No. 83344

## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JDD, LLC; TCS PARTNERS, LLC; JOHN SAUNDERS; and TREVOR SCHMIDT, Electronically Filed

Petitioners, Nov 012021 04:30 p.m. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court
vs.
THE HONORABLE TIMOTHY C. WILLIAMS, EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK

Respondent,
-and-
ITEM 9 LAB CORP. f/k/a Airware Labs Corp. and Crown Dynamics Corp.; ITEM 9 PROPERTIES, LLC; STRIVE MANAGEMENT, LLC f/k/a Strive Life; VIRIDIS GROUP I9 CAPITAL, LLC; VIRIDIS GROUP HOLDINGS, LLC; SNOWELL HOLDINGS, LLC; ANDREW BOWDEN; DOUGLAS BOWDEN; BRYCE SKALLA; AND CHASE HERSHMAN,

Real Parties in Interest

## REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST'S APPENDIX

| Lauren Elliott Stine | Michael B. Wixom |
| :--- | :--- |
| AZ Bar 025083 (admitted Pro Hac Vice) | NV Bar No. 2812 |
| Christian G. Stahl | Karl L. Nielson |
| AZ Bar 029984 (admitted Pro Hac Vice) | NV Bar No. 5082 |
| Quarles \& Brady LLP | Smith Larsen \& Wixom |
| One Renaissance Square | Hills Center Business Park |
| Two North Central Avenue | 1935 Village Center Circle |
| Phoenix, AZ 85004 | Las Vegas, Nevada 89134 |
| 602-229-5200 | $702-252-5002$ |


| DESCRIPTION | FILE DATE | PAGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings <br> before the Honorable Judge Timothy C. <br> Williams, District Court Judge | $06 / 08 / 2021$ | RPI 001 |

RESPECTFULLY submitted this 1st day of November, 2021.
SMITH LARSEN \& WIXOM
/s/ Karl L. Nielson
Michael B. Wixom, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 2812
Karl L. Nielson, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 5082
Hills Center Business Park
1935 Village Center Circle
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
and
Lauren Elliott Stine (\#025083)
(admitted Pro Hac Vice)
Christian G. Stahl (\#029984)
(admitted Pro Hac Vice)
Quarles \& Brady LLP
Renaissance One
Two North Central Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85004-2391

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on November 1, 2021, I served the following document(s):

## REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST'S APPENDIX

BY ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION: by transmitting the document to the parties identified below via the Court's E-Flex efiling system.

BY MAIL: by placing the documents(s) listed above in a sealed envelope, postage prepaid, in the U.S. Mail at Las Vegas, Nevada, addressed as set forth below.

BY FAX: by transmitting the document(s) listed above via telefacsimile to the fax number(s) set forth below. A printed transmission record is attached to the file copy of this document(s).

## /s/ Jana L. Rivard

An Employee of SMITH LARSEN \& WIXOM

JUNE 8, 2021 JDD, LLC V. LARRY LEMONS, ET AL.

1

A-20-811232-B
DEPARTMENT XVI

## DISTRICT COURT

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

JDD, LLC, A NEVADA LIMITED )
LIABILITY COMPANY; TCS PARTNERS, ) LLC, A NEVADA LIMITED LIABILITY ) COMPANY; JOHN SAUNDERS, AN ) INDIVIDUAL; AND TREVOR SCHMIDT, AN ) INDIVIDUAL,

Plaintiffs,
vs.
MARIMED, INC. F/K/A WORLDS ONLINE, INC., A DELAWARE CORPORATION; )

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE.

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT
OF
PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE THE HONORABLE JUDGE TIMOTHY C. WILLIAMS
DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

DATED TUESDAY, JUNE 8, 2021

REPORTED BY: MARLENE DURON, RPR, NV CCR NO. 958

1


APPEARANCES :
FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

## IGLODY LAW

BY: LEE I. IGLODY, ESQ.
2580 ST. ROSE PARKWAY, SUITE 330
HENDERSON, NEVADA 89074
(702) 425-5366

LEE@IGLODY.COM

FOR THE DEFENDANTS ITEM 9 LABS CORP. F/K/A AIRWARE LABS CORP. AND CROWN DYNAMICS CORP.; ITEM 9 PROPERTIES, LLC; STRIVE MANAGEMENT, L.L.C. D/B/A STRIVE LIFE; VIRIDIS GROUP I9 CAPITAL, LLC; VIRIDIS GROUP HOLDINGS, LLC; ANDREW BOWDEN; DOUGLAS BOWDEN; BRYCE SKALLA; JEFFREY RASSAS; AND CHASE HERSCHMAN:

```
QUARLES & BRADY, LLP
```

BY: CHRISTIAN G. STAHL, ESQ.
TWO NORTH CENTRAL AVENUE

PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85004
(602) 229-5200

CHRISTIAN.STAHL@QUARLES.COM

AND
APPEARANCES CONTINUED:
SMITH, LARSEN \& WIXON
BY: KARL L. NIELSON, ESQ.
1935 VILLAGE CENTER CIRCLE
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89134
(702) 252-5002
HLN@ SLWLAW. COM
FOR DEFENDANT THE HARVEST FOUNDATION, LLC:
BARRETT MATURA
BY: KEVIN C. BARRETT, ESQ.
7575 WEST VEGAS DRIVE, SUITE 150C
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89128
(702) 833-1033
KBARRETT@BARRETTMATURA.COM

1

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA; TUESDAY, JUNE 8, 2021
9:25 A.M. PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: All right. So we're going to move on. Next up happens to be page 10 of the calendar, and that's JDD, LLC versus Larry Lemons. And let's go ahead and set forth our appearances for the record.

MR. IGLODY: Good morning, your Honor. Lee Iglody for the plaintiffs.

MR. STAHL: Morning, your Honor. Christian Stahl for the Item 9 defendants. There's ten of them. I can list them off for the record. They are: Item 9 Labs Corp., Item 9 Properties, Strive Management, Viridis Group 9 -- I9 Capital, Viridis Group Holdings, Andrew Bowden, Douglas Bowden, Bryce Skalla, Jeffrey Rassas and Chase Herschman.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
MR. NIELSON: Good morning, your Honor. Karl
Nielsen, also on behalf of Item 9.
THE COURT: Okay. And does that cover all appearances? I think so, right?

MR. BARRETT: This is Kevin Barrett on behalf of Harvest, your Honor.

09:26:3010

THE COURT: Yes, okay. Thank you, sir.
And we want to have this matter reported; is that correct?

MR. IGLODY: That is correct, your Honor. This is Lee Iglody speaking.

THE COURT: All right. And it's my understanding that this was the defendants' motion for attorneys' fees. We'll go ahead and pass the floor over to the defense.

MR. STAHL: Thank you, your Honor.
The Item 9 defendants should be awarded their attorneys' fees and costs of $\$ 79,893.83$ and the cost of this motion for three reasons.

First, the Item 9 defendants' incurred fees and costs are reasonable. This is not a simple two-party, red car, blue car case.

Second, Plaintiffs find themselves here because of their own actions. Plaintiffs reneged on their agreement to dismiss in November, leaving the Item 9 defendants to incur a substantial portion of their requested fees, only to have Plaintiffs concede half of their claims and dismiss all of the individual defendants in their opposition papers.

Third, Plaintiffs' attempts to relitigate the motion to dismiss by filing voluminous exhibits in their opposition is irrelevant and further demonstrates the

09:27:4610
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harassment the Item 9 defendants have had to navigate. Going to the reasonableness of the fees, the criteria for attorneys' fees motions is governed by the Brunzell factors. Plaintiffs do not dispute any of the factors except the amount of fees for the work performed. This is found in Plaintiff's opposition at page 8. The fees are reasonable. As listed in the Item 9 defendants' reply brief at pages 8 and 9, Defendants performed necessary work to dismiss Plaintiffs' complaint against them.

Second, with respect to Plaintiffs reneging the November dismissal agreement, Plaintiffs had agreed to dismiss all claims against the Item 9 defendants without prejudice in late November. Inexplicably Plaintiffs reneged, with no reasoning. Even more inexplicably, when faced with a motion to dismiss, Plaintiffs dismissed all of the individual defendants and half of their claims against all of the Item 9 defendants in their opposition papers and thus, did not have to incur the cost of defense and yet force Defendants to bring the motion.

Nothing changed between November and January. Notably, had Plaintiffs honored their agreements to dismiss unsubstantiated complaints against the Item 9 defendants, Defendants would not have had to incur over 70 percent of their requested fees and over 90 percent of the requested

09:29:0110

09:29:1715
costs. The amount of the Item 9 defendants' fees and costs falls squarely on Plaintiffs.

Finally, with respect to Plaintiffs' attempts to re-litigate the motion to dismiss and harassment of the Item 9 defendants, Plaintiffs attempt to justify their actions by attempting to re-litigate the motion to dismiss and filing over 300 pages of exhibits to a declaration. The majority of the opposition in the declaration does not even pertain to the Item 9 defendants but, rather, Defendants MariMed, Lemons and Burton. The motion to dismiss has already been decided, and the opposition papers and declaration are irrelevant.

Interestingly, Plaintiffs' opposition is the first time they explicitly admit their agency with Mr. Roche. Mr. Roche's actions during the pendency of the case are another reason fees and costs are more than reasonable. Mr. Roche's tactics of obtaining client goals through fear, intimidation and harassment, regardless of merit, facts or actual substantiation, have no place in discourse.

For these reasons the Item 9 defendants request they be awarded their attorneys' fees and costs of $\$ 79,893.83$ and the costs of bringing this motion. If the court has any questions on the Item 9 defendants' motion, I am happy to answer them. Thank you for your time, your Honor.

THE COURT: Not at this time, sir.
We'll hear from the plaintiffs.
MR. IGLODY: Thank you, your Honor. Lee Iglody again, here for the plaintiffs.

Briefly, as outlined in our opposition, we, again, disagree with the court's dismissal of the claims; however, the standard here is whether or not there would have been a reasonable basis for bringing the claims in the first place.

Brian Roche was involved. He did investigate the facts and circumstances surrounding the $\$ 741,250$ invested in Harvest Foundation with Burton and Lemons. His investigation resulted in the first amended complaint that was the subject of the motion to dismiss, which the court granted.

Here, the question is whether or not Roche's declaration attached exhibits -- and, again, going back to the first amended complaint -- by the way, I'll be asking to file a second amended one tomorrow. But in the meantime, the facts that were pled were sufficient, we argued, to maintain the causes of action that were pled in the first amended complaint. And so we ask the court not to grant the motion for fees.

However, since the court recently granted the motion for fees from one of the other defendants, we went
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ahead and said, on the Brunzell factors -- I'm not going to dispute in any way, shape or form the capabilities of opposing counsel. Their work was outstanding on every level. However, the amount of fees being requested on the motion to dismiss, where, again, the court dismissed our claims without us ever having an opportunity to offer one shred discovery, we're saying it would be somewhat excessive and unreasonable in the context of the case.

And so we just ask your Honor, first, deny the motion, but if the court's inclined to grant the motion, we would suggest the fees being requested are excessive. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
We'll hear the reply.
MR. STAHL: Yes, your Honor, thank you.
As Mr. Iglody has mentioned, the court has already granted Defendant Snowell's motion for attorneys' fees and costs. And in that grant, it granted $\$ 15,620$ in attorneys' fees for a motion that was over a lack of personal jurisdiction for a single client. I have ten clients, seven of which required declarations, and we're fighting eight different claims. If you multiply Snowell's award by ten you're at 150,000, and that's not what we're asking for. We're asking for our legitimate fees spent on the case of $\$ 79,983.83$.

09:33:2210

Going through the work that was performed is substantial. In their opposition, Plaintiffs suggest that a reasonable fee is one hour of lawyer time and one hour of paralegal time per page of motion. That's illogical. Walking through what actually occurred, we can see why. The Item 9 defendants and some of my partners at my law firm had to deal with Mr. Roche's harassment, intimidation at the beginning of the case. He wasn't concerned about the actual merits of the case. He was just concerned about getting his clients their money. He sums it up nicely in one of this e-mails from June 20th, 2020:
"The only path I'm aligned on currently is the path to 100 percent complete success: Getting my guys their money back. Anyone not helping in that regard will be road kill in my rearview mirror."

The Item 9 defendants wrote a letter to Plaintiffs' counsel detailing the harassment and lack of substantiated claims on November 10th, 2020 and showing the case was meritless. In response, Plaintiffs' former counsel agreed to dismiss the Item 9 defendants. The parties drafted dismissal papers and were on the verge of dismissing, finalizing details. Out of the blue, Plaintiffs fired their lawyers at that time and reneged on the agreement to
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dismiss. Then the Item 9 defendants had to turn to writing a motion to dismiss.

Again, I have ten clients, each of which was defending eight claims of a 244-paragraph, meandering complaint. The eight claims were not simple claims. They ranged from unjust enrichment and civil conspiracy to alter ego and intentional interference with contract and prospective economic advantage. We also had to research and investigate the equitable relief that Plaintiff had brought forth in the first amended complaint. Each of these have to be researched, applied to the facts and argued in the motion. Moreover, several of the defendants had jurisdictional challenges which also had to be investigated, researched and argued in the motion. Those defendants also need declarations to support the jurisdictional challenges.

In the end, the ten Item 9 defendants had formulated a motion to dismiss seeking various forms of dismissal, from lack of personal jurisdiction, lack of subject matter jurisdiction, and failures to state a claim for each of the claims against them.

In Plaintiffs' opposition brief, they began it by dismissing five of the Item 9 defendants outright and then dismissing four other claims against of all the defendants outright. Nothing had changed between the November
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$09: 36: 4425$
dismissal agreement and the January opposition brief, yet Plaintiff forced the Item 9 defendants to brief, investigate, research the arguments for five defendants and four claims for no reason. The remainder of the plaintiffs' opposition barely pertained to the Item 9 defendants and, rather, focused on MariMed, Lemons, Burton and Harvest.

Nevertheless, the Item 9 defendants needed to address their opposition papers and file a reply brief. Given the multiple Item 9 defendants remaining and the remaining claims, counsel prepared at length for the hearing. The hearing itself was lengthy because of all the defendants involved and the various motions to dismiss. After the hearing, after prevailing, the Item 9 defendants also drafted the order hereby granted by the court.

Plaintiffs have no one to blame but themselves for the amount of fees incurred by the Item 9 defendants. Over 73 percent of the fees and over 91 percent of the costs the Defendant requests now were occurred after November 30th, 2020, which was the approximate date that Plaintiffs reneged on their agreement to dismiss. It would be wrong for Plaintiffs to be able run up costs only to punt later and not have to face the consequences of squandering legal and judicial resources.

Again, the Item 9 defendants request the court
grant them their motion for attorneys' fees for $\$ 79,893.83$ and the costs of bringing this motion. Thank you again, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. This is what I'm going to do. I just have a general comment. You don't file a complaint to conduct discovery. Rule 11 mandates that prior to filing a lawsuit, you have to have sufficient enough facts to support claims for relief and/or jurisdictional issues. If not, it's problematic. It just is.

And when I look at the history of this case, I become somewhat concerned because litigation shouldn't be utilized as a bludgeon, right? It shouldn't. Cases should -- there should be facts that support the complaint, and, hopefully, cases get decided on the merits by the factfinder at the end of the day.

I rarely grant motions to dismiss, I don't mind saying that. But to me, in this case, it was fairly obvious what the outcome should be. And so what I'm going to do is this -- and I think it's important to point out, number one, I did consider the Brunzell factors in this case, and it was a little more complex than the normal oneor two- or three-party case. It just was. And it appeared, to me, it did take a lot of work to prepare and investigate on behalf of the number of clients that were
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part of the dismissal motion in this matter.
And so what I'm going to do is this: Regarding the motion for fees and costs, I'm going to grant that, number one.

Secondly, as far as the fees being requested, I've considered the Brunzell factors, as I'm required to do. And that focused on, you know, the quality of work performed, the background of the firm involved, the complexity of the issues and the like. And I'm going to go ahead and award the fees as requested in this matter.

And so, sir, what I'm going to require you to do is prepare an order with some detail, addressing the Brunzell factors and my ultimate decision in this case. Do you understand?

MR. STAHL: Thank you, your Honor.
THE COURT: All right.
MR. STAHL: Will do, thank you.
THE COURT: All right. Everyone, enjoy your day.
(Proceedings concluded at 9:39 a.m.)
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