragraph 47 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant asserts that the allegations contained therein constitute legal conclusions, to which no response is required. To the extent said paragraph is determined to contain factual allegations made against Counter-defendant, Counter-defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to enable it to admit or deny the allegations and on that basis deny the allegations contained therein.
- 48. Answering Paragraph 48 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Answering Paragraph 49 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering 49. Counter-defendant denies each and every allegation in this Paragraph.

- Answering Paragraph 50 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant denies each and every allegation in this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 51 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering 51. Counter-defendant denies each and every allegation in this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 52 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering 52. Counter-defendant assert that the allegations contained therein constitute legal conclusions, to which no response is required. To the extent said paragraph is determined to contain factual allegations made against Counter-defendant, Counter-defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to enable it to admit or deny the allegations and on that basis deny the allegations contained therein.
- Answering Paragraph 53 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering 53. Counter-defendant asserts that the allegations contained therein constitute legal conclusions, to which no response is required. To the extent said paragraph is determined to contain factual allegations made against Counter-defendant, Counter-defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to enable it to admit or deny the allegations and on that basis deny the allegations contained therein.
- Answering Paragraph 54 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering 54. Counter-defendant asserts that the allegations contained therein constitute legal conclusions, to which no response is required. To the extent said paragraph is determined to contain factual allegations made against Counter-defendant, Counter-defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to enable it to admit or deny the allegations and on that basis deny the allegations contained therein.

26 27

23

24

25

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Alternative Claim for Unjust Enrichment)

- 55. Answering Paragraph 55 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant repeats and re-alleges the response set forth to Paragraphs 1 through 54 and incorporates the same by this reference as if fully set forth herein.
- 56. Answering Paragraph 56 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.
- 57. Answering Paragraph 57 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant denies each and every allegation in this Paragraph.
- 58. Answering Paragraph 58 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant denies each and every allegation in this Paragraph.
- 59. Answering Paragraph 59 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant denies each and every allegation in this Paragraph.
- 60. Answering Paragraph 60 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant asserts that the allegations contained therein constitute legal conclusions, to which no response is required. To the extent said paragraph is determined to contain factual allegations made against Counter-defendant, Counter-defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to enable it to admit or deny the allegations and on that basis deny the allegations contained therein.
- 61. Answering Paragraph 61 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant assert that the allegations contained therein constitute legal conclusions, to which no response is required. To the extent said paragraph is determined to contain factual allegations made

against Counter-defendant, Counter-defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to enable it to admit or deny the allegations and on that basis deny the allegations contained therein.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Intentional Interference with Prospective Economic Advantage)

- 62. Answering Paragraph 62 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant repeats and re-alleges the response set forth to Paragraphs 1 through 61 and incorporates the same by this reference as if fully set forth herein.
- 63. Answering Paragraph 63 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.
- 64. Answering Paragraph 64 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation in this Paragraph.
- 65. Answering Paragraph 65 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant denies each and every allegation in this Paragraph.
- 66. Answering Paragraph 66 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant denies each and every allegation in this Paragraph.
- 67. Answering Paragraph 67 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant denies each and every allegation in this Paragraph.
- 68. Answering Paragraph 68 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant asserts that the allegations contained therein constitute legal conclusions, to which no response is required. To the extent said paragraph is determined to contain factual allegations made

26

27

28

against Counter-defendant, Counter-defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to enable it to admit or deny the allegations and on that basis deny the allegations contained therein.

69. Answering Paragraph 69 set forth in Counterclaimant's Counterclaim, this Answering Counter-defendant asserts that the allegations contained therein constitute legal conclusions, to which no response is required. To the extent said paragraph is determined to contain factual allegations made against Counter-defendant, Counter-defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to enable it to admit or deny the allegations and on that basis deny the allegations contained therein.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's Counterclaim fails to state a claim against the Answering Counterdefendant upon which relief can be granted.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's claims are barred by the applicable statutes of limitations.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's claims are barred under the Doctrine of Laches.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's claims are barred under the Doctrine of Waiver.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The Answering Counter-defendant aver that Counterclaimant's injuries and damages, if any, were contributed to and caused by Counterclaimant's own acts and negligence, which negligence was greater than Answering Counter-defendant's negligence, if any.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant has failed to mitigate his damages and/or the Answering Counter-defendant is entitled to a reduction in damages under the doctrine of avoidable consequences.

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's claims are reduced, in whole or in part, by virtue of the actions of third persons over whom the Answering Counter-defendant exercised no control and whose actions were a proximate cause of Counterclaimant's alleged damages.

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimants are guilty of unclean hands.

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant has failed to satisfy conditions precedent to bring any action against Answering Counter-defendant.

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

If the Answering Counter-defendant failed to perform any contractual obligation owed to Counterclaimant, which it expressly denies, there is a valid excuse for such nonperformance.

ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

If the Answering Counter-defendant failed to perform any contractual or legal obligation owed to Counterclaimant, which it expressly denies, it was due to fraud perpetrated on the Answering Counter-defendant by Counterclaimant.

TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's claims for relief are barred by the Doctrines of Estoppel, Estoppel by Fraud, and/or Equitable Estoppel.

THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The conduct of the Answering Counter-defendant alleged to be wrongful was induced by Counterclaimant's own conduct.

26 ///

27 /

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Plaintiff/Counter-defendant, DVC'S Answer to Defendant/Counterclaimant, EUGENE INOSE'S Counterclaim - 14

FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant ratified, approved or acquiesced in the actions of Answering Counterdefendant

FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The Answering Counter-defendant, at all relevant times herein, acted in accordance with reasonable standards, in good faith, with reasonable care and did not contribute to the alleged damages.

SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The Answering Counter-defendant denies each and every allegation of Counterclaimant's Counterclaim not specifically admitted or otherwise pleaded to herein.

SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

It has been necessary to employ the services of an attorney to defend this action and a reasonable sum should be allowed Answering Counter-defendant as and for attorneys' fees, together with costs expended on this action.

EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Answering Counter-defendant incorporates by reference those affirmative defenses enumerated in N.R.C.P 8, as if fully set forth herein. If further investigation or discovery reveals the applicability of any such defenses, Answering Counter-defendant reserves the right to seek leave of Court to amend this answer to specifically assert any such defense. Such defenses are herein incorporated by reference for the specific purpose of not waiving any such defenses.

NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Pursuant to N.R.C.P, Rule 11, as amended, all possible affirmative defenses may not have been alleged herein insofar as sufficient facts were not available after reasonable inquiry upon the filing of this Answering Counter-defendant's Answer to Counterclaimant's Counterclaim; and therefore, this

Answering Counter-defendant reserves the right to amend this Answer to allege additional affirmative defenses.

this answering Plaintiff/Counter-defendant, WHEREFORE, DESERT VALLEY CONTRACTING, INC. prays as follows:

- That Defendant/Counterclaimant, EUGENE INOSE takes nothing by reason of the I. Counterclaim on file herein;
- That the Defendant/Counterclaimant, EUGENE INOSE'S Counterclaim be dismissed 2. with prejudice as against this answering Counter-defendant;
- 3. That this answering Plaintiff/Counter-defendant, DESERT VALLEY CONTRACTING, INC. recovers costs and reasonable attorneys' fees incurred herein; and
- For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper under the circumstances.

DATED this day of July, 2016.

HURTIK LAW & ASSOCIATES

CARRIE E. HURTIK, ESO. Nevada Bar No. 7028

7866 W. Sahara Avenue

Las Vegas, Nevada 89117

(702) 966-5200 Telephone (702) 966-5206 Facsimile

churtik@hurtiklaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counter-defendant, DESERT VALLEY CONTRACTING, INC.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

STATE OF NEVADA) ss.
COUNTY OF CLARK)

I, RACHEL L. SHELSTAD, declare:

I am a resident of and employed in Clark County, Nevada. I am over the age of eighteen (18) years and not a party to the within action. My business address is 7866 West Sahara Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada 89117.

Pursuant to N.R.C.P 5(b) and EDCR 7.26, I hereby certify that on 8th day of July, 2016, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing document described as PLAINTIFF/COUNTER-

DEFENDANT, DESERT VALLEY CONTRACTING, INC.'S ANSWER TO

DEFENDANT/COUNTERCLAIMANT, EUGENE INOSE'S COUNTERCLAIM the parties listed below:

M

BRIAN W. BOSCHEE, ESQ.
WILLIAM N. MILLER, ESQ.
HOLLEY, DRIGGS, WALCH
FINE, WRAY, PUZEY & THOMPSON
400 South Fourth Street, Third Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Attorneys for Defendants

- VIA U.S. MAIL: by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Las Vegas, Nevada. I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence by mailing. Under that practice, it would be deposited with the U.S. postal service on that same day with postage fully prepaid at Las Vegas, Nevada in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing an affidavit.
 - VIA ELECTRONIC SERVICE: by transmitting via electronic service maintained by court's electronic filing system, on whom it is served at the electronic service address as last given by that person on any e-document which he/she has filed in the action and served on the party making the service. The copy of the document served by electronic service bears a notation of the date and time of transmission and the electronic mail address to which transmitted. A confirmation of the electronic service containing the electronic mail addresses to which the e-document(s) was/were transmitted will be maintained with the e-document(s) served.

Plaintiff/Counter-defendant, DVC'S Answer to Defendant/Counterclaimant, EUGENE INOSE'S Counterclaim - 17

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed at Las Vegas, Nevada on July **3**, 2016.



RACHEL SHELSTAD, an employee of HURTIK LAW & ASSOCIATES

EXHIBIT 4

Electronically Filed 08/04/2016 10:33:15 AM

1 ANCS BRIAN W. BOSCHEE, ESQ. (NBN 7612) 2 E-mail: bboschee@nevadafirm.com WILLIAM N. MILLER, ESQ. (NBN 11658) E-mail: wmiller@nevadafirm.com 3 HOLLEY, DRIGGS, WALCH, FINE, WRAY, PUZEY & THOMPSON 4 400 South Fourth Street, Third Floor 5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Telephone: 702/791-0308 6 Facsimile: 702/791-1912 Attorneys for Defendants 7 8 9 DESERT VALLEY CONTRACTING, INC. a 10 Nevada corporation, 11 Plaintiff, 12 13 IN-LO PROPERTIES, a Nevada limited liability company; EUGENE INOSE, an individual; 14 15 Defendants. 16 EUGENE INOSE, an individual; 17

CLERK OF THE COURT

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Case No .: A-16-734351-C Dept. No .: XV

> DEFENDANT IN-LO PROPERTIES' ANSWER TO COMPLAINT

JEFFREY LOUIE, an individual; DOES 1 through 10; and ROE ENTITIES 1 through 10,

Counterclaimant.

DESERT VALLEY CONTRACTING, INC., a Nevada corporation; DOES I through X, inclusive, and ROE CORPORATIONS I through X, inclusive,

Counterdefendants.

Defendant IN-LO PROPERTIES ("IN-LO Properties"), by and through its attorneys of record, the law firm of Holley, Driggs, Walch, Fine, Wray, Puzey & Thompson, hereby responds to, admits, denies, and answers the allegations of Plaintiff/Counterdefendant DESERT VALLEY CONTRACTING, INC.'s as follows:

28

FINE-WRAY-PUZEY-THOMPSON

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

HOLLEY-DRIGGS-WALCH

11218-00/1736297.doc

HOLLEY-DRIGGS-WALCH FINE-WRAY-PUZEY-THOMPSON

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

PARTIES

- Answering Paragraph 1 of Desert Valley's Complaint (the "Complaint"), IN-LO
 Properties admits that Desert Valley is a Nevada corporation. IN-LO Properties is without
 sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations
 in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 2 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties admits the allegations contained in this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 3 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- 4. Answering Paragraph 4 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties admits that Eugene Inose ("Inose") was a registered manager of it. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- 5. Answering Paragraph 5 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties admits that JEFFREY LOUIE ("Louie") was a registered manager of it. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 6 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.
- 7. Answering Paragraph 7 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.

JURISDICTION

8. Answering Paragraph 8 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.

-2-

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

- 9. Answering Paragraph 9 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- 10. Answering Paragraph 10 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 11. Answering Paragraph 11 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties admits that it purchased the Subject Property in 2005 but is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- 12. Answering Paragraph 12 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- 13. Answering Paragraph 13 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. Notwithstanding that, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- 14. Answering Paragraph 14 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. Notwithstanding that, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- 15. Answering Paragraph 15 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 16 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the
 Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient

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

- Answering Paragraph 17 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 18 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the 18. Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- 19. Answering Paragraph 19 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- 20. Answering Paragraph 20 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 21 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 22 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.

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

- Answering Paragraph 24 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient 24. knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- 25. Answering Paragraph 25 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 26 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient 26. knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- 27. Answering Paragraph 27 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 28 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 29 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 30 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 31 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 32 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.

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

Answering Paragraph 33 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties denies the 33. allegations contained in this paragraph.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Breach of Contract against Defendant EUGENE INOSE)

- Answering Paragraph 34 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties adopts, repeats, and realleges its responses to the prior allegations and the preceding paragraphs in the Answer as though fully set forth herein.
- 35. Answering Paragraph 35 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 36 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the 36. Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. Notwithstanding that, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- 37. Answering Paragraph 37 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. Notwithstanding that, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 38 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the 38. Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- 39. Answering Paragraph 39 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.

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

Answering Paragraph 40 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.

- 41. Answering Paragraph 41 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- 42. Answering Paragraph 42 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- 43. Answering Paragraph 43 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 44 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 45 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 46 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient 46. knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.

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

- Answering Paragraph 48 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient 48. knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 49 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient 49. knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 50 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient 50. knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- 51. Answering Paragraph 51 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 52 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- 53. Answering Paragraph 53 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 54 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties denies the 54. allegations contained in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 55 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties denies the 55. allegations contained in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 56 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.

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

Answering Paragraph 57 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient 57. knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Breach of the Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing against Defendant **EUGENE INOSE)**

- Answering Paragraph 58 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties adopts, repeats, and 58. realleges its responses to the prior allegations and the preceding paragraphs in the Answer as though fully set forth herein.
- Answering Paragraph 59 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the 59. allegations contained therein are legal conclusions. Notwithstanding this however, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore deny the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 60 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient 60. knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 61 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient 61. knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 62 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the 62. allegations contained therein are legal conclusions. Notwithstanding this however, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore deny the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 63 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient 63. knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.

-9-

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

- 64. Answering Paragraph 64 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 65 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 66 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient 66. knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 67 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient 67. knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Unjust Enrichment against Defendant IN-LO PROPERTIES)

- 68. Answering Paragraph 68 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties adopts, repeats, and realleges its responses to the prior allegations and the preceding paragraphs in the Answer as though fully set forth herein.
- Answering Paragraph 69 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties admits the allegations contained in this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 70 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 71 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties admits that Inose was a registered manager of it. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 72 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties admits that Louie was a registered manager of it. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information

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

- Answering Paragraph 73 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 74 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the 74. allegations contained therein are legal conclusions. Notwithstanding this however, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore deny the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 75 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the 75. allegations contained therein are legal conclusions. Notwithstanding this however, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore deny the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 76 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the allegations contained therein are legal conclusions. Notwithstanding this however, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore deny the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 77 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 78 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. Notwithstanding that, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 79 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. Notwithstanding that, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.

FINE-WRAY-PUZEY-THOMPSON HOLLEY-DRIGGS-WALCH

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

- 81. Answering Paragraph 81 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 82 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the 82. Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 83 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 84 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 85 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 86 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.

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

- Answering Paragraph 87 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 88 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 89 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 90 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient 90. knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 91 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient 91. knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 92 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 93 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 94 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 95 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient 95. knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.

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

97. Answering Paragraph 97 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.

Answering Paragraph 98 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties denies the 98. allegations contained in this paragraph.

Answering Paragraph 99 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient 99. knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Intentional Interference with Contract against Defendants EUGENE INOSE and IN-LO PROPERTIES)

Answering Paragraph 100 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties adopts, repeats, 100. and realleges its responses to the prior allegations and the preceding paragraphs in the Answer as though fully set forth herein.

Answering Paragraph 101 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.

Answering Paragraph 102 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without 102. sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.

Answering Paragraph 103 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.

Answering Paragraph 104 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.

105. Answering Paragraph 105 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.

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

- Answering Paragraph 107 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 108 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.
- 109. Answering Paragraph 109 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.
- 110. Answering Paragraph 110 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties the allegations contained in this paragraph.
- 111. Answering Paragraph 111 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties the allegations contained in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 112 of the Complaint, IN-LO Properties the allegations contained in this paragraph.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

IN-LO Properties asserts and alleges the following non-exclusive list of defenses to this action. These defenses have been labeled as "Affirmative" defenses regardless of whether, as a matter of law, such defenses are truly affirmative defenses. Such designation should in no way be construed to constitute a concession on the part of IN-LO Properties that its bears the burden of proof to establish such defenses.

- 1. IN-LO Properties denies each and every allegation of the Complaint not specifically admitted or otherwise pled to herein.
- 2. The Complaint fails to state a claim against IN-LO Properties upon which relief can be granted.
- 3. At all times relevant to the allegations contained in the Complaint, IN-LO Properties acted with due care, circumspection, and good faith in the performance of any and all duties imposed on him, if any.

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

4.	Desert Valley's claims ar	e barred by the	doctrine of equitable estoppe
----	---------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------------

- 5. Desert Valley's claims are barred by the doctrine of equitable rescission.
- Desert Valley's claims are barred because it did not incur any injury or damages 6. cognizable at law.
 - Desert Valley, by its own acts and conduct, waived its rights to assert any claim. 7.
- 8. Desert Valley is barred from obtaining any relief from any claim by operation of the doctrine of unclean hands.
 - 9. Desert Valley claims are barred by the doctrine of laches.
- 10. Each and every action contained in the Complaint is barred by Desert Valley's breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing.
- 11. Desert Valley breached or failed to perform any agreement alleged in the Complaint and is therefore not entitled to any relief under any agreement.
- 12. Damages and injuries suffered by Desert Valley, if any, are not attributable to any act, conduct, or omission on the part of IN-LO Properties.
 - The conduct of the IN-LO Properties was privileged. 13.
- 14. IN-LO Properties performed on his part, each and every term and condition owed by him, if any, to Desert Valley.
- Desert Valley's alleged damages, if any, should be offset by monies due and owing by Desert Valley to IN-LO Properties.
- 16. Because of Desert Valley's breach of the agreement, Inose had to hire replacement subcontractors to complete/correct Desert Valley's work on the subject property.
 - 17. Desert Valley has pleaded mutually exclusive claims.
- 18. The conduct of IN-LO Properties alleged to be wrongful was induced by Desert Valley's own wrongful conduct.
- By virtue of the acts, conduct, mismanagement and/or omissions to act of the Desert Valley under the circumstances, IN-LO Properties is released, excused, and discharged from any liability whatsoever to Desert Valley, which liability is expressly denied.

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

- 22. Desert Valley is barred from obtaining any relief from any claim by operating of the doctrine of accord and satisfaction.
- Desert Valley's claims for relief are barred on the grounds that IN-LO Properties 23. has a valid justification for any alleged nonperformance of any alleged agreement.
- Any damages which Desert Valley may have sustained by reason of the allegations of the Complaint were proximately caused, in whole or in part, by sets of persons other than IN-LO Properties and, therefore, Desert Valley is not entitled to any relief from IN-LO Properties.
- 25. To the extent Desert Valley's claims are based in whole or in part on alleged oral promises or statements, such claims are barred by the lack of acceptance, lack of mutuality, failure of consideration, and/or the statute of frauds.
- 26. Desert Valley ratified, approved, or acquiesced in the actions of IN-LO Properties.
- 27. Desert Valley has failed to mitigate its damages, if any exist or were incurred, the existence of which is expressly denied by IN-LO Properties.
- Desert Valley's claims for relief are barred on the grounds that any assent to any alleged contract was obtained by Desert Valley's misrepresentations, concealment, circumvention, and unfair practices.
- 29. Desert Valley materially breached any agreement between the parties, thereby excusing the future performance thereof by IN-LO Properties.
- Desert Valley brings its claims in bad faith, with an ulterior motive to harass IN-LO Properties, abuse the litigation process, and otherwise raise frivolous and unfounded claims against IN-LO Properties causing IN-LO Properties to incur damages.
 - Desert Valley has acted in bad faith in his dealings with IN-LO Properties.

HOLLEY-DRIGGS-WALCH FINE-WRAY-PUZEY-THOMPSON

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



- 32. Desert Valley's claims are barred by the economic loss doctrine.
- Desert Valley's claims are barred by the statute of limitations.
- 34. IN-LO Properties hereby incorporates by reference those affirmative defenses enumerated in NRCP 8 as though fully set forth herein. Such defenses are herein incorporated by reference for the specific purpose of not waiving the same.
- 35. It has been necessary for IN-LO Properties to employ the services of an attorney to defend this Complaint and reasonable sums should be allowed as and for attorneys' fees, together with the costs expended in this action.
- 36. Pursuant to the provisions of NRCP 11, at the time of the filing of this Answer, all possible affirmative defenses may not have been alleged inasmuch as insufficient facts and relevant information may not have been available after reasonable inquiry. Therefore, IN-LO Properties reserves the right to amend this Answer to allege additional affirmative defenses if subsequent investigation so warrants.

WHEREFORE, IN-LO Properties prays for the following relief:

- That Desert Valley takes nothing by way of the Complaint and that the same be dismissed with prejudice;
- That IN-LO Properties be awarded all costs and expenses, including reasonable attorneys' fees, incurred by IN-LO Properties in connection with this action; and
 - For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.
 Dated this 4 day of August, 2016.

HOLLEY, DRIGGS, WALCH, FINE, WRAY, PUZEY & THOMPSON

BRIAN W. BOSCHEE, ESQ. (NBN 7612) WILLIAM N. MILLER, ESQ. (NBN 11658) 400 South Fourth Street, Third Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Attorneys for Defendants

11218-00/1736297 doc

-18 -

INT000083

FINE-WRAY-PUZEY-THOMPSON

HOLLEY-DRIGGS-WALCH

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing **DEFENDANT IN-LO PROPERTIES'**ANSWER TO COMPLAINT, was submitted electronically for filing and/or service with the Eighth Judicial District Court on the day of August, 2016. Electronic service of the foregoing document shall be made in accordance with the E-Service List as follows:

Carrie E. Hurtik, Esq.
Rachel L. Shelstad, Esq.
HURTIK LAW & ASSOCIATES
7866 West Sahara Avenue
Las Vegas, NV 89117
Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counterdefendant

An employee of Holley, Driggs, Walch, Fine, Wray, Puzey & Thompson

- 19 -

EXHIBIT 5

Electronically Filed 2/10/2020 3:37 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

RTRAN 1 2 3 4 5 DISTRICT COURT 6 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 7 DESERT VALLEY CONTRACTING, CASE#: A-16-734351-C 8 INC., DEPT. XV 9 Plaintiff, 10 VS. IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, 11 12 Defendant. 13 BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOSEPH HARDY 14 DISTRICT COURT JUDGE MONDAY, APRIL 8, 2019 15 RECORDER'S TRANSCRIPT OF BENCH TRIAL - DAY 1 16 17 APPEARANCES: 18 For the Plaintiff: CARRIE E. HURTIK, ESQ. 19 JONATHAN PATTERSON, ESQ. 20 For the Defendant: BRIAN W. BOSCHEE, ESQ. SEAN E. STORY, ESQ. 21 22 23 24 RECORDED BY: MATTHEW YARBROUGH, COURT RECORDER 25

INDEX

	INDEX
2	
3	Bench Trial3
4	Testimony6
5	
6	WITNESSES FOR THE PLAINTIFF
7	EUGENE INOSE
8	Direct Examination by Ms. Hurtik 6
9	
10	WITNESSES FOR THE DEFENDANT
11	None
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
In	

	II .
1	Las Vegas, Nevada, Monday, April 8, 2019
2	
3	[Case called at 1:15 p.m.]
4	THE CLERK: LO Properties, LLC.
5	THE COURT: Go ahead and state your appearances.
6	MS. HURTIK: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Carrie Hurtik on
7	behalf of Desert Valley Contracting.
8	MR. PATTERSON: Good morning, Your Honor. Jonathan
9	Patterson on behalf of Desert Valley Contracting.
10	THE COURT: Good morning.
11	MR. BOSCHEE: Good morning, Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: Wait. Good afternoon.
13	MR. BOSCHEE: Good afternoon, yeah. Brian Boschee, Sean
14	Story on behalf of the Defendants.
15	THE COURT: Okay.
16	MR. BOSCHEE: And Mr. Inose is here as well.
17	THE COURT: Okay, Good afternoon, Have a seat.
18	MR. BOSCHEE: Well, probably make that mistake more often
19	as the afternoon goes on saying good morning.
20	THE COURT: Yeah.
21	MS. HURTIK: Yeah.
22	THE COURT: So on the exhibits, do we have agreement as to
23	any or all that are admitted?
24	MR. BOSCHEE: All of them.
25	MS. HURTIK: All of them.

THE COURT: Oh, good. I think you probably told me that actually, so all exhibits by Plaintiff and Defendant all admitted. Okay. Easy.

And I did review Defendant's trial brief and the Plaintiff's proposed findings of fact, and the joint pretrial, so on bench trials, you know, if either side wants to give me a, what I call, brief synopsis, that's fine, or if you just want to dive right into the evidence, that's fine too.

MS. HURTIK: I think we talked, Your Honor, and we'd like to just dive right in.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BOSCHEE: And first, and just to clarify, I want to make sure that you've got everything from both sides. We emailed over proposed findings and conclusions, as well, and we submitted a trial brief, so if you did not get our proposed findings and conclusions, then someone needs to re-email them to you.

THE COURT: No. We probably did, but I only saw the -- this is Plaintiff's and this is Defendant's trial brief.

MR. BOSCHEE: Well, anyway, I guess those -- at this stage of the afternoon, it doesn't matter --

THE COURT: I mean, I know what --

MR. BOSCHEE: -- but if you did not receive our proposed findings last week, let us know, and we'll re-email.

THE COURT: I'm thinking we did.

MR. BOSCHEE: Okay.

MS. HURTIK: And we kind of discussed about maybe a way

1	to shortcut everything. That we would put on I would call my
2	witnesses and Mr. Boschee would cross and then question at the same
3	time afterwards.
4	THE COURT: And not limit the scope.
5	MS. HURTIK: Yeah.
6	MR. BOSCHEE: We're going to expand the scope so we can
7	just call the witnesses once and then get through this as quickly and
8	efficiently as possible because I know that Your Honor thought Your
9	Honor would appreciate that and I know
10	THE COURT: Yes.
11	MR. BOSCHEE: the witnesses will certainly appreciate that
12	so.
13	THE COURT: Very much so. Yeah no, that sounds good.
14	Anything else?
15	MS. HURTIK: We may have to take some people out of orde
16	tomorrow because we have some people with some constraints.
17	THE COURT: Okay.
18	MR. BOSCHEE: And some subpoenas out that we have to
19	kind of accommodate and flights, and things like that, so
20	THE COURT: Okay.
21	MR. BOSCHEE: we'll just kind of play by ear. We'll see
22	how far we get today and then we'll just figure it out tomorrow with this
23	being witnesses. And then yeah, I think that's it.
24	Yeah, we're both waiving the opening so just
25	MS. HURTIK: Right.

1	THE COURT: Okay.	
2	MR. BOSCHEE: jumping in.	
3	THE COURT: Sounds good. So who are you are calling first	
4	then?	
5	MS. HURTIK: We'll call Mr. Inose.	
6	THE COURT: Okay.	
7	THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand.	
8	EUGENE INOSE, PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS, SWORN	
9	THE CLERK: For the record, please state and spell your first	
10	and last name.	
11	THE WITNESS: First name is Eugene, E-U-G-E-N-E, last	
12	name is Inose, that's I-N-O-S-E.	
13	THE CLERK: Thank you.	
14	THE MARSHAL: You can go ahead and take a seat.	
15	THE WITNESS: Thank you.	
16	DIRECT EXAMINATION	
17	BY MS. HURTIK:	
18	Q Okay. Good afternoon, Mr. Inose.	
19	A Good afternoon.	
20	Q So we're here today regarding claims regarding your house	
21	at 587 St. Croix in Henderson, Nevada. I want to go through a little bit of	
22	your background for the Court. How long have you when did you first	
23	purchase the house in Henderson on St. Croix?	
24	A You mean when did I purchase the land?	
25	Q Uh-huh.	

1.	А	I don't recall the exact date or the year, but it was probably in
2	2005 I'm	guessing.
3	Q	And that was when you first purchased the land to build a
4	house on	it?
5	A	That is correct. Approximately.
6	Q	Approximately. And when did you start building the house?
7	A	Probably in sometime in 2006.
8	a	2006. And at that time, did you have a general contractor?
9	A	I did.
10	Q	Okay. And did your general contractor proceed through the
11	entire bui	ld of the house?
12	А	No, they did not.
13	Q	Okay. And can you when you first built the house, what
14	was the e	nd price of what you paid to build house?
15	А	I do not know that right now.
16	Q	Okay. Would we say it's a couple of million dollar house,
17	correct?	
18	А	It's probably more than that.
19	Q	Right. So at the time that you did you terminate the first
20	general co	ontractor when you first built the house?
21	A	That is correct.
22	0	Okay. And would you say that you had approximately were
23	\$2 million	into the build at that time when you terminated him?
24	A	Approximately, yes.
25	Q	Okay. So the house was worth significantly more than half a

1	million?	
2	А	Than half a million dollars?
3	٥	Than 500 million.
4		MR. BOSCHEE: Five-hundred-thousand?
5	BY MS. H	URTIK:
6	Q	Five-hundred-thousand.
7	A	I'm sorry.
8	۵	Sorry.
9	А	I was, like
10		THE COURT: So start that one over
11		MS. HURTIK: Start that one over.
12		THE COURT: so I can yeah.
13	BY MS. H	URTIK:
14	Q	So does that kind of refresh what kind of just give me a
15	ballpark o	f what the house cost? You don't have to be exact.
16	А	Maybe around four million.
17	Q	Okay.
18	А	Three and a half.
19	٥	Okay.
20	А	I I I'm really not sure.
21	Q	Okay. So when you let the general contractor go, did you
22	then hire	another general contractor?
23	A	No, I did not hire another general contractor.
24	Q	Okay. So how did you proceed? Was it an owner build?
25	А	It was I proceeded as an owner build, correct?

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

DESERT VALLEY CONTRACTING, INC. a Nevada corporation,

Appellant,

VS.

IN-LO PROPERTIES, a Nevada limited liability company; EUGENE INOSE, an individual; JEFFREY LOUIE, an individual; DOES 1 through 10; and ROE ENTITIES 1 through 10,

Respondents,

CASE NO. 83338

JOINT INDEX The Toler of Supreme Court

JOINT INDEX The Toler of Supreme Court

JOINT INDEX The Toler of Supreme Court

VOLUME 1

Attorneys for Respondent:
Brian W. Boschee, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 7612
HOLLEY DRIGGS, WALCH, FINE, WRAY,
PUZEY & THOMPSON
Third Floor, 400 S 4th St,
Las Vegas, NV 89101
(702) 791-0308
Email: bboschee@nevadafirm.com

12.	Exhibit 560-Contract Between In-Lo and	N/A	JNT001137-
	Desert Valley Contracting 8.14.2021		JNT001138
13.	Exhibit 274 DVC Job Cost and Billing	N/A	JNT001139-
	Detail Report 4.25.2017		JNT001160
14.	Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law	9.3.20219	JNT001161-
	9.3.2019		JNT001179
15.	Notice of Entry of Order of Findings of	9.4.2019	JNT001180-
	Fact and Conclusions of Law 9.3.2019		JNT001201
16.	Notice of Appeal	9.30.2021	JNT001202-
			JNT001204
17.	Supreme Court Order of Reversal and	3.3.2021	JNT001205-
	Remand		JNT0012010
18.	Amended Order of Findings of Fact and	7.1.2021	JNT001211-
	Conclusions of Law Following Remand 7.1.2021		JNT001217
19.	Notice of Entry of Amended Order of	7.6.2021	JNT001218
	Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law Following Remand 7.6.2021		JNT001227
20.	Notice of Appeal 8.05.2021	8.05.2021	JNT001228
			JNT001230
21.	Amended Judgment Against Desert	9.13,2021	JNT001231-
	Valley Contracting		JNT001232

APPENDIX INDEX

#	Document	File Stamp Date	Pages
	Volume I		
1.	Complaint by Desert Valley Contracting 3.31.2016	3.31.2016	JNT000001- JNT000019
2.	Eugene Inose's Answer to Complaint and Counterclaim 6.07.2016	6.07.2016	JNT000020- JNT000047
3.	Desert Valley Contracting's Answer to Eugene Inose's Counterclaim 7.08.2016	7.08.2016	JNT000048- JNT000065
4.	Defendant In-Lo Properties' Answer to Complaint 8.04.2016	8.04.2016	JNT000066- JNT000084
5.	Bench Trial Transcript Day One 4.8.2019	2.10.2020	JNT000084- JNT000208
	Volume II		
6.	Bench Trial Transcript Day Two 4.9.2019	2.10.2020	JNT000209- JNT000345
	Volume III		b man
7.	Bench Trial Transcript Day Three 4.10.2019	2.10.2020	JNT000346- JNT000527
	Volume IV		
8.	Bench Trial Transcript Day Four 4.11.2019	2.10.2020	JNT000528- JNT000660
	Volume V		
9.	Bench Trial Transcript Day Five 6.19.2019	2.10.2020	JNT000661- JNT000843
10.	Volume VI		
	Bench Trial Transcript Day Six 6.20.2019	2.10.2020	JNT000844- JNT001019
	Volume VII		
11.	Bench Trial Transcript Day Seven 6.21.2019	2.10.20	JNT001020- JNT001136

EXHIBIT 1

A-16-734351-C

DISTRICT COURT CIVIL COVER SHEET

County, Nevada

XV

Case No.

I. Party Information (provide both he Plaintiff(s) (name/address/phone):		Defendant(s) (name/address/phone):	
Desert Valley Con	tracting, Inc.	IN-LO Properties LLC, Eugene Inose, Jeffrey Louie	
3395 West Cheyenn		587 Saint Croix Street	
North Las Vegas, N		Henderson, Nevada 89012	
(702) 633-		THE TOTAL COURT	
Attorney (name/address/phone):		Attorney (name/address/phone):	
Carrie E. Hur	tik. Esa.	N/A	
7866 West Saha		IVA	
Las Vegas, Nev	The latest and the la		
(702) 966-			
II. Nature of Controversy (please s Civil Case Filing Types	elect the one most applicable filing type	z below)	
Real Property		Torts	
Landford/Tenant	Negligence	Other Torts	
Unlawful Detainer	Auto	Product Liability	
Other Landlord/Tenant	Premises Liability	Intentional Misconduct	
Title to Property	Other Negligence	Employment Tort	
Judicial Foreclosure	Malpractice	Insurance Tort	
Other Title to Property	Medical/Dental	Other Tort	
Other Real Property	Legal	Liother 1011	
Condemnation/Eminent Domain	Accounting		
Other Real Property	=		
Probate	Other Malpractice		
Probate (select case type and estate value)	Construction Defect & Cont. Construction Defect	ract Judicial Review/Appeal Judicial Review	
Summary Administration	Chapter 40	Foreclosure Mediation Case	
General Administration			
Special Administration	Other Construction Defect Contract Case	Petition to Seal Records	
Set Aside		Mental Competency	
	Uniform Commercial Code	Nevada State Agency Appeal	
Trust/Conservatorship	Building and Construction	Department of Motor Vehicle	
Other Probate	Insurance Carrier	Worker's Compensation	
Estate Value	Commercial Instrument	Other Nevada State Agency	
Over \$200,000	Collection of Accounts	Appeal Other	
Between \$100,000 and \$200,000	Employment Contract	Appeal from Lower Court	
Under \$100,000 or Unknown	Other Contract	Other Judicial Review/Appeal	
Under \$2,500			
Civil Writ		Other Civil Filing	
Civil Writ		Other Civil Filing	
Writ of Habeas Corpus Writ of Prohibition		Compromise of Minor's Claim	
Writ of Mandamus Other Civil Writ		Foreign Judgment	
Writ of Quo Warrant		Other Civil Matters	
Business Ce	ourt filings should be filed using the	Business Court civil coversheet.	
03/30/2016		1	
Date		Signature of initiating party or representative	

See other side for family-related case filings.

Electronically Filed 03/31/2016 04:57:47 PM

Steen & Chum

CLERK OF THE COURT

COMP
CARRIE E. HURTIK, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 7028
RACHEL L. SHELSTAD, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 13399
HURTIK LAW & ASSOCIATES
7866 West Sahara Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89117
(702) 966-5200 Telephone
(702) 966-5206 Facsimile
churtik@hurtiklaw.com
rshelstad@hurtiklaw.com
Attorney for Plaintiff,

DESERT VALLEY CONTRACTING, INC.

EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

DESERT VALLEY CONTRACTING, INC., a Nevada Corporation,

Plaintiff,

VS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, a Nevada Limited Liability Company, EUGENE INOSE, an Individual, and JEFFREY LOUIE, an Individual, DOES 1 through 10; and ROE ENTITIES 1 through 10,

Defendant(s).

CASE NO. A- 16-734351- C DEPT NO.

XV

COMPLAINT

Arbitration Exemption Claimed - Involves an Amount in Excess of \$50,000.00

COMES NOW, Plaintiff, DESERT VALLEY CONTRACTING, INC. (hereinafter "DVC"), an individual, by and through its attorneys of record CARRIE E. HURTIK, ESQ., and RACHEL L. SHELSTAD, ESQ., and for its causes of action against Defendants, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, EUGENE INOSE, JEFFREY LOUIE, DOES 1 through 10; and ROE ENTITIES 1 through 10, inclusive, hereby files its Complaint and complains, alleges, avers and states as follows:

25 ///

27 ///

I

4

7

10

13

16

17

. 18 19

2021

22

23 24

252627

28

PARTIES

- Plaintiff, DESERT VALLEY CONTRACTING, INC., was and is at all times relevant
 a Nevada Corporation, duly authorized and qualified to do business in the State of Nevada, as a
 contractor holding a Nevada State Contractor's license, which license is in good standing.
- 2. Upon information and belief, Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, is a Nevada Limited-Liability Company, duly authorized and qualified to do business in the State of Nevada since on or about November 5, 2004. The Registered Agent on file for Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, is Eugene Inose, and is located at 587 Saint Croix Street, Henderson, Nevada 89012.
- 3. During all relevant times herein, Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, either directly or indirectly through its agents, employees, subsidiaries and/or related companies held, serviced and/or engaged in transactions related to real property within the State of Nevada.
- Upon information and belief, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE is a resident of Clark County, State of Nevada, and during all relevant times herein was a registered manager of Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC.
- Upon information and belief, Defendant, JEFFREY LOUIE is a resident of Clark County, State of Nevada; and during all relevant times herein was a registered manager of Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC.
- During all relevant times herein, Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, either
 directly or indirectly through its agents, employees, subsidiaries and/or related companies held,
 serviced and/or engaged in transactions related to real property within the State of Nevada.
- 7. That the true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, partnership, associate or otherwise, of defendant DOES 1 through 10 and ROE Entities 1 through 10, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore, sue said defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the defendants designated herein as DOE and ROE is responsible in some manner for the events and happenings referred to herein, and as a result proximately caused damages to Plaintiff as herein alleged. That Plaintiff will ask leave of this court

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

to amend this Complaint to insert the true names and capacities of DOES 1 through 10 and ROE Corporations or Business Entities 1 through 10, inclusive, when the same have been ascertained, and to join such defendants in this action.

II.

JURISDICTION

- 8. The amount of controversy is in excess of Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$10,000.00), plus prejudgment interest and costs of suit.
- The occurrences complained of herein transpired in the State of Nevada, County of Clark. The events that give rise to this Complaint occurred in the State of Nevada, County of Clark.
- Venue is proper in the State of Nevada, Clark County, as the occurrences at issue in this lawsuit occurred there, the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred there and Plaintiff's damages were suffered there.

III.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- On or about November 8, 2005, Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, purchased the residential home located at 587 Saint Croix Street, Henderson, Nevada 89012 (APN: 178-27-114-001) (hereinafter "Subject Property").
- During all relevant times herein, Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, either 12: directly or indirectly through its agents, including Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, employees, subsidiaries and/or related companies held, serviced and/or engaged in transactions related to real property within the State of Nevada.
- On August 8, 2014, Plaintiff, DVC, and Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, executed a 13. valid Work Authorization and Contract for Plaintiff, DVC to perform a scope of work as provided by approved estimates (hereinafter "Contract"). Specifically, the Contract provides that Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, the undersigned (insured):

Represents that he/she/they are collectively or individually agents for the hereinafter specified property (and/or it contents) and hereby authorize and direct Desert Valley Contracting, Inc. (Contractor) to provide all labor, equipment and materials required to properly repair the specified real property or structure common known as [Subject Property.]

- 14. Pursuant to the Contract, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE authorized and transferred and assigned and conveyed to Plaintiff DVC, his right, title and interest in and to the insurance policy proceeds and all drafts for work performed by Plaintiff, DVC.
- 15. Pursuant to the Contract, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE authorized the applicable insurer to pay Plaintiff, DVC for work performed on the property and agreed to endorse and tender all drafts as produced to the Plaintiff, DVC.
- 16. Pursuant to the Contract, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE if either party terminates the Contract prior to completion, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE is to pay Plaintiff, DVC, prior to the actual work beginning and all costs and fees associated with preparation for beginning the job, such as estimates, permits, materials ordered, or any and all such fees and costs for services performed.
- 17. Pursuant to the Contract, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE is responsible for any and all fees and costs associated with the work performed, plus the profit that Plaintiff, DVC would have made on the job had Defendant, EUGENE INOSE not repudiated the contract.
- 18. Pursuant to the Contract, upon termination of the Plaintiff, DVC'S services, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE is responsible to pay all fees and costs incurred by Plaintiff, DVC, within five (5) business days of termination by either party.
- 19. Pursuant to the Contract, if any requests for additional work to be performed were made during the scope of the job, all such requests were required to be put in writing so that these costs will be added to the Scope of work.
- 20. Pursuant to the Contract, if the scope of the work is beyond any insurance claim, the owner, agent or authorized party, including Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, agreed to pay all claims within ten (10) days of completion of work, and agreed to pay for any materials prior to the additional work being performed.
- Pursuant to the Contract, all insurance work performed by Plaintiff, DVC was subject to approval of the terms of the Defendant, EUGENE INOSE'S policy of insurance.
- Pursuant to the Contract, any code-upgrade work or upgrades to the Subject Property were not covered pursuant to the applicable insurance policy.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- During performance of valid Contract, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE chose to have 23. several upgrades in materials and work added onto the Contract's scope of work, which increased the original Contract's scope of work.
- All subcontractors were selected at the direction of Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, 24. who insisted that he have the original subcontractors that built the home.
- Defendant, EUGENE INOSE dictated who the superintendent would be for the 25. jobsite.
- The superintendent was paid over One Hundred Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents 26. (\$100,000.00), and during the performance of the Contract the superintendent quit coming to the jobsite.
- 27. The main subcontractors who have performed work on the Subject Property are as follows, without limitation: Diversified Protections Systems, Inc.; Desert Home Electric, Inc.; Sunrise Service, Inc.; Plumbing S.S. Inc; ARX LLC dba ARX Engineering; Ferguson; Firehouse Electric; Artesia Kitchen & Bath; Creative Closets & Cabinetry LLC; Diva Interior Concepts LLC; Eagle Sentry; Summit Tile & Stone LLC; Flooring Encounters, LLC; Walker & Zanger, Inc.; Latin Glass; HY-BAR Las Vegas; Picture Perfect TV Repair; Eazy Lift Elevators; and Custom Landau.
- Plaintiff, DVC paid all of its subcontractors for work performed, but the additional 28. change orders made by Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, were significant and materials for certain trades needed to be ordered and paid for in advance.
- Defendant, EUGENE INOSE settled out the claim with the insurance company and 29. contrary to the contractual terms of the Contract, had all funds paid directly to him which was contrary to the terms of the Contract.
- 30. As you may know, most of these type of claims have the insurer remain in the matter until the project is complete in case any contingencies, so that the funds if covered would be made available for contingencies that were unknown or not discovered initially.
- Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, individually and as a manager of Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, is responsible for the upgrades and change orders that he caused to happen on

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

this Subject Property, due to his choices and changing his mind in several instances as to what products were to be installed.

- Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, individually and as a manager of Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, has failed to pay Plaintiff, DVC the monies owed and due for the upgrades and change orders of the Subject Property.
- On or about December of 2015, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, individually and as a manager of Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, breached his duties, obligations, and responsibilities under the Contract by denying Plaintiff, DVC's ability to complete the terms and conditions Contract, and by precluding Plaintiff, DVC from gaining access to the Subject Property, and by failing to pay Plaintiff, DVC the monies owed and due for the upgrades and change orders of the Subject Property.

IV.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Breach of Contract against Defendant, EUGENE INOSE)

- 34. Plaintiff, DVC hereby repeats, re-alleges and incorporates by this reference each and every allegation set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 33 above, as though fully set forth herein.
- During all relevant times herein, Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, either 35. directly or indirectly through its agents, including Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, employees, subsidiaries and/or related companies held, serviced and/or engaged in transactions related to real property within the State of Nevada.
- On August 8, 2014, Plaintiff, DVC, and Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, executed a valid Work Authorization and Contract for Plaintiff, DVC to perform a scope of work as provided by approved estimates (hereinafter "Contract"). Specifically, the Contract provides that Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, the undersigned (insured):

Represents that he/she/they are collectively or individually agents for the hereinafter specified property (and/or it contents) and hereby authorize and direct Desert Valley Contracting, Inc. (Contractor) to provide all labor, equipment and materials required to properly repair the specified real property or structure common known as [Subject Property.]

27

28

1

- Pursuant to the Contract, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE authorized and transferred and 37. assigned and conveyed to Plaintiff DVC, his right, title and interest in and to the insurance policy proceeds and all drafts for work performed by Plaintiff, DVC.
- Pursuant to the Contract, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE authorized the applicable insurer to pay Plaintiff, DVC for work performed on the property and agreed to endorse and tender all drafts as produced to the Plaintiff, DVC.
- Pursuant to the Contract, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE if either party terminates the 39. Contract prior to completion, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE is to pay Plaintiff, DVC, prior to the actual work beginning and all costs and fees associated with preparation for beginning the job, such as estimates, permits, materials ordered, or any and all such fees and costs for services performed.
- Pursuant to the Contract, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE is responsible for any and all 40. fees and costs associated with the work performed, plus the profit that Plaintiff, DVC would have made on the job had Defendant, EUGENE INOSE not repudiated the contract.
- Pursuant to the Contract, upon termination of the Plaintiff, DVC'S services, 41. Defendant, EUGENE INOSE is responsible to pay all fees and costs incurred by Plaintiff, DVC, within five (5) business days of termination by either party.
- Pursuant to the Contract, if any requests for additional work to be performed were 42. made during the scope of the job, all such requests were required to be put in writing so that these costs will be added to the Scope of work.
- Pursuant to the Contract, if the scope of the work is beyond any insurance claim, the owner, agent or authorized party, including Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, agreed to pay all claims within ten (10) days of completion of work, and agreed to pay for any materials prior to the additional work being performed.
- Pursuant to the Contract, all insurance work performed by Plaintiff, DVC was subject to approval of the terms of the Defendant, EUGENE INOSE'S policy of insurance.
- Pursuant to the Contract, any code-upgrade work or upgrades to the Subject Property were not covered pursuant to the applicable insurance policy.

26

27

- 46. During performance of valid Contract, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE chose to have several upgrades in materials and work added onto the Contract's scope of work, which increased the original Contract's scope of work.
- 47. All subcontractors were selected at the direction of Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, who insisted that he have the original subcontractors that built the home.
- Defendant, EUGENE INOSE dictated who the superintendent would be for the jobsite.
- 49. The superintendent was paid over One Hundred Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$100,000.00), and during the performance of the Contract the superintendent quit coming to the jobsite.
- 50. The main subcontractors who have performed work on the Subject Property are as follows, without limitation: Diversified Protections Systems, Inc.; Desert Home Electric, Inc.; Sunrise Service, Inc.; Plumbing S.S. Inc; ARX LLC dba ARX Engineering; Ferguson; Firehouse Electric; Artesia Kitchen & Bath; Creative Closets & Cabinetry LLC; Diva Interior Concepts LLC; Eagle Sentry; Summit Tile & Stone LLC; Flooring Encounters, LLC; Walker & Zanger, Inc.; Latin Glass; HY-BAR Las Vegas; Picture Perfect TV Repair; Eazy Lift Elevators; and Custom Landau.
- 51. Plaintiff, DVC paid all of its subcontractors for work performed, but the additional change orders made by Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, were significant and materials for certain trades needed to be ordered and paid for in advance.
- 52. Defendant, EUGENE INOSE settled out the claim with the insurance company and contrary to the contractual terms of the Contract, had all funds paid directly to him which was contrary to the terms of the Contract.
- 53. Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, individually and as a manager of Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, is responsible for the upgrades and change orders that he caused to happen on this Subject Property, due to his choices and changing his mind in several instances as to what products were to be installed.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, individually and as a manager of Defendant, IN-LO 54. PROPERTIES, LLC, has failed to pay Plaintiff, DVC the monies owed and due for the upgrades and change orders of the Subject Property, and overhead and contingencies.
- On or about December of 2015, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, individually and as a manager of Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, breached his duties, obligations, and responsibilities under the Contract by denying Plaintiff, DVC's ability to complete the terms and conditions Contract, and by precluding Plaintiff, DVC from gaining access to the Subject Property, and by failing to pay Plaintiff, DVC the monies owed and due for the upgrades and change orders of the Subject Property.
- As a direct and proximate result of Defendant, EUGENE INOSE'S breach(es) of 56. contract(s), Plaintiff, DVC has incurred and continues to incur costs and expenses including, but not limited to, litigation costs, attorney fees and costs in connection with the Complaint filed by Plaintiff, DVC in the instant action to the general damages of Plaintiff, DVC as will be shown according to proof at the time of trial of this matter but alleged to be in excess of Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$10,000.00).
- Plaintiff, DVC has suffered additional damages in the form of attorneys' fees and 57. costs as a proximate and foreseeable result of Defendant, EUGENE INOSE'S breach.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Breach of the Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing against Defendant EUGENE INOSE)

- Plaintiff, DVC hereby repeats, re-alleges and incorporates by this reference each and 58. every allegation set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 57 above, as though fully set forth herein.
- Every contract imposes upon each party a duty of good faith and fair dealing in its 59. performance and its enforcement. This implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing requires that no party will do anything that will have the effect of impairing, destroying, or injuring the rights of the other party to receive the benefits of their agreement. The covenant implies that in all contracts

each party will do all things reasonably contemplated by the terms of the contract to accomplish it purpose. This covenants protects the benefits of the contract that the parties reasonably contemplated by the terms contract to accomplish its purpose. This covenant protects the benefits of the contract that the parties reasonably contemplated when they entered into the agreement.

- 60. Defendants, EUGENE INOSE breached the contracts/agreements by failing to adequately or accurately disclose the beneficiary or trustee.
- 61. Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, individually and as an agent for Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, had a duty to act in good faith and fair dealing in the execution of his obligations under the Contract.
- 62. That the covenant of good faith and fair dealing required Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, to fairly, honestly and reasonably deal with Plaintiff, DVC, including the relationship and actions undertaken performance of the Contract. That the covenant of good faith and fair dealing is inherent in every agreement and is implied in the dealings between the parties of this action, as well.
- 63. That Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, enjoyed substantial discretionary power affecting the rights of Plaintiff, DVC, during the events alleged in this Complaint.
- 64. That Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, was required to exercise such power in good faith.
- 65. That Defendant, EUGENE INOSE did not act in good faith and did not deal fairly with Plaintiff, DVC, in connection with the Contract.
- 66. That Defendant, EUGENE INOSE bad faith has caused damages to Plaintiff, DVC in an amount in excess of Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$10,000.00), and Plaintiff, DVC is entitled to recover the same.
- 67. Plaintiff, DVC has suffered additional damages in the form of attorneys' fees and costs as a proximate and foreseeable result of Defendant, EUGENE INOSE'S breach.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Unjust Enrichment against Defendants, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, and JEFFREY LOUIE)

- 68. Plaintiff, DVC hereby repeats, re-alleges and incorporates by this reference each and every allegation set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 67 above, as though fully set forth herein.
- 69. Upon information and belief, Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, is a Nevada Limited-Liability Company, duly authorized and qualified to do business in the State of Nevada since on or about November 5, 2004. The Registered Agent on file for Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, is Eugene Inose, and is located at 587 Saint Croix Street, Henderson, Nevada 89012.
- 70. During all relevant times herein, Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, either directly or indirectly through its agents, employees, subsidiaries and/or related companies held, serviced and/or engaged in transactions related to real property within the State of Nevada.
- 71. Upon information and belief, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE is a resident of Clark County, State of Nevada, and during all relevant times herein was a registered manager of Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC.
- 72. Upon information and belief, Defendant, JEFFREY LOUIE is a resident of Clark County, State of Nevada, and during all relevant times herein was a registered manager of Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC.
- 73. During all relevant times herein, Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, either directly or indirectly through its agents, employees, subsidiaries and/or related companies held, serviced and/or engaged in transactions related to real property within the State of Nevada.
- 74. Plaintiff, DVC is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that each Defendant, including, EUGENE INOSE, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, and JEFFREY LOUIE owed a duty of good faith to Plaintiff, DVC.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Plaintiff, DVC is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants, 75. EUGENE INOSE, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, and JEFFREY LOUIE breached that duty by performing in a manner that was unfaithful to the purpose of the contract.

- Plaintiff, DVC is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Plaintiff, DVC'S 76. justified expectations were thus denied.
- During all relevant times herein, Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, either directly or indirectly through its agents, including Defendants, EUGENE INOSE and JEFFREY LOUIE, employees, subsidiaries and/or related companies held, serviced and/or engaged in transactions related to real property within the State of Nevada.
- On August 8, 2014, Plaintiff, DVC, and Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, executed a valid Work Authorization and Contract for Plaintiff, DVC to perform a scope of work as provided by approved estimates (hereinafter "Contract"). Specifically, the Contract provides that Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, the undersigned (insured):

Represents that he/she/they are collectively or individually agents for the hereinafter specified property (and/or it contents) and hereby authorize and direct Desert Valley Contracting, Inc. (Contractor) to provide all labor, equipment and materials required to properly repair the specified real property or structure common known as [Subject Property.]

- Pursuant to the Contract, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE authorized and transferred and 79. assigned and conveyed to Plaintiff DVC, his right, title and interest in and to the insurance policy proceeds and all drafts for work performed by Plaintiff, DVC.
- Pursuant to the Contract, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE authorized the applicable 80. insurer to pay Plaintiff, DVC for work performed on the property and agreed to endorse and tender all drafts as produced to the Plaintiff, DVC.
- Pursuant to the Contract, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE if either party terminates the 81. Contract prior to completion, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE is to pay Plaintiff, DVC, prior to the actual work beginning and all costs and fees associated with preparation for beginning the job, such as estimates, permits, materials ordered, or any and all such fees and costs for services performed.

- 82. Pursuant to the Contract, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE is responsible for any and all fees and costs associated with the work performed, plus the profit that Plaintiff, DVC would have made on the job had Defendant, EUGENE INOSE not repudiated the contract.
- 83. Pursuant to the Contract, upon termination of the Plaintiff, DVC'S services, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE is responsible to pay all fees and costs incurred by Plaintiff, DVC, within five (5) business days of termination by either party.
- 84. Pursuant to the Contract, if any requests for additional work to be performed were made during the scope of the job, all such requests were required to be put in writing so that these costs will be added to the Scope of work.
- 85. Pursuant to the Contract, if the scope of the work is beyond any insurance claim, the owner, agent or authorized party, including Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, agreed to pay all claims within ten (10) days of completion of work, and agreed to pay for any materials prior to the additional work being performed.
- 86. Pursuant to the Contract, all insurance work performed by Plaintiff, DVC was subject to approval of the terms of the Defendant, EUGENE INOSE'S policy of insurance.
- 87. Pursuant to the Contract, any code-upgrade work or upgrades to the Subject Property were not covered pursuant to the applicable insurance policy.
- 88. During performance of valid Contract, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE chose to have several upgrades in materials and work added onto the Contract's scope of work, which increased the original Contract's scope of work.
- 89. All subcontractors were selected at the direction of Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, who insisted that he have the original subcontractors that built the home.
- 90. Defendant, EUGENE INOSE dictated who the superintendent would be for the jobsite.
- 91. The superintendent was paid over One Hundred Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$100,000.00), and during the performance of the Contract the superintendent quit coming to the jobsite.

2

3

4

5

- The main subcontractors who have performed work on the Subject Property are as follows, without limitation: Diversified Protections Systems, Inc.; Desert Home Electric, Inc.; Sunrise Service, Inc.; Plumbing S.S. Inc; ARX LLC dba ARX Engineering; Ferguson; Firehouse Electric; Artesia Kitchen & Bath; Creative Closets & Cabinetry LLC; Diva Interior Concepts LLC; Eagle Sentry; Summit Tile & Stone LLC; Flooring Encounters, LLC; Walker & Zanger, Inc.; Latin Glass; HY-BAR Las Vegas; Picture Perfect TV Repair; Eazy Lift Elevators; and Custom Landau.
- Plaintiff, DVC paid all of its subcontractors for work performed, but the additional change orders made by Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, were significant and materials for certain trades needed to be ordered and paid for in advance.
- Defendant, EUGENE INOSE settled out the claim with the insurance company and 94. contrary to the contractual terms of the Contract, had all funds paid directly to him which was contrary to the terms of the Contract.
- As you may know, most of these type of claims have the insurer remain in the matter until the project is complete in case any contingencies, so that the funds if covered would be made available for contingencies that were unknown or not discovered initially.
- Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, individually and as a manager of Defendant, IN-LO 96. PROPERTIES, LLC, is responsible for the upgrades and change orders that he caused to happen on this Subject Property, due to his choices and changing his mind in several instances as to what products were to be installed.
- Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, individually and as a manager of Defendant, IN-LO 97. PROPERTIES, LLC, has failed to pay Plaintiff, DVC the monies owed and due for the upgrades and change orders of the Subject Property.
- That Defendants, EUGENE INOSE, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, and JEFFREY 98. LOUIE unjustly benefited when they refused to pay Plaintiff, DVC, the outstanding monies owed.
- As a result of Defendants, EUGENE INOSE'S, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC'S, and JEFFREY LOUIE'S breach, Plaintiff, DVC has unjustly suffered damages in the amount of Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$10,000.00).

3 4

5 6 7

9 10

12 13

11

14 15 16

17

18 19

21

22

20

23 24

25

26 27

28

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(INTENTIONAL INTERFERENCE WITH CONTRACT against

Defendants, EUGENE INOSE and IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC,)

- Plaintiff, DVC hereby repeats, re-alleges and incorporates by this reference each and 100. every allegation set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 99 above, as though fully set forth herein.
- 101. After August 8, 2014, Plaintiff DVC had a valid and enforceable contract with the following subcontractors including: Diversified Protections Systems, Inc.; Desert Home Electric, Inc.; Sunrise Service, Inc.; Artesia Kitchen & Bath; Eagle Sentry; Summit Tile & Stone LLC; Efficient Space Planning, HY-BAR Las Vegas; and Eazy Lift Elevators.
- That Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, knew of the existence of the subcontracts between Plaintiff DVC and Diversified Protections Systems, Inc.; Desert Home Electric, Inc.; Sunrise Service, Inc.; Artesia Kitchen & Bath; Eagle Sentry; Summit Tile & Stone LLC; Efficient Space Planning, HY-BAR Las Vegas; and Eazy Lift Elevators as it pertains to the Subject Property.
- That Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, was fully aware that knew Plaintiff DVC had a business relationship with Diversified Protections Systems, Inc.; Desert Home Electric, Inc.; Sunrise Service, Inc.; Artesia Kitchen & Bath; Eagle Sentry; Summit Tile & Stone LLC; Efficient Space Planning, HY-BAR Las Vegas; and Eazy Lift Elevators as it pertains to Subject Property, which were likely to result in economically advantageous relationship for Plaintiff, DVC.
- On or about December of 2015, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, individually and as a manager of Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, precluded Plaintiff, DVC from gaining access to the Subject Property to complete the contractual and sub-contractual work.
- Upon information and belief, On or about December of 2015, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, individually and as a manager of Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, made disparaging remarks to Diversified Protections Systems, Inc.; Desert Home Electric, Inc.; Sunrise Service, Inc.; Artesia Kitchen & Bath; Eagle Sentry; Summit Tile & Stone LLC; Efficient Space Planning, HY-BAR Las Vegas; and Eazy Lift Elevators, and instructed Diversified Protections Systems, Inc.; Desert Home Electric, Inc.; Sunrise Service, Inc.; Artesia Kitchen & Bath; Eagle Sentry; Summit

Tile & Stone LLC; Efficient Space Planning, HY-BAR Las Vegas; and Eazy Lift Elevators to cease its performance of the DVC's valid and enforceable subcontracts and/or business relationship with Plaintiff, DVC as it pertains to the Subject Property. agreements and/or business relationships with QUINCEANERA MAGAZINE NEVADA, INC.

- 106. Upon information and belief, On or about December of 2015, Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, individually and as a manager of Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, engaged in conduct that tortiously interfered with Plaintiff, DVC'S contractual rights with Diversified Protections Systems, Inc.; Desert Home Electric, Inc.; Sunrise Service, Inc.; Artesia Kitchen & Bath; Eagle Sentry; Summit Tile & Stone LLC; Efficient Space Planning, HY-BAR Las Vegas; and Eazy Lift Elevators.
- 107. Thereafter, Diversified Protections Systems, Inc.; Desert Home Electric, Inc.; Sunrise Service, Inc.; Artesia Kitchen & Bath; Eagle Sentry; Summit Tile & Stone LLC; Efficient Space Planning, HY-BAR Las Vegas; and Eazy Lift Elevators refused to honor the terms and conditions of the contracts with Plaintiff, DVC.
- 108. That Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, individually and as a manager of Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, engaged in conduct alleged herein with the intent to harm Plaintiff, DVC and induce Diversified Protections Systems, Inc.; Desert Home Electric, Inc.; Sunrise Service, Inc.; Artesia Kitchen & Bath; Eagle Sentry; Summit Tile & Stone LLC; Efficient Space Planning, HY-BAR Las Vegas; and Eazy Lift Elevators to terminate their subcontracts and/or business relationship with Plaintiff, DVC.
- 109. The actions of Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, individually and as a manager of Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, constitute an intentional and unprivileged interference with the Diversified Protections Systems, Inc.'s Desert Home Electric, Inc., Sunrise Service, Inc.'s, Artesia Kitchen & Bath's, Eagle Sentry's, Summit Tile & Stone LLC's, Efficient Space Planning's, HY-BAR Las Vegas's, and Eazy Lift Elevators's subcontracts with Plaintiff, DVC.
- 110. The conduct by Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, individually and as a manager of Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC, as alleged herein was a purposeful and intentional interference, that was engaged in for the sole purpose to deprive Plaintiff, DVC of earnings and/or

28 //

causing injury intended and/or designed to disrupt the contractual relationships between Plaintiff, DVC and Diversified Protections Systems, Inc.; Desert Home Electric, Inc.; Sunrise Service, Inc.; Artesia Kitchen & Bath; Eagle Sentry; Summit Tile & Stone LLC; Efficient Space Planning, HY-BAR Las Vegas; and Eazy Lift Elevators.

- 111. As a direct and proximate result Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, individually and as a manager of Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC's intentional interference with Plaintiff, DVC's subcontractual relationships with Diversified Protections Systems, Inc.; Desert Home Electric, Inc.; Sunrise Service, Inc.; Artesia Kitchen & Bath; Eagle Sentry; Summit Tile & Stone LLC; Efficient Space Planning, HY-BAR Las Vegas; and Eazy Lift Elevators, Plaintiff, DVC has suffered, and will continue to suffer, monetary damage and irreparable injury, in an amount exceeding Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000.00), plus pre-judgment and post judgment interest.
- I12. Based on the intentional, willful and malicious nature of Defendant, EUGENE INOSE, individually and as a manager of Defendant, IN-LO PROPERTIES, LLC's actions, Plaintiff, DVC is entitled to exemplary damages and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred in connection with this action.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, DESERT VALLEY CONTRACTING INC., expressly reserves the right to amend this Complaint at or before the time of trial of the action herein to include all items of damages not yet ascertained, and demands judgment against the Defendant as follows, upon each cause of action:

- 1. Find for Plaintiff and against the Defendant on all causes of action;
- Award general damages in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendants in an amount to be determined at trial, in excess of \$10,000.00;
- Award special damages in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendants in an amount to be determined at trial, in excess of \$10,000.00;

4. Award reasonable attorney's fees, costs of suit and pre-judgment interest in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendants; and,

5. Award such other relief as this Court deems just and proper in this matter.

DATED this 30 day of March, 2016.

HURTIK LAW & ASSOCIATES

CARRIE E. HURTIK, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 7028

RACHEL L. SHELSTAD, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 13399

7866 West Sahara Avenue

Las Vegas, Nevada 89117

(702) 966-5200 Telephone (702) 966-5206 Facsimile

churtik@hurtiklaw.com

Attorney for Plaintiff,
DESERT VALLEY CONTRACTING, INC.

EXHIBIT 2

Electronically Filed 06/07/2016 03:00:23 PM

1 AACC BRIAN W. BOSCHEE, ESQ. (NBN 7612) 2 E-mail: bboschee@nevadafirm.com WILLIAM N. MILLER, ESQ. (NBN 11658) E-mail: wmiller@nevadafirm.com HOLLEY, DRIGGS, WALCH, 3 4 FINE, WRAY, PUZEY & THOMPSON 400 South Fourth Street, Third Floor 5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Telephone: 702/791-0308 6 Facsimile: 702/791-1912 Attorneys for Defendants 7

CLERK OF THE COURT

DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

DESERT VALLEY CONTRACTING, INC. a Nevada corporation,

Plaintiff,

IN-LO PROPERTIES, a Nevada limited liability company; EUGENE INOSE, an individual: JEFFREY LOUIE, an individual; DOES 1 through 10; and ROE ENTITIES 1 through 10,

Defendants.

EUGENE INOSE, an individual:

Counterclaimant.

DESERT VALLEY CONTRACTING, INC., a Nevada corporation; DOES I through X, inclusive, and ROE CORPORATIONS I through X, inclusive.

Counterdefendants.

Case No .: A-16-734351-C Dept. No .:

EUGENE INOSE'S ANSWER TO COMPLAINT AND COUNTERCLAIM

FINE-WRAY-PUZEY-THOMPSON

HOLLEY-DRIGGS-WALCH

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Defendant/Counterclaimant EUGENE INOSE ("Inose"), by and through his attorneys of record, the law firm of Holley, Driggs, Walch, Fine, Wray, Puzey & Thompson, hereby: (1) responds to, admits, denies, and answers the allegations of Plaintiff/Counterdefendant DESERT VALLEY CONTRACTING, INC.'s ("Desert Valley") Complaint; and (2) counterclaims against Desert Valley as follows:

11218-00/1681899.doc

FINE WRAY PUZEY THOMPSON HOLLEY-DRIGGS-WALCH

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

PARTIES

Answering Paragraph 1 of Desert Valley's Complaint (the "Complaint"), Inose admits that Desert Valley is a Nevada corporation. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.

2. Answering Paragraph 2 of the Complaint, Inose admits the allegations contained in this Paragraph.

3. Answering Paragraph 3 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.

Answering Paragraph 4 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained this Paragraph.

Answering Paragraph 5 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge 5. or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.

Answering Paragraph 6 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.

7. Answering Paragraph 7 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.

JURISDICTION

Answering Paragraph 8 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.

Answering Paragraph 9 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.

-2-

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

10. Answering Paragraph 10 of the Complaint, Inose admits that venue is proper here. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 11. Answering Paragraph 11 of the Complaint, Inose admits that Defendant IN-LO Properties purchased the Subject Property in 2005 but is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- 12. Answering Paragraph 12 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- 13. Answering Paragraph 13 of the Complaint, Inose admits that he and Desert Valley entered into the Contract and further states that this agreement is a written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- 14. Answering Paragraph 14 of the Complaint, Inose states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- 15. Answering Paragraph 15 of the Complaint, Inose states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.

1.5

28 .

24

25

26

27

-3-

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

- written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 18 of the Complaint, Inose states that the Contract is a 18. written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 19 of the Complaint, Inose states that the Contract is a 19. written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 20 of the Complaint, Inose states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 21 of the Complaint, Inose states that the Contract is a 21. written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 22 of the Complaint, Inose states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.

-4-

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

. . .

23.	Answering Paragraph 23 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained
in this paragr	aph.

- Answering Paragraph 24 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained 24. in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 25 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained 25. in this paragraph.
- 26. Answering Paragraph 26 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- 27. Answering Paragraph 27 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- 28. Answering Paragraph 28 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 29 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained 29. in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 30 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge 30. or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- 31. Answering Paragraph 31 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 32 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained 32. in this paragraph.
- 33. Answering Paragraph 33 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.

-5-

HOLLEY-DRIGGS-WALCH FINE-WRAY-PUZEY-THOMPSON

H

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Breach of Contract against Defendant EUGENE INOSE)

- 34. Answering Paragraph 34 of the Complaint, Inose adopts, repeats, and realleges its responses to the prior allegations and the preceding paragraphs in the Answer as though fully set forth herein.
- 35. Answering Paragraph 35 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- 36. Answering Paragraph 36 of the Complaint, Inose admits that he and Desert Valley entered into the Contract and further states that this agreement is a written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- 37. Answering Paragraph 37 of the Complaint, Inose states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- 38. Answering Paragraph 38 of the Complaint, Inose states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- 39. Answering Paragraph 39 of the Complaint, Inose states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.

-6-

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

- Answering Paragraph 41 of the Complaint, Inose states that the Contract is a 41. written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 42 of the Complaint, Inose states that the Contract is a 42. written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 43 of the Complaint, Inose states that the Contract is a 43. written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 44 of the Complaint, Inose states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 45 of the Complaint, Inose states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 46 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 47 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained 47. in this paragraph.

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

- Answering Paragraph 48 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained 48. in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 49 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge 49. or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- 50. Answering Paragraph 50 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 51 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 52 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained 52. in this paragraph.
- 53. Answering Paragraph 53 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 54 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained 54. in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 55 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained 55. in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 56 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained 56. in this paragraph.
- 57. Answering Paragraph 57 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.

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

- Answering Paragraph 58 of the Complaint, Inose adopts, repeats, and realleges its 58. responses to the prior allegations and the preceding paragraphs in the Answer as though fully set forth herein.
- 59. Answering Paragraph 59 of the Complaint, Inose states that the allegations contained therein are legal conclusions. Notwithstanding this however, lnose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore deny the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 60 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained 60. in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 61 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge 61. or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 62 of the Complaint, Inose states that the allegations contained therein are legal conclusions. Notwithstanding this however, Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore deny the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 63 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge 63. or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- 64. Answering Paragraph 64 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 65 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained 65. in this paragraph.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

16

17

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Answering Paragraph 66 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.

Answering Paragraph 67 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained 67. in this paragraph.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Unjust Enrichment against Defendants IN-LO PROPERTIES and JEFFREY LOUIE)

- Answering Paragraph 68 of the Complaint, Inose adopts, repeats, and realleges its 68. responses to the prior allegations and the preceding paragraphs in the Answer as though fully set forth herein.
- 69. Answering Paragraph 69 of the Complaint, Inose admits the allegations contained in this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 70 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- 71. Answering Paragraph 71 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained this Paragraph.
- 72. Answering Paragraph 72 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 73 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- 74. Answering Paragraph 74 of the Complaint, Inose states that the allegations contained therein are legal conclusions. Notwithstanding this however, Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore deny the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 75 of the Complaint, Inose states that the allegations contained therein are legal conclusions. Notwithstanding this however, Inose is without

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

sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore deny the allegations of this Paragraph.

- Answering Paragraph 76 of the Complaint, Inose states that the allegations 76. contained therein are legal conclusions. Notwithstanding this however, Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore deny the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 77 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge 77. or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 78 of the Complaint, Inose admits that he and Desert 78. Valley entered into the Contract and further states that this agreement is a written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 79 of the Complaint, Inose states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 80 of the Complaint, Inose states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 81 of the Complaint, Inose states that the Contract is a 81. written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 82 of the Complaint, Inose states that the Contract is a 82. written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information

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

- Answering Paragraph 83 of the Complaint, Inose states that the Contract is a 83. written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- 84. Answering Paragraph 84 of the Complaint, Inose states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 85 of the Complaint, Inose states that the Contract is a 85. written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 86 of the Complaint, Inose states that the Contract is a written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 87 of the Complaint, Inose states that the Contract is a 87. written document which speaks for itself. Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in this Paragraph, and, therefore, denies each and every remaining allegation of this Paragraph.
- 88. Answering Paragraph 88 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.
- 89. Answering Paragraph 89 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 90 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained 90. in this paragraph.

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

	91.	Answering Paragraph 91 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge
or info	rmatio	n to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore
		egations of this Paragraph.

- Answering Paragraph 92 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge 92. or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 93 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge 93. or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 94 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained 94. in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 95 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge 95. or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 96 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained 96. in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 97 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained 97. in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 98 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained 98. in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 99 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge 99. or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.

- 13 -

FINE-WRAY-PUZEY-THOMPSON HOLLEY-DRIGGS-WALCH

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

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Intentional Interference with Contract against Defendants EUGENE INOSE and IN-LO PROPERTIES)

- Answering Paragraph 100 of the Complaint, Inose adopts, repeats, and realleges 100. its responses to the prior allegations and the preceding paragraphs in the Answer as though fully set forth herein.
- Answering Paragraph 101 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 102 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations 102. contained in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 103 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 104 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 105 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 106 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.
- 107. Answering Paragraph 107 of the Complaint, Inose is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this Paragraph, and therefore denies the allegations of this Paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 108 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.
- 109. Answering Paragraph 109 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.
- Answering Paragraph 110 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.

- 14 -

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

Answering Paragraph 111 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.

Answering Paragraph 112 of the Complaint, Inose denies the allegations contained in this paragraph.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

Inose asserts and alleges the following non-exclusive list of defenses to this action. These defenses have been labeled as "Affirmative" defenses regardless of whether, as a matter of law, such defenses are truly affirmative defenses. Such designation should in no way be construed to constitute a concession on the part of Inose that its bears the burden of proof to establish such defenses.

- Inose denies each and every allegation of the Complaint not specifically admitted or otherwise pled to herein.
- The Complaint fails to state a claim against Inose upon which relief can be 2. granted.
- At all times relevant to the allegations contained in the Complaint, Inose acted 3. with due care, circumspection, and good faith in the performance of any and all duties imposed on him, if any.
 - 4. Desert Valley's claims are barred by the doctrine of equitable estoppel.
 - Desert Valley's claims are barred by the doctrine of equitable rescission. 5.
- Desert Valley's claims are barred because it did not incur any injury or damages 6. cognizable at law.
 - Desert Valley, by its own acts and conduct, waived its rights to assert any claim. 7.
- Desert Valley is barred from obtaining any relief from any claim by operation of 8. the doctrine of unclean hands.
 - Desert Valley claims are barred by the doctrine of laches.
- Each and every action contained in the Complaint is barred by Desert Valley's breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing.

I

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

- Desert Valley breached or failed to perform any agreement alleged in the Complaint and is therefore not entitled to any relief under any agreement.
- Damages and injuries suffered by Desert Valley, if any, are not attributable to any 12. act, conduct, or omission on the part of Inose.
 - The conduct of the Inose was privileged. 13.
- Inose performed on his part, each and every term and condition owed by him, if 14. any, to Desert Valley.
- Desert Valley's alleged damages, if any, should be offset by monies due and 15. owing by Desert Valley to Inose.
- 16, Because of Desert Valley's breach of the agreement, Inose had to hire replacement subcontractors to complete/correct Desert Valley's work on the subject property.
 - Desert Valley has pleaded mutually exclusive claims. 17.
- 18. The conduct of Inose alleged to be wrongful was induced by Desert Valley's own wrongful conduct.
- By virtue of the acts, conduct, mismanagement and/or omissions to act of the Desert Valley under the circumstances, Inose is released, excused, and discharged from any liability whatsoever to Desert Valley, which liability is expressly denied.
- Desert Valley is barred from obtaining any relief from any claim by operation of the doctrine of waiver.
- 21. Desert Valley's claims are barred by the doctrines of mutual mistake, unilateral mistake, impossibility, or impracticability.
- 22. Desert Valley is barred from obtaining any relief from any claim by operating of the doctrine of accord and satisfaction.
- 23. Desert Valley's claims for relief are barred on the grounds that Inose has a valid justification for any alleged nonperformance of any alleged agreement.
- 24. Any damages which Desert Valley may have sustained by reason of the allegations of the Complaint were proximately caused, in whole or in part, by sets of persons other than Inose and, therefore, Desert Valley is not entitled to any relief from Inose.

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

- 25. To the extent Desert Valley's claims are based in whole or in part on alleged oral promises or statements, such claims are barred by the lack of acceptance, lack of mutuality, failure of consideration, and/or the statute of frauds.
 - Desert Valley ratified, approved, or acquiesced in the actions of Inose. 26.
- Desert Valley has failed to mitigate its damages, if any exist or were incurred, the 27. existence of which is expressly denied by Inose,
- Desert Valley's claims for relief are barred on the grounds that any assent to any 28. alleged contract was obtained by Desert Valley's misrepresentations, concealment, circumvention, and unfair practices.
- Desert Valley materially breached any agreement between the parties, thereby 29. excusing the future performance thereof by Inose.
- Desert Valley brings its claims in bad faith, with an ulterior motive to harass Inose, abuse the litigation process, and otherwise raise frivolous and unfounded claims against Inose causing Inose to incur damages.
 - Desert Valley has acted in bad faith in his dealings with Inose. 31.
 - 32. Desert Valley's claims are barred by the economic loss doctrine.
 - 33. Desert Valley's claims are barred by the statute of limitations.
- Inose hereby incorporates by reference those affirmative defenses enumerated in 34. NRCP 8 as though fully set forth herein. Such defenses are herein incorporated by reference for the specific purpose of not waiving the same.
- It has been necessary for Inose to employ the services of an attorney to defend this Complaint and reasonable sums should be allowed as and for attorneys' fees, together with the costs expended in this action.
- Pursuant to the provisions of NRCP 11, at the time of the filing of this Answer, all 36. possible affirmative defenses may not have been alleged inasmuch as insufficient facts and relevant information may not have been available after reasonable inquiry. Therefore, Inose reserves the right to amend this Answer to allege additional affirmative defenses if subsequent investigation so warrants.

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

WHEREFORE, Inose prays for the following relief:

- That Desert Valley takes nothing by way of the Complaint and that the same be dismissed with prejudice;
- That Inose be awarded all costs and expenses, including reasonable attorneys' fees, incurred by Inose in connection with this action; and
 - For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

COUNTERCLAIM

Defendant/Counterclaimant EUGENE INOSE ("Inose"), by and through his attorneys of record, the law firm of Holley, Driggs, Walch, Fine, Wray, Puzey & Thompson, hereby alleges and complains against Plaintiff/Counterdefendant DESERT VALLEY CONTRACTING, INC. ("Desert Valley") as follows:

THE PARTIES

- Inose is, and was at all times relevant to this action, an individual.
- Upon information and belief, at all times relevant to this this action, Desert Valley was a Nevada corporation.
- 3. Inose does not know the true names of the individuals, corporations, partnerships, and entities sued and identified in fictitious names as DOES I through X and ROE Corporations I through X. Inose will request leave of this Honorable Court to amend this Counterclaim to allege the true names and capacities of each fictitious defendants when Inose discovers the information.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this case and venue is proper in Clark County, because the Contract (defined below) was entered in Nevada, and the Property (defined below) is located in Clark County, Nevada.

HOLLEY-DRIGGS-WALCH FINE-WRAY-PUZEY-THOMPSON

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

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 5. On or about October 10, 2005, Defendant IN-LO PROPERTIES ("IN-LO") purchased the real property located at 587 St. Croix Street, Henderson, Nevada 89012, APN Number 178-27-114-001 (the "Property") and since that date, IN-LO has been the owner of the Property.
- On or about August 2, 2014, the Property was flooded and damaged to the core, and Inose was unable to reside in the Property.
- On or about August 24, 2014, Inose and Desert Valley entered into a Work Authorization and Contract to Perform (the "Contract") to fix and repair the Property.
- Pursuant to the Contract, Desert Valley, as the general contractor, was required to repair the Property back to its original condition.
 - Additionally, pursuant to the Contract, among other things:
 - Desert Valley had to perform its work on the Property in good and workmanlike manner;
 - b. Desert Valley agreed to perform its work on the Property for the amount of insurance proceeds (the "<u>Insurance Proceeds</u>") for the Property, absent written authorization for additional amounts; and
 - c. If any requests for additional work was needed to be performed during the scope of the work on the Property, all such requests had to be in writing.
- Shortly after entering into the Contract, Desert Valley began its work under the Contract.
- 11. Around that same time, Desert Valley told Inose that the work on the Property was supposed to only take approximately eight months and should be fully completed by approximately April 2015.
- Thus, Desert Valley confirmed that Inose would be able to reside back in the Property by April 2015.
- April 2015 came and went and Desert Valley's work was nowhere near complete on the Property.

-19-

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

- In October 2015, approximately fourteen months after the Contract was signed, 15. Inose was still unable to reside in the Property, as the work was not complete on the Property, resulting in considerable damages to Inose.
- On or about December 8, 2015, because Desert Valley had breached its duties, 16. obligations, and responsibilities under the Contract, Inose terminated the Contract for cause, effective immediately.
- More specifically, Desert Valley breached the Contract, as it did not perform its 17. work in "good and workmanlike manner" and did not complete its scope of work on the Property in fifteen months, a considerable delay, harming Inose by keeping him out of the Property.
- Additionally, as noted above, pursuant to the Contract, Desert Valley agreed to perform the work on the Property for the amount of Insurance Proceeds for the Property, absent written authorization for additional amounts; since Desert Valley is claiming, in its Complaint, more than the Insurance Proceeds, it has breached the Contract as well.
- Further, Desert Valley was also grossly negligent and intentionally malicious in its oversight and work on the Property throughout the entire term of the Contract.
- Moreover, throughout the entire term of the Contract, there was no urgency on Desert Valley's part to get Inose back in his Property, as well as there was no full time, or even part time, supervisor that had been assigned to the Property since approximately April 2015, causing the process of repairing the Property to be extremely inefficient and causing inexcusable delay hereto.
- Further, Inose was told that Desert Valley had ordered certain items for 21. installation in the Property, only to find out months later that no such items were ordered, and therefore, not installed.
 - This resulted in massive delays and costs, directly to the detriment of Inose. 22.

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

- 23. Before the instant dispute arose between Plaintiff and Inose, Desert Valley never presented any change orders to Inose, and therefore, Inose never signed off or approved any change orders before the instant dispute arose.
- 24. Due to Desert Valley's breach of the Contract, and after Inose terminated the Contract for cause, Inose had no other alternative but to hire replacement subcontractors on the Property to complete/correct Desert Valley's work on the Property.
- 25. Regarding these subcontractors, Desert Valley knew many of them, as many of them were working on the Property during the time period of the Contract, and also knew about the prospective relationship between Inose and the replacement subcontractors.
- 26. Desert Valley intended to harm Plaintiff by preventing such relationship between Plaintiff and the replacement subcontractors, by sending letters to them and instructing them not to work on the Property.
 - 27. Desert Valley had no privilege or justification in preventing such relationship.
- 28. In June 2015, Inose, with Desert Valley's express consent, confirmation and approval, settled out the claim with the insurance company for \$1,321,133.12, the Insurance Proceeds.
- 29. More specifically, the insurance company and Desert Valley negotiated the total amount of Insurance Proceeds that would be available for the construction of the Property, and once an agreement was reached between them, then and only then, did Desert Valley approach Inose and instruct/recommend Inose to except the settlement amount that the insurance company offered.
- 30. Inose would have never settled out the amount of the claim with the insurance company without Desert Valley's express consent, confirmation and approval.
- As of date, Desert Valley has been paid \$1,123,734.48 out of the Insurance Proceeds.

-21 -

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

- 32. Because Desert Valley has materially breached the Contract and has damaged Inose, as noted above, Desert Valley should not be entitled to any of the Insurance Proceeds, but rather, Inose should be entitled to this, so he can pay replacement subcontractors to complete/contract Desert Valley's work on the Property.
- 33. Thus, as a direct and proximate result of Desert Valley's aforementioned conduct, Inose had to hire these aforementioned replacement subcontractors to complete/correct Desert Valley's work on the Property.
- 34. As of date, Inose has had to pay at least \$250,000.00 to hire these aforementioned replacement subcontractors to complete/correct Desert Valley's work on the Property; however, this amount continuously is increasing, as Inose is continuing to have to pay other replacement subcontractors to complete/correct Desert Valley's work on the Property.
- 35. Pursuant to the Contract, and since the outset of the Contract, Inose has performed all of his duties, obligations, and responsibilities under the Contract.
- Since the outset of the Contract, Desert Valley has materially breached its duties, 36. obligations, and responsibilities under the Contract, by among other things, not performing its work in good and workmanlike manner, not completing its scope of work on the Property in fifteen months, a considerable delay, harming Inose by keeping him out of the Property, claiming more than the instance proceeds, and claiming damages on alleged change orders, when Inose never approved these changes, especially since he was never presented any such change orders prior to the instant dispute arising.
- As a direct and proximate result of Desert Valley's aforementioned actions, Inose has been damaged in a substantial sum in excess of \$10,000.00, the exact amount of which will be set forth at the time of trial in this matter.
- As a direct result of the aforementioned conduct on the part of Desert Valley, 38. Inose has been forced to retain the services of the undersigned counsel to defend and prosecute this matter and is thus entitled to an award of his reasonable attorneys' fees and costs associated herewith from Desert Valley.

HOLLEY-DRIGGS-WALCH FINE-WRAY-PUZEY-THOMPSON

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

田

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Breach of Contract)

- Inose incorporates the preceding paragraphs of this Counterclaim by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- 40. Inose and Desert Valley entered into a valid and enforceable contract, the Contract, relating to repaid work on the Property.
- 41. Inose has complied with all the conditions and requirements under this contract, the Contract.
- 42. Through its actions complained of herein, Desert Valley has wrongfully, intentionally, and/or maliciously breached its obligations under the Contract.
- 43. As a direct and proximate result of Desert Valley's aforementioned conduct, Inose had to hire replacement subcontractors to complete/correct Desert Valley's work on the Property.
- 44. As a direct and proximate result of Desert Valley's aforementioned conduct, Inose has been damaged in a substantial sum in excess of \$10,000.00, the exact amount of which will be set forth at the time of trial in this matter.
- 45. As a direct result of the aforementioned conduct on the part of Desert Valley, Inose has been forced to retain the services of the undersigned counsel to defend and prosecute this matter and is thus entitled to an award of his reasonable attorneys' fees and costs associated herewith from Desert Valley.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Breach of the Implied Covenant of Good Fair and Fair Dealing)

- 46. Inose incorporates the preceding paragraphs of this Counterclaim by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- 47: Every contract entered into in Nevada, including the above-referenced Contract, contains an implied covenant that the parties will act in good faith, and with fair dealing, and that one party will not conduct itself in a manner that would prevent the other party from achieving the benefit of its bargain.

- 23 -

11218-00/1681899 doc

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

- 48. Inose and Desert Valley entered into a valid and enforceable contract, the Contract, relating to repaid work on the Property.
- 49. Inose has complied with all the conditions and requirements under this contract, the Contract.
- 50. Through its actions complained of herein, Desert Valley has wrongfully, intentionally, and/or maliciously breached said covenant of good faith and fair dealing. This aforementioned conduct was unfaithful to the purpose of the Contract.
- Inose's justified expectations under the Contract were denied because of Desert Valley's aforementioned conduct.
- 52. As a direct and proximate result of Desert Valley's aforementioned conduct, Inose had to hire replacement subcontractors to complete/correct Desert Valley's work on the Property.
- 53. As a direct and proximate result of Desert Valley's aforementioned conduct, Inose has been damaged in a substantial sum in excess of \$10,000.00, the exact amount of which will be set forth at the time of trial in this matter.
- 54. As a direct result of the aforementioned conduct on the part of Desert Valley, Inose has been forced to retain the services of the undersigned counsel to defend and prosecute this matter and is thus entitled to an award of his reasonable attorneys' fees and costs associated herewith from Desert Valley.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Alternative Claim for Unjust Enrichment)

- 55. Inose incorporates the preceding paragraphs of this Counterclaim by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- 56. In the alternative to the First Claim for Relief for Breach of Contract, Desert Valley unjustly retained Inose's property, including, but not limited to, the money that Desert Valley has received for its work on the Property.
- 57. Desert Valley's unjust retention of this aforementioned property is against the fundamental principles of justice, as the money rightfully belongs to Inose, so he can pay replacement subcontractors to complete/contract Desert Valley's work on the Property.

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

- Desert Valley has appreciated this benefit, as well as accepted and retained this 59. benefit, since Desert Valley has failed and/or refused to return any of the aforementioned property to Inose.
- As a direct and proximate result of Desert Valley's aforementioned conduct, Inose 60. has been damaged in a substantial sum in excess of \$10,000.00, the exact amount of which will be set forth at the time of trial in this matter.
- As a direct result of the aforementioned conduct on the part of Desert Valley, Inose has been forced to retain the services of the undersigned counsel to defend and prosecute this matter and is thus entitled to an award of his reasonable attorneys' fees and costs associated herewith from Desert Valley.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Intentional Interference with Prospective Economic Advantage)

- 62. Inose incorporates the preceding paragraphs of this Counterclaim by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- Due to Desert Valley's breach of the Contract, and after Inose terminated the Contract for cause, Inose had no other alternative but to hire replacement subcontractors on the Property to complete/correct Desert Valley's work on the Property.
- Thus, there was a perspective contractual relationship between Plaintiff and third 64. parties, the replacement subcontractors.
- Regarding these subcontractors, Desert Valley knew many of them, as many of them were working on the Property during the time period of the Contract, and also knew about the prospective relationship between Inose and the replacement subcontractors.
- Desert Valley intended to harm Plaintiff by preventing such relationship between Plaintiff and the replacement subcontractors, by sending letters to them and instructed them not to work on the Property.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- 67. Desert Valley had no privilege or justification in preventing such relationship.
- 68. As a direct and proximate result of Desert Valley's aforementioned conduct, Inose has been damaged in a substantial sum in excess of \$10,000.00, the exact amount of which will be set forth at the time of trial in this matter.
- 69. As a direct result of the aforementioned conduct on the part of Desert Valley, Inose has been forced to retain the services of the undersigned counsel to defend and prosecute this matter and is thus entitled to an award of his reasonable attorneys' fees and costs associated herewith from Desert Valley.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Inose prays for judgment against Desert Valley as follows:

- With respect to the First Claim for Relief (Breach of Contract), judgment in an amount in excess of \$10,000.00;
- With respect to the Second Claim for Relief (Breach of the Implied Covenant of Good Fair and Fair Dealing) judgment in an amount in excess of \$10,000.00;
- With respect to the Third Claim for Relief (Alternative Claim for Unjust Enrichment) judgment in an amount in excess of \$10,000.00;
- With respect to the Fourth Claim for Relief (Intentional Interference with Prospective Economic Advantage) judgment in an amount in excess of \$10,000.00;
 - For pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;
- For all costs and expenses incurred by Inose in enforcing its rights under the Contract, including, but not limited to, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred in defending and prosecuting this action; and

23

24

25 .

26 ...

27

28 .

- 26 -